

Pavol Tišliar & Branislav Šprocha

Censuses in Slovakia in the interwar and post-war period

MASARYK
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

MUNI
ARTS

Censuses in Slovakia in the interwar and post-war period

Pavol Tišliar and Branislav Šprocha

MASARYK UNIVERSITY PRESS

Brno 2023

Tišliar, Pavol, 1975-

Censuses in Slovakia in the interwar and post-war period / Pavol Tišliar and Branislav Šprocha.
-- First electronic edition. -- Brno : Masaryk University Press, 2023. -- 1 online zdroj
Obsahuje bibliografii a bibliografické odkazy

ISBN 978-80-280-0443-9 (online ; pdf)

* 314.116 * (437.6) * (048.8)

- 1919-1950

- sčítání obyvatelstva -- Slovensko -- 20. století

- sčítání obyvatelstva -- dějiny -- 20. století

- sčítání obyvatelstva -- metodologie

- monografie

314 - Demografie. Populace [18]

Reviewers:

prof. PhDr. Martin Hetényi, PhD.

(Faculty of Arts, Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra)

Prof. PhDr. Peter Mičko, PhD.

(Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica)

Ing. Boris Vaňo

(Demographic Research Centre – Infostat Bratislava)



SLOVAK RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY

The monograph is the result of the grant task APVV-0199-20 “*Transformácia populačného vývoja na Slovensku v regionálnom pohľade od konca 19. do polovice 20. storočia*” [Transformation of population development in Slovakia in regional view from the end of the 19th to the middle of the 20th century]



CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0

© 2023 Masaryk University, Branislav Šprocha

ISBN 978-80-280-0443-9

<https://doi.org/10.5817/CZ.MUNI.M280-0443-2023>

Contents

Foreword	7
Census as a Mean of Population Research in Slovakia	9
Census in Slovakia in 1919	13
Problems in Slovakia after declaration of Czechoslovak Republic	14
Preparation work for extraordinary census and its methodology	16
Census forms	24
Preparation of census by public administration	29
About 1919 census process	31
Results of census	39
Meaning of census 1919	44
Czechoslovak census 1921	47
Background of the 1921 Census with emphasis on the relationship with Slovakia	47
Basic forms and sheets	57
Implementation of census	60
Processing, publication and quality of the census results	67
Census 1930	71
Preparation of the 1930 census	71
Census forms and how to fill them in	81
The course of the 1930 census	86
Errors in national statistics	96
Processing and publication of results	103
Selected results of the Czechoslovak censuses of 1921 and 1930	106
The path to the 1938 Provincial Population Census	111
Conscription sheet and forms of the 1938 provincial census	115
Implementation and results of the provincial inventory	118
Census 1940	125
Draft national cadastre	126
Preparation of the 1940 census	129
1940 Census Forms	134
The course of the 1940 census	136

Results of the 1940 census and its comparison with the results of census 1938	139
Civil population census 1946	143
Census preparation	143
Census content and its implementation	144
Publishing of census results	146
National census 1950	147
Census preparation work	147
Concept of data gathering about houses, flats and persons	149
Data gathering	154
Census results processing and publishing	155
Conclusion	159
Archival Sources and References	165
Archival Sources	165
Statistical editions and reports	167
References	170
The period presses	178
Sources of law	178

Foreword

The publication is dedicated to seven most significant census projects organised in the territory of Slovakia following the Czechoslovak Republic declaration. Conceptually, the publication refers to and follows up our monograph published in 2022 (Tišliar and Šprocha 2022c), where we analysed the process of preparation and implementation of census projects in Slovakia during the first half of the 20th century, focusing mainly on the Slovak historical peculiarities. Since this subject matter is not associated only with the Slovak history but affects the broader Central-European area, we decided to prepare a more complex publication in the language available for professional circles outside of the Czechoslovak territory. Not only census subject matter is dominating in the publication; it also deals with nationalities, population nationality structure, the problem of approach and concept of language and nationality, and their application in particular census projects. While detail dedication to particular censuses' results wasn't our primary goal, finally we dedicated a smaller room to nationality structure and selected results that indicate more significant changes at population of Slovakia during the monitored period.

Practically each of the censuses and conscriptions held during period of years 1919–1950 can be reconstructed in detail and a special publication could be compiled about each of them. We decided to choose such information that we considered of key importance for understanding of the history of censuses and their contextual elements, especially in connection with the demographic development of Slovakia and its population structures.

We would like to especially acknowledge our reviewers, prof. Peter Mičko (Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica), prof. Martin Hetényi (Constantin the Philosopher University in Nitra), and Ing. Boris Vaňo (Demographic Research Centre – Infostat Bratislava) for valuable annotations and numerous ideas.

Bratislava, August 13, 2023

the authors

Census as a Mean of Population Research in Slovakia

In the modern society, census represent necessary and important statistical events with significant information package as an outcome thereof, characterizing the population from various points of view (personal, social, economic). They are searching actions that are usually organised and methodically coordinated in the modern era by the Statistical Office upon assistance of the public administration authorities. The importance of these events doesn't refer merely to the fact that they capture the population in particular moment but the fact that they are organised on periodical basis, yielding in the information capturing the development of particular population at time and in particular space. Subsequently it allows for analyzing and synthesizing selected demographical indicators in long-term context and on various levels.

Censuses associated with the territory and population of Slovakia have been organised for more than 2 centuries and no sufficient attention has been paid to them in our historiography to date. In the theses from latest modern history, censuses results are often used and analysed, however often uncritically or even without the required knowledge of what the data represent. Only negligible room has been dedicated to the census methodology, to content components, census field process itself, or to processing and publishing of the outcomes. In our publication, we focused on all these mutually interconnected staged actions in relation to census and nomenclature events that were held in Slovakia during period of years 1919 through 1950. The aim of our work is to assess the data quality and their narrative value.

Modern censuses have been held in Slovakia on regular basis in 10-years intervals since 1869. However, it doesn't mean that census-like and nomenclature events weren't organised before. Such census-like events and conscriptions weren't organised under auspices of the Statistical Office, they didn't relate to regular census cycle and mainly, they weren't aimed at a broader information gathering about the population. The census-like events and conscriptions were focused on gathering of selected characteristics of the population for military or fiscal purposes. On the other hand, modern censuses since 1869 were dealing also with gathering of detail data for scientific purposes of population studies. They were associated with the development of modern demography and their results were mainly used in the decision-making area and in various other areas of human activities and functioning of the society.

In the historical Hungary whose current territory of Slovakia had been a part of, censuses were organised till the half of the 19th century and bound exclusively to practical needs. Regardless the censuses of economic nature, e.g. the oldest preserved fragments of portal (dical) censuses dated in the 15th century, more significant conscriptions are dated in the 18th century (Tišliar and Šprocha

2017a:12) Upon initiation of the Charles III, so called regnicolar (territorial) conscriptions were created during years 1715 and 1720. They were aimed at ensuring the army funding (Dávid 1957:148). While these conscriptions failed to ensure the pursued goal, data summary from the conscriptions was published at the end of the 19th century (Acsády 1896). Another census was organised at the end of the 18th century, now aimed at ensuring the military needs. General census during the reign of Joseph II. was organised during years 1785/1786 with subsequent review (Acsádi 1957:231). It was of general nature, thus capturing all inhabitants of the Hungary, despite of the primary interest that was focused on identification of particular data about the male part of the population (Thirring 1938).¹ Census covering only the commons was held at the beginning of the 19th century, initiated by the Hungarian Council, and it was of military nature as well (Kovacsics 1957:22–23). Since its main interest was to gather certain information about the commons, it captured only selected groups of the Hungarian population. In 1828, country census was held in Hungary, focused on the register of adult population of age 18–60 years (Bottló 1957:254–255). So called Bach censuses represent the transition from older feudal to modern censuses, which were organised for practical administration purposes in Hungary. Therefore, in both censuses mainly basic characteristics were gathered, for example number of population present at particular settlements and their basic structure according to religion and language. The first census was held during years 1850/1851 when civil administration was implemented during the post-revolution period, and the second census was held in 1857 (Czoernig 1861; Kovacsics 1957: 24–25).² Practically, we consider census dated at the end of 1869 the first modern census organised by the Statistical Office and pursuing also scientific goals. The rule of regular censuses as of Dec 31 in the years ending with zero was adopted in 1869, covering the years 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1910. In Hungary, special legal standard was adopted at every census, contrary to the Austrian part of the Monarchy. Census dated in 1910 represented the last census in the Hungarian Monarchy before the Czechoslovak Republic declaration.³

Following the Czechoslovak Republic declaration in 1918, joining the Czech countries, Slovakia and later also Ruthenia in a single state confederacy, building

¹ Published results in the following papers: *Az első magyarországi népszámlálás (1784–1787)*. Budapest: Központi statisztikai hivatal, 1960; *II. József népszámlálásának községi adatai*. Budapest: Központi statisztikai hivatal, 1960/61. *Történeti statisztikai tanulmányok 2. Pótlás az első magyarországi népszámláláshoz 1786–1787*. Budapest, 1975.

² *Az 1850. és 1857. évi népszámlálás*. Budapest: KSH, 1993; *Hírdetés a magyarországi k. főkörmánytól 1856-diki június 20-káról 10,323 sz. a.; 12,376 sz. a. I.*

³ *Az 1869. évi népszámlálás vallási adatai*. Budapest: KSH Levéltár, 2005; *A Magyar Korona Országáiban Az 1881. Év Elején Végrehajtott Népszámlálás Eredményei*. I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar Kir. Statisztikai Hivatal, 1882; *A Magyar korona országáiban az 1881. Év Elején Végrehajtott Népszámlálás Eredményei*. II. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1882; *A Magyar korona országainak helységnévtára*. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1892; *A Magyar korona országainak 1900. évi népszámlálása*. Első rész. In: *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, Új sorozat I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1902; *A Magyar szent korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása*. Első rész. In: *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, Új sorozat I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1912.

of a new statistical service started in Slovakia that assumed major responsibility for the preparation and implementation of the following censuses. Nevertheless, special and unplanned censuses were also organised in Slovakia for particular purposes and goals. They differed from periodical censuses in many aspects. Extraordinary or preliminary census in 1919 was the first census in Slovakia during period between WWI and WWII, initially responding to the idea of supporting the Czechoslovak delegation at the peace talks in Paris with timely data about population in Slovakia (Tišliar 2007a). Since it was mainly effort for substantiation of the new Slovakia state borders, the primary aim here was to identify especially the nationality of inhabitants in this territory. With another census dated in 1921, the Czechoslovak statistics submitted request for the continuation of cyclic censuses. The next census was organised by the Statistical Office in 1930, despite of originally planned in 1925 or 1926 (Tišliar 2014:266–270).

The crisis that the Central Europe started facing upon the rising of fascism to prominence in Germany and that was adversely reflected in the political and social development of Czechoslovakia, resulted in 1938 in the organizing of so called country conscription of population in Slovakia. It was performed by the Regional Office in Bratislava in cooperation with the autonomous Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak State. Nationality was of primary importance also here but the reasons were mainly associated with internal policy and the efforts of the German minority in Slovakia to acquire cultural autonomy and special status (Šprocha and Tišliar 2016:17–18). The census dated in 1940 was denominated as the first one of the kind but it was simply a follow up of the periodical censuses between the WWI. and WWII as for major part of the applied methodology (Tišliar and Šprocha 2022b:69–86). Both the country conscription and census dated in 1940 were conducted on restricted territory of Slovakia, since the southern part of the territory was annexed to the neighboring Hungary.

Post-war censuses or conscriptions were also of a specific nature. Census dated in 1946 was aimed in Slovakia at increasing quality of the supplies' records and gathering more precise statistics about the population workforce (Tišliar and Šprocha 2022a:52–73). Periodical census was planned and organised in 1950 (Gyurgyík 2020:107–128; Gyurgyík 2021:13–34). Soon after the WWII. ending, census dated in 1946 served also as the first registration of the changes that occurred during the war. Considering Slovakia, census dated in 1950 was rather a follow up of the censuses held between the WWI. and WWII since, as we already mentioned, census dated in 1940 covered only the restricted territory of Slovakia.

The stated brief overview indicates that the history of conscriptions, nomenclatures and censuses is extensive also in our territory but also widely unknown and not evaluated. We divided the paper in particular “weight centers” according to censuses and similar events that follow one another chronologically, contextually but especially with methodology that was developed during the entire monitored period. We made effort to embed all censuses and similar events in the historical context of the history of Slovakia, evtl. Central European history, and to explain particular stages of preparation or implementation of the censuses.

Archive research repeatedly conducted primarily in Slovak and Czech archives represented a fundamental source of our knowledge. We also referred to relevant scientific papers including significant source works and editions of statistical nature. We didn't pay attention to census outcomes in the context of the Slovak population development since we dealt with it in our previous few works and grant tasks. We intended to analyze the history of censuses, to name the pros and cons, and to point out the faults that could have finally affected the results and contributed to the source criticism.

Census in Slovakia in 1919

Census in 1919 was the first one in Slovakia following the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic (CSR). It was a very unusual and specific census that was inscribed in the history as a hugely controversial event that those in charge had managed to organise thanks to willpower only, despite of all accompanied issues. Census 1919 was organised at extraordinarily complicated conditions determined by the nature of the post-war Europe where the face of the Central European room was primarily changing. Moreover, instability and often a peculiar interpretation of preliminary peace terms were significantly expressed in the Central Europe at the time.

The World War I. was without doubts one of the major milestones of the European history. The war conflict that significantly affected not only population development has finally resulted in the changes that changed the society direction in many aspects. The importance of the WWI. has been sometimes marked in the world historiography as a milestone of the end of so called long 19th century (Burke 2000).⁴ Major geopolitical changes occurred in the Central Europe after the war, namely demarcation or change of the state borders of a few countries, which was definitely expressed in both social and economic area. The new post-war structure in the Central Europe represented major impulse for Slovakia primarily for development of society, ethnicity and national culture. Declaration of the CSR in 1918 undoubtedly represented a significant aspect of our national history.

Census 1919 should be perceived mainly in relation to declaration of the CSR since identification of the citizens' headcount living initially within temporary state borders of the eastern, Slovak part of Czechoslovakia, represented the initial idea and finally also the main goal of the extensive project. The efforts to support the Czechoslovakia peace delegation that represented the new state formation at the post-war talks in Paris, where the new state borders of Czechoslovakia should be set out, referred to the intention of at least the same importance. While this goal was later changed and adjusted, it was sufficient as substantiation for the commencement of preparations for extraordinary census. The very first mention of census organizing in Slovakia came from personal diary of Vavro Šrobár, a recognised Slovak politician who entered the organization of the "population conscription" in his diary on December 07, 1918.⁵ The Šrobár's remarks included the proposals of so called description sheets intended for census and separately for villages. Regarding the persons, it was proposed to identify the name and

⁴ Denomination *The long Nineteenth Century* mostly relates to a longer period defined by years (1750) 1789–1914.

⁵ Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – Slovak national archives in Bratislava (SNA), archival fund (f.) Osobný fond Vavro Šrobár (Personal Fund Vavro Šrobár), 1900–1948 (OFVŠ), box No. 2, signature No. 47.

surname (including the previous one/s), mother language and place of birth.⁶ Communal sheet accentuated the teaching language at schools, offices and churches. It can be presumed that the idea was originated in the Slovak political environment, probably directly from Vavro Šrobár, since it was him who was later directly engaged and empowered with preparation and implementation of census. He played an important role also in case of publishing the census 1919 results. Since the draft census sheets existed already on December 07, 1918, we can draw from that the idea of organizing the census was more elaborated and of the earlier date for sure. He informed the government on December 24, 1918 on the commencement of census and required “...regulation of what else should be identified within the census along with population nationality, official language at schools, offices, churches and villages.” He asked the Statistical Office in Prague for assistance and for notifying the State Printing Company on the prepared census.⁷ Afterwards it was solely up to the Czechoslovak Government to assume standpoint thereto, also in relation to the then situation in Slovakia.

Problems in Slovakia after declaration of Czechoslovak Republic

Along with international factors that were directly associated with census 1919 in some moments, internal situation of Czechoslovakia also significantly influenced the census. Especially, situation in Slovakia immediately after the Czechoslovakia declaration was troublesome. Namely, large part of Slovak territory wasn't controlled by the Czechoslovak administration system at the end of 1918 that had not managed to consolidate and develop till then. Initially, various temporary bodies and units managed to engage these “blind spots”, for example Skalica provisional government – Skalická dočasná vláda (November 04, 1918), led by already mentioned V. Šrobár (Klimko 1979:43; Čaplovič et al. 2000:225; Bielik 1961:636; Vojáček and Shelle 2007:213). On the regional and local level, self-appointed local national committees were founded (Krajčovičová 2004:64–65). However, all these bodies were only of an episodic nature and they ceased in a very short time. It applied also to a spontaneous declaration of the Slovak National Republic in the Eastern Slovakia. It was declared in November 1918 by so called Eastern-Slovak Board with support of Budapest and led by Viktor Dvorčák (Petranský 2015:335). Support from Budapest was subsequently reflected in the declaration of self-appointed republic with headquarters in Košice to remain an integral part of the post-war Hungary. This formation ceased upon arrival of the Czechoslovak army in Košice.

Finally, all attempts for keeping the Slovak territory as a part of Hungary after the WWI. failed. It is not surprising that demarcation of the common Czechoslovak – Hungarian state borders represented one of the most problematic areas. It was even more complicated on November 13, 1918 upon signed Belgrade Truce. Based on the Belgrade Truce, former Hungarian Administration System remained in Hungarian possession (Krajčovičová 2004:66). It represented the pretence for

⁶ SNA, f. OFVŠ, box. 2, signature 47.

⁷ National Archives of the Czech Republic in Prague (NAČR), f. Předsednictvo ministerské rady (Headquarters of Ministerial Board), 1918–1945 (PMR), box. No. 3285, signature No. 3891/1918.

Hungarian army to gradually annex the Slovak territory and expel the weaker Czechoslovak military corps out of the area. Annexation by the Hungarian army stopped and restoration was made upon the decision of the Higher Allied Headquarters on December 03, 1918. The decision named Czechoslovakia as one of the allied countries that were entitled to annex the territory. Pursuant to the decision, the Hungarian army had to leave the Slovak territory and demarcation line was set on December 24, 1918 that should be subject to further discussions at the prepared peace talks in Paris.

Since inclusion of the Slovak territory in Czechoslovakia should represent one of the key areas of the Czechoslovak peace delegation at the talks in Paris, the idea of supporting the talks about the new state borders by timely data about headcount and ethnicity of the population seemed as reasonable and necessary.

In Slovakia that required internal consolidation and functionality of the public administration, V. Šrobár was appointed for Minister of Slovak administration on December 07, 1918. It was a temporary office with rather extensive competences aimed primarily at consolidating the Slovak territory and its administrative inclusion (Bianchi et al. 1973:52; Vojáček et al. 2013:103). As well, the empowered minister was ordered to gradually adapt the Hungarian administration system to the new Czechoslovak conditions.⁸ The empowered minister reported to Central Czechoslovak Government and his functions and office, whose building started as a part of fulfillment of his competences and powers, cumulated practically all governmental departments (Bianchi et al. 1973: 58).⁹ The office of a “Slovak minister” was renamed to CSR Minister with Full Powers for Slovak Administration through the new Act on Extraordinary and Temporary Provisions, dated at the end of 1918. The minister’s competences weren’t enumerative stated but he was in charge of acting and doing all to ensure the order and consolidation of conditions in Slovakia.¹⁰ The competences of the appointed minister were territorially restricted and regulations adopted by the minister with full powers became valid upon his signature (Vojáček and Schelle 2007: 217). Thus, it was truly the office with almost dictator’s powers valid for period of consolidation of conditions in Slovakia (Tišliar 2013:11–13). Originally, the empowered minister and his office were located at northern Slovakia in Žilina. In February 1919, Bratislava became his permanent residence upon partial consolidation of the state border conditions.¹¹ The Office of Empowered Minister was renamed to the Ministry with Full Powers for Administration of Slovakia (MPS) with total 148 employees. It was usually called the Šrobár’s Ministry or the Office of Empowered Minister, despite of the fact that it wasn’t a ministry as

⁸ Act No. 11/1918 Coll.

⁹ 14 governmental departments were gradually created for: 1. administration, 2. justice, 3. military affairs, 4. the state police, 5. agriculture, 6. finances, 7. Catholic Church affairs, 8. Lutheran Church and other churches, 9. industry and commerce, 10. healthcare, 11. education and culture, 12. transport and post, 13. social care, 14. and for public work.

¹⁰ Act No. 64/1918 Coll.

¹¹ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 746/1921.

such (Kačírek and Tišliar 2019:9-10).¹² The person of the Empowered Minister, Vavro Šrobár, became a crucial person for the preparation and implementation of extraordinary census in Slovakia in 1919.

Preparation work for extraordinary census and its methodology

Speaking of extraordinary census is actually very correct. The Ministerial Board in Prague identified itself with the idea of implementing census in Slovakia on December 30, 1918 while the situation in Slovakia was extraordinary in the light of its inclusion in Czechoslovakia (Mráz 1919/1920:2). Karel Kramář, Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Government, informed on the organization of census the Ministry of Internal Affairs on January 02, 2019. He mentioned its primary focus on nationality of persons, official languages at schools, offices and churches, and occupation according to nationality.¹³

Entire census organization was entrusted to the empowered minister V. Šrobár, which was definitely not traditional since the preceding censuses in the Hungarian part of Monarchy had been prepared and evaluated by the Statistical Office since 1869. Anyway, it didn't operate at the time in Czechoslovakia and its official opening had been prepared (Tišliar 2009:8-9; Podzimek 1974:111).¹⁴ Along with conferring consent to census, the Ministerial Board asked the provincial Statistical Office that later became a foundation for the Czechoslovak Statistical Office, to delegate professional support of preparation meetings dealing with census and thus assisted at successful course of the census. The provincial Statistical Office delegated its secretary Josef Mráz on January 13, 1919 who subsequently attended all preparation methodical meetings about the census (Mráz 1919/1920:2).¹⁵

The most important meeting held on the census methodology was held in Žilina. All crucial principles and issues were discussed there. The meeting was held on January 22 and 23, 1919. All minister assistants having full power attended it. On the first day of meeting they set forth the goals of census and paid special attention to demographical marks that the basic census form should specify about every person. Efforts for correction of outcomes of the last Hungarian census dated 1910 represented an important argument for the need for census organization along with the mentioned goals of Czechoslovak delegation support at the peace talks in Paris, and also practical goals focused on functioning of the public administration.¹⁶ The outcomes of the last Hungarian census in the area of

¹² Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic - the State archives in Bratislava (ŠABA), f. Slúžnovský úrad v Trnave (Subordinate Office in Trnava), 1856-1922 (f. SÚ Trnava), box. No. 5, and No. 202/1919 adm.; ŠABA, f. Bratislavská župa I (Bratislava district I), 1398-1922 (f. Župa Bratislava I.), box No. 1, signature No. 228a/1919 pres.

¹³ NAČR, f. Ministerstvo vnútra - Stará registratúra (Ministry of Internal Affairs - the Old Registry) 1918-1938 (f. MV-SR), box No. 249, signature No. 2122/19.

¹⁴ Fundament of the Czechoslovak Statistical Office that was opened in January 1919 represented transformation of the Provincial Statistical Office, which subsequently significantly influenced the statistical services in Slovakia, Act No. 49/1919 Coll.

¹⁵ SNA, f. Krajský úrad v Bratislave (Regional Office in Bratislava), 1928-1939 (f. KÚ), box No. 490, signature No. KÚ-No.1-1930-2.4.1; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 482/19; signature No. 1436/1919.

¹⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 482/19.

population ethnicity weren't considered correct already at the time of the census and the argument repeatedly sounded in the preparation of the extraordinary census in 1919.¹⁷ Finally it significantly affected the methodology of national census statistics in 1919.

General census methodology referred to the Hungarian statistical praxis; in particular the principles of census 1910 were overtaken. For this reason, census sheet from 1910 became one of the essential materials. It was modified in a few aspects, especially in relation to the goals and requirements of the prepared census. Extensive discussion was held at the meeting in Žilina regarding a broader consensus and approval of 15 points that should become an integral part of the time-marked "conscription sheet" of census in 1919. In case of name and surname, information was required about the previous name and surname because of identified Hungarian modification of the names. Furthermore, the data required specification of relation between the persons and household owner (landlord); gender; age (whole years of reached age); family status; birthplace for better identification as well as possible monitoring of domestic population migration. Further marks that were recommended to include in the conscription sheets were also of utmost importance; namely nationality; religion; language skills; and ability to read and write, i.e. literacy of a person being subject to census.

The most dramatic discussion during preparation meetings in Žilina were held regarding the population nationality identification. It was rather sensitive area that had provoked polemics since the last quarter of the 19th century. Hungarian statistical praxis was based on the mother language identification as a fundamental objective mark – an attribute that statistically recorded the population ethnicity. Mother language was for the first time identified during census in 1880 and has become a permanent part of censuses. Prevailing language of the whole settlement had been usually recorded during period before periodical census, i.e. language of inhabitants of the settlement/s. Thus, language has represented the basis of national statistics since 1880 but later unfortunately also a mean of statistical increase of Hungarian population in the Hungarian part of Monarchy. The case was that mother language had gradually acquired different meaning and nature, which became a direct part of methodology and instructions for census commissaries. This attribute was defined in 1910 so that mother language can be different from language of mother if it was for example learnt by a person at school. It was marked at the preparation meeting as a part of political misuse pursuing the hungarization goals. This moment became a decisive and the organizers practically completely refused to include mother language as a basis of population characteristics. Therefore, identification of "nationality" was introduced in the census methodology in 1919, defined as an inner confession of a person being subject to census. Nationality had to be identified similar as religion, i.e. declaratorily.¹⁸ Representative of the Statistical Office J. Mráz was

¹⁷ SNA, f. Minister ČSR s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska (Minister of Czechoslovakia with Full Powers for Administration of Slovakia), 1918-1928 (f. MPS), box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

¹⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, No. 249, signature No. 482/19; SNA, f. MPS, No. 277, without signature.

a convinced advocate of nationality declaration as pointed out in his report dated February 08, 1919. Therein he directly mentioned that the nationality couldn't be substituted for mother language since it could have a different interpretation, while to his opinion, direct choice excludes possible different interpretation (Mráz 1919/1920; Mráz 1920:120–134).¹⁹ The author of the idea of substituting mother language with nationality couldn't be identified from information obtained from the meeting in Žilina. However, we can definitely state that it was generally approved. While direct declaration, i.e. subjective affiliation to particular nationality, represents the expression of free will on one hand, there is risk on the other hand, resulting from its instability that could be expressed through recession.

Information about army duty and WWI. became a non-standard component of the census sheet in 1919. It was proposed at the meeting about the census methodology that persons subject to census should report on accomplished army duty and on eventual engagement in the last world war (1914–1918). Information about eventual disablement and on missing household members resulting from the world war should be also included in the census sheet, specifying whether those persons died, were captured or were missing.²⁰

Information of military nature was of course sensitive since only a few months passed from the end of WWI. and such information was considered a part of the state secret. Therefore more extensive discussion was held about possible skipping or more consistent distinguishing between military and civil population. J. Mráz, representing the Statistical Office, insisted on consistent distinguishing between military and civil population. The Ministry of Defense responded to the empowered minister's request without objections. It means that the whole population was a subject of census, including active soldiers. What was definitely strange that the Czechoslovak army on the Slovak territory was mentioned at the meeting in Žilina as occupation army.²¹ It indicates that the situation in Slovakia was extraordinary. At the time, not the whole territory of Slovakia was under direct control of the Czechoslovak administration.

Fundamental demographical marks that were approved as a part of the census sheet 1919 weren't standard marks for censuses in that era. They also differed from those presented at the beginning of 1919 by the Czechoslovak Prime Minister K. Kramář.²² Along with inclusion of non-typical data gathered about the military issues, the census sheet didn't contain rather significant characteristics – occupation of population. Occupation represented a standard part of the preceding censuses in the Hungarian part of Monarchy. Identification of further common characteristics was neither proposed – e.g. length of stay, citizenship and address, which would have brought valuable and interesting results in the terms of nature and goals of the census. Regarding the age, finally it was decided that census sheet questions will include also the birth year plus the whole date

¹⁹ Ibidem.

²⁰ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

²¹ Ibidem.

²² NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 2122/19.

for children up to the 1st survived year of life.²³ Focus and goals of census, as well as time demanding project that the census organizers were aware of, represented the reasons of removed marks and characteristics from the census sheet that had been usually included before. The situation required rather quick organization of census aimed at gathering particular selected marks, and further information was considered a useless complication that would only delay the field data gathering. Mainly the problems and possible complications with presentation of documents on the persons' address of the stay were mentioned.

Later, the mentioned practices were claimed as counter-productive since skipping the enlisted marks was stated at the end of 1919 as the cause of declared incompleteness and rather a temporary nature of entire census.²⁴ Time aspect of census implementation and the pressure that the organizers faced were marked as most troublesome factors. The case was that nobody knew, even approximately at the beginning of 1919 when the Slovak population status data will be required for the Czechoslovak peace delegation in Paris. The pressure was present practically at all further actions that the census organizers made. As a typical example we should mention simple and brief trainings of census commissaries that were swiftly agreed at the meeting in Žilina on the very first day.²⁵

The idea to prepare a special census sheet per capita was rejected. Financial aspect prevailed, as well as lack of paper for printing in that period. A census sheet applied to households living in a single house. Final version of the census sheet contained also special data about the flat owner, who was usually also the landlord/head of household.²⁶ His house (timely spoken) sheet wasn't the only census form. Along with, further drafts of printings should be prepared, especially the forms for partial results summary that would allow for faster gathering of local and regional overviews. This led to preparation of a draft form for census district (village) that census commissaries had to fill in. Also county and regional overviews were prepared in relation to particular in-bound counties and administration districts. These forms contained detail instructions for census commissaries and general instructions for entire census organization. All the mentioned printings were prepared also in Hungarian and German language, taking in account most numerous minorities. J. Mráz was in charge to prepare the census forms and instructions in Prague, where these documents should be also printed out. The press company was called on January 12, 1919 to prepare to printing of census related materials and to ensure sufficient quantity of paper.²⁷

While not even approximate deadline for results completion was known, the census time frame and entire schedule was necessary. It was important to determine so called decisive date, i.e. the day for which the data will be gathered.

²³ Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Nitra (ŠANI), f. Župa Nitra I. (Nitra District I.), 1919–1922 (f. Župa Nitra I.), the set of census sheets.

²⁴ Ministry of Internal Affairs of Czechoslovakia declared census as incomplete in the letter addressed to MPS on December 13, 1919, referring therein to the statement of the Statistical Office. SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

²⁵ Ibidem.

²⁶ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., census sheets file.

²⁷ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 3891/1919.

The term of sending at least approximate results to Paris where the peace talks were held was unknown even after multiple prompts. Therefore, the acteurs made effort to agree on at least a simple frame schedule and census budget at the second methodical meeting held on January 23, 1919. Readiness of the public administration to implement the census was discussed as well. Slovakia dividing within temporary state borders²⁸ to census districts represented the basis for census organization. Attendees at the meeting decided to apply the same principles and procedures to demarcation of census districts that were used also in the preceding censuses. It meant that particular villages/towns had to prepare the lists of houses at first, as well as buildings that initially weren't intended as residential premises but some people lived therein. Subsequently, district officers had to check the lists numbering. Census district should be determined by proportion of persons' headcount per one census commissary. Similar to census in the Hungarian part of Monarchy in 1910, one census commissary would control approx. 600 persons living in 100 houses on the area of approx. 100 km² (Mráz 1919/1920:14). Based on this formula, they should consider creation of approx. 5,500 census districts in the territory of Slovakia and they needed the same number of census commissaries. At the time, these commissaries were named as conscription trustees. They were in charge of entering respective data in the conscription sheets. Another longer discussion was held in Žilina as a result of calculation and awareness of such high amount of persons required for census. The meeting mainly dealt with considerations whether such huge number of responsible and capable persons could be found for census, taking in account current situation. They considered also engaging the Czechoslovak army therein, but this idea remained unsupported since it would draw an impression of population oppression. However, the organizers could find thousands of people who would approach to the census in a responsible way. While notaries, teachers and public officers who were aware of local situation, were traditionally marked as the most suitable persons for census - related work, such high number of these persons couldn't be found. They admitted it also at the methodical meeting at the empowered minister in Žilina, mainly in relation to overall readiness of the then public administration in Slovakia.

Following the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy cessation and declaration of Czechoslovakia, the public administration in Slovakia had almost fully disappeared in some areas and didn't work (see Pacelt 1935). Nor the mentioned Skalica's Government managed to bring it to life just after the declaration of Czechoslovakia and the Šrobár's MPS had maintained and built it from the grounds with huge problems. The problems related to the leave of a part of the office staff from Slovakia to Hungary, as well as to the new terms set forth by the adoption of the Act on Extraordinary and Temporary Provisions in Slovakia. The Act required loyalty oaths to Czechoslovak Republic from the state and self-government officers, and from clerical dignitaries; and it introduced the Slovak

²⁸ Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic - the State archives in Košice, branch in Rožňava (ŠAKE, p. Rožňava), f. Magistrát mesta Dobšiná (Town Hall Dobšiná), 1326-1922 (f. MM Dobšiná), Administrative box No. 1919, signature 1809/1919 adm.

office holding.²⁹ Emptied offices had to be engaged but there weren't suitable persons. The absence of higher number of intelligence in Slovakia with adequate education has become a serious obstacle in both problems solving in the public administration, and in the area of education where it was urgently needed to engage vacancies after those who left. Only 37 Slovak persons worked in the Slovak state administration after the declaration of the Czechoslovak Republic; only 26 of total 783 medical doctors confessed Slovak as mother language, as well as 243 of total 4,687 teachers, only 67 of total 1,710 attorneys in law, and 428 of total 2,763 Slovak priests (Mičko and Martuliak 2014:209). While not all had left, it was necessary to seek a solution that would primarily ensure the public administration functioning. Solution was finally found in the vacancies engagement by the arrived numerous group of officers and teachers from the western part of Czechoslovakia. It was not just a one-time transport; number of these persons had gradually increased and reached more than 120 thsd. persons from the Czech regions in 1930 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:164). They included also relatives but the numbers were negligible at the beginning of 1919. We should definitely talk about temporary activity of the public administration in Slovakia on the turn of 1918 and 1919, and its gradually building.

Thus, 1919 census organizers were aware of the problem and they should count with it also during the preparation stage of census and its methodology. Finally, the originally considered intention of having a single census district comprising max. one village had changed and census district could later be comprised of two or three villages. Total count of inhabitants and accessibility of the villages/towns represented the major criterion (Mráz 1919/1920:14).³⁰

Schedule that was later discussed had to be as flexible as possible in order to obtain at least preliminary results as soon as possible. Apparently, attendees at the meetings held in Žilina couldn't imagine what field census and subsequent summary of results actually meant. The role of J. Mráz was significant also for this reason, since he responded mainly with stressing the risk of underestimating the census preparation at the meetings. J. Mráz clearly knew that the situation in Slovakia wasn't consolidated in such extent that such an event could be implemented without big problems, moreover if personal and organizational provision referred to such risk that should be overtaken partly by non-functional public administration on local and regional level. These concerns are less or more apparent in the preserved Mráz's report about the census preparation.³¹

Census schedule consisted of three basic parts: preparation, implementation and processing of results. The work on the first part commenced already in December 1918. It was a preparation stage when census methodology should be discussed and set in details, as well as preconditions created for quality field data gathering (forms, methodical guidelines), and gradual preparation of publishing and information provision to the population about the project. As for the info campaign, it required to focus primarily on correct explanation of the essence

²⁹ Act No. 64/1918 Coll. § 2 and 3. The language issue was finally separately organised by the Act No. 122/1920 Coll.

³⁰ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

³¹ Ibidem.

of goals, explanation of the project implementation and simple interpretation of gathered data in order to avoid any failures. In this term, the planned language versions of the forms and circulars should be positively perceived since they took in account the numerous communities of Hungarian and German inhabitants living within temporary state borders of Slovakia. The preparation should continue with targeted searching of persons who would be capable of discharging the census commissary office that was, as mentioned above, a serious problem. Suitable candidates should be sought especially at public administration, namely subordinate and district offices where such lists should be prepared. As for local level, preparation stage should mainly focus on the preparation of the lists of houses, check of their numbering and proposed census districts. Thus, it was fully presumed that official representations of particular villages and towns will be engaged therein. Following the determination of census districts, the villages and towns should present their proposals for census commissaries who should conduct field census. District offices were assigned with check of census districts, correctness of their boundaries, and with allocation of particular persons as census commissaries to districts who should be acquainted in detail with all important actions to be taken after their appointment. Instruction meetings should be held under direct control of district administrators.

Accordingly, preparation stage of census that didn't principally differ from the preceding censuses, couldn't logically take only a few days. J. Mráz estimated that the preparation stage would take at least till the mid-April 1919, thus approx. 3 months. He mainly referred to the last census in the Hungarian part of Monarchy in 1910 when the preparation stage took 4 months at the time of trouble-free functioning of public administration, and everybody knew less or more what to do from the preceding census.³² However, the situation in Slovakia was in many aspects very different at the beginning of 1919. Nevertheless, the optimistic scenario was presented – 3 months duration of the preparation stage.

It was necessary to prepare methodology of census, to print out the forms or to create the list of census commissaries. Last but not least, preparation of the citizens was required. The task was assigned to the newly created *Census Committee*, which was founded as a part of MPS administrative department. Its main task was to prepare further important printings for census. First of all, scheme of census order should be prepared. The organizers passed resolution on MPS order instead of the system used in the past – adoption of a special act. It was a reasonable change since legislative discussion on the draft act would take longer. Another task of the Committee referred to preparation of draft circulars and instruction for municipal, district and regional offices. The Committee assumed the agenda on January 24 and 25, 1919, thus right after the end of methodical meetings in Žilina.

Census was implemented in two stages. In the first stage, data were gathered in every municipality and its duration was estimated to 6 days at least. Compared to average headcount of persons in a single census municipality, approx. 100 persons were considered per a day. When the 2nd stage commenced, another week was required for creation of district and municipal overview. In the next step, the

³² SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

overviews should be sent to head of subordinate office who had to prepare the district overview. Finally, district overviews per particular region were used and summarised by the district administrator in order to prepare the regional overview. Together with preliminary audit of the results that the appointed inspectors had to commence with especially on the district and municipal level, this census stage should take another month, thus till the mid May.

The last stage presumed overall processing of census results and their gradual publishing. It should include another audit aimed at recapturing eventual deficiencies on local level. Exact time of census results processing wasn't determined at the meeting since it was a time demanding process. Even J. Mráz wasn't able to estimate its duration.

While the Czechoslovak peace delegation needed only selected results of the census, especially total headcount of population and nationality statistics, both on local and regional level, the data wouldn't be available before the summer or fall 1919. Talks were held that the results could be useful also after termination of the peace talks in Paris. Thus, further four goals were specified on the second day of meetings in Žilina in order to explain 1919 census reasonability and importance by the organizers. The meetings attendees stated that it should be the first big project of the administration body in Slovakia that could verify its functionality and ability to act. Creation of the lists of census commissaries who should be considered trustworthy in the terms of public administration was deemed very important. Moreover, they were persons that should be evenly deployed across whole Slovakia. The created list presented the possibility for the future to use up their potential at further, similar activities. The third substantiation referred to municipal review of houses and house numbers, since the preceding review was dated in 1910, thus during the last census in the Hungarian part of Monarchy. And finally, the last, fourth point represented an interesting substantiation where the organizers mentioned "*the term of approaching regular census*". Thus, the census 1919 wasn't considered as full-valued but rather as an adequate preparation, along with gathering of particular data, yielding in plenty of ideas and experiences used in regular Czechoslovak census. The term "*preliminary census*" was directly used in relation to census 1919. It was a significant signal for the near future also for just opened Statistical Office in Prague. On the other hand, this denomination can be perceived as a sign of certain degradation and reduction of its meaning. We can presume that the fourth point was formulated and enforced mainly by J. Mráz, since he used the term "*preliminary census*" or a few times in his report from the January meetings in Žilina. (Mráz 1919/1920)

It was realised that 1919 census funding represented another rather significant problem. The basis of financial provision calculation method was taken over from the census 1900 in the Hungarian part of Monarchy in the main points, when entire funding was covered by the state and the villages/towns. Villages and towns funded practically all major needs, i.e. travel and transport cost, traveling expenses, rewards for commissaries; provided that travel cost and traveling expenses should be reimbursed only for those commissaries whose district was located outside of their residence and required traveling. The state should provide

the remaining funding. Thus, it was funding and distribution of census forms, and further printings, as well as all cost associated with processing and publishing the census results. Pursuant to the budget key from 1900, municipalities should be burdened with approx. 2.886,000 Czechoslovak crowns (CZK). Preliminary amount calculated, to be borne by the state, reached 183 thsd. CZK and it covered printout of materials, distribution and further small expenses related to publishing of results. Thus, it was a remarkable disproportion on account of municipalities and their budgets. Total amount required for the prepared census in 1919 should exceed 3 million CZK and this amount was also considered during the census preparation stage.

Census forms

As we mentioned above, house sheet (house record) represented the basic form that contained all demographic components and characteristics as agreed at the preparation meeting. All persons were entered on the house sheet that were physically present in particular house at the time of census. We also said that buildings and constructions should be added to the residential houses that didn't primarily serve to habitation but somebody lived therein. Instruction for census commissaries included as examples also "*ships barges and travel vehicles of circuses, as well as sheds of Gypsies and sheep farms*".³³

Basic information about particular house was entered on the house sheet, its nomenclature No., information about the owner, name of village/town and corresponding district. If, during field data gathering, situation occurred when the commissary found a house without nomenclature No., he entered "without number" on the sheet.³⁴ Further entries on the house sheet included characteristics of the persons subject to census according to households in particular house.³⁵ Flat owner was entered as the first person, followed by other persons living in the household, stating basic biological and social marks, i.e. name and surname, previous surname, person's relation to the flat owner (landlord), gender, age referring to birth year, and birthplace expressed as village (town and district).³⁶ We should pay attention to relation of persons to the flat owner/landlord that was important from a few aspects. Relatives and non-relatives were mostly entered in this column, e.g. wife, son, daughter, father, mother, grandson, daughter-in-law, brother, as well as son-in-law, father-in-law, maid, servant, plough-boy, seasonal worker, apprentice, consort, etc., always in relation to the flat owner/landlord. This information is suitable also for a deeper demographical microanalysis and allowing us to identify the family and non-family cores of households, and to determine the typology of particular households.

³³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Stratenej (Municipal Notary Office in Stratena), 1895–1945 (f. ObNÚ Stratena), unsettled fund, box administrative No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm. Detail instruction provision to describing trustees, § 1, p. 1.

³⁴ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., e.g. census forms file for village Andač.

³⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratena, box administrative No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instruction provision..., § 21, p. 10.

³⁶ Ibidem, Detail instruction provision..., § 26, p. 11–12.

When entering the data on the census form, the commissaries were notified on frequent and troublesome rounding of age, especially to decades.³⁷ According to well preserved census sheets, birth year was usually entered or the whole birth date in case of children younger than 1 year of age.³⁸ Family status entering also required a special instruction. Separated persons could be entered along with single, widowed and married status. This status (separated) included all persons that were separated but also divorced.³⁹ However, these terms were different in civil life. Marital separation meant the same what we currently call divorce. At the time, divorce meant separation from the table and the bed. It was regulated by a special law,⁴⁰ when divorce didn't mean definite termination of marital life (see Tišliar 2019:21–22; Tišliar 2007c:93–105; Šprocha and Tišliar 2008a; Tišliar and Šprocha 2017b:35–44).

Heading of the second part of the house record was dedicated to selected data about the census municipality, town quartier and street, and information was entered there also about eventual remote places (remote mountain settlements). The Slovak name was entered in the record, as well as official name in 1917. In case of larger settlements, the record should state the names of streets. In case of smaller settlements, data from the front record page were copied.⁴¹ Order No. of the house record represented the last data in the heading in the following order: At first, village/town center had to be recorded, followed by particular town quartiers and streets. Remote settlements and houses without number were stated at the end.⁴² This information released the image of field work performed by the census commissaries. It is apparent from the file of well preserved census sheets that the data were gathered in other manner and the sheets order numbers indicate rather random gathering. For example, house sheet filled in for not numbered “*Gypsy shed*” was under No, 13 in the village Andáč.⁴³

Characteristics important in the terms of main census goal were mainly entered on the reverse page of the pre-printed census form. They were data about persons' nationality and note about their language skills; followed by religion, education (literacy – reading, writing) and information on the ended war conflict.

Nationality could be entered either in four pre-printed columns or in the column with heading “*other nationality*”. The following options were pre-printed on the form: S = Slovak, C = Czech, either entered in a common column. Then it was column R = Ruthenian, H = Hungarian, and G = German. These basic nationalities were expressed also in the form of language mutation of the house sheet. Along with Slovak version, Hungarian and German census sheet versions

³⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, box administrative No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instructioning..., § 29, p. 12.

³⁸ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., census sheets file.

³⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instruction provision..., §§ 27–28, p. 12.

⁴⁰ Act No. 320/1919 Coll., referring to the Hungarian Marital Act dated 1894 – Act No. XXXI:1894 that introduced also civil wedding.

⁴¹ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., census sheets file.

⁴² ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instruction provision..., § 41, p. 17.

⁴³ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., census sheets for village Andáč.

were distributed in the areas where these minorities lived. However, census sheet in Ruthenian language wasn't prepared and the commissaries distributed only Slovak sheets in the territory of the northeastern Slovakia.

Religion was divided in five major denominations – Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed (Calvin), Jewish and a separate option that allowed to confess other religion.

We should pay special attention to the last group of the gathered data that related to the end of the WWI. It wasn't only about dividing people to active soldiers and civilians. Instruction for commissaries specified the terms at which a person wasn't considered an active soldier (permanent vacation, retirees, persons out of service). Participation on the ended war conflict considered persons that fulfilled war tasks during the war. It was about identification of an active service. Data about disablement rent entitlement resulting from the war should be entered separately. These data were generally required only from male population older than 17 years of age (see Tišliar 2007a:18). The data was completed with headcount of persons missing in a household as a result of war. Persons were included therein that died, were captured or missing. Commissary entered the data in the form of number, based on the information obtained from the head of household.⁴⁴

The last column was intended for various remarks, corrections, changes but it practically served only to verification of declared data accuracy. The data accuracy was confirmed by signature of the head of household.⁴⁵ However, various signs or crosslets appeared instead of signature as a substitute.

Filled in house sheet was finally signed by the census commissary, adding the date of filling in thereto.

In the light of other census sheets, special attention should be paid to municipal or local summary. Census commissary stated in the form whether the summary applies to a village or municipality.⁴⁶ The importance of the summary lays in the information filled per particular villages.⁴⁷ Along with the name in Slovak language and official name from 1917, administrative jurisdiction of the residence in the subordinate district and county should be stated, as well as information about Hungarian language use at schools and teaching language used at the time, and holy mass language in churches (current and preceding). The following was national summary of results per village/municipality in absolute and relative numbers, number and nature of schools, the distance from railroad station, post and telegraph, or a port, if applicable. If the offices and stations weren't present in the village, they were estimated. These topographical data were followed by enlisting of public offices having site in the village/municipality, and information about parish. If parish wasn't present in the village, the parish that the village belonged to was named. Jewish religious community was entered on the form.

⁴⁴ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., census sheets for village Andač.

⁴⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instruction provision..., § 39, p. 15–16.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, § 42, p. 17.

⁴⁷ Preparation of detail topographical lexicon of settlements was considered. SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

The last part of the form stated all big companies, factories, mines and metallurgy works, banks and other subjects that had business site in the village/municipality. Results from the house sheets were summarised on the rear page of the form. We should point out that only a part of the data was entered in the municipal summary (house sheet No., name of town quartier/street/mountain settlement, number of house, house owner's name, total headcount of persons present in the house, gender, structure according to nationality and religion). If the municipal summary applied to a larger settlement, house owner name wasn't entered. The summaries had undoubtedly to serve operatively for audit but especially for fast obtaining of partial necessary data for the Czechoslovak peace delegation. Later, these village/municipality summaries became the basis for publishing the official census 1919 results.

An overview was compiled from the village/municipality summaries. It was a separate form serving to data summarizing for villages in particular district, and separately also for towns with established Town Hall that were legally on the level of a subordinate district (Tišliar 2007a:10). The form contained the information per particular villages, therefore every entry/village contained the name of village and its official name from 1917. Year of attaching the Hungarian name to the village was stated, as well as info about teaching language in schools and at holly masses with optional use of Slovak and Hungarian language, and stated year of Hungarian language introduction.⁴⁸ Specification of the data appeared as very problematic in praxis. Preserved file of census forms from Nitra district mostly indicated many discrepancies in the years of Hungarian language introduction at schools, or such data were absent at all. Therefore, district summaries were without such data in many cases. Regarding the gathered demographical signs and characteristics, the situation was completely different. Headcount of inhabitants, gender, nationality (Czechoslovak nationality - separately), in both relative and absolute numbers, and religion was stated per every village. Proportion of inhabitants of Czechoslovak nationality was highlighted in red.

Regional overview became the main summary. The data were taken over from the district summaries, separately for districts and towns with established Town Hall. The form specialty was dividing the villages/towns according to headcount of persons of Czechoslovak nationality in 10% intervals. This enabled to subsequently divide the villages/towns with majority/minority of inhabitants of Czechoslovak nationality. Another parameter to which the villages/towns were divided referred to the language used at schools and holy masses. Data per villages/towns, headcount of inhabitants, gender, nationality and religion was summarised in another part of the form in absolute numbers.⁴⁹

Intention of the organizers was apparent from the 1919 census forms' overview - to obtain required data about Slovakia as soon as possible. The summaries contained the data that were considered the most important. However, it is not possible to say that work with more detailed house sheets wasn't planned. A few stages of gradual data availability was probably preliminary presumed during

⁴⁸ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, signature No. 10688/1919 Adm. Pres.

⁴⁹ Ibidem.

the census results publishing, probably also with publishing of derived and combined data.

The forms overview wouldn't be complete if we didn't deal with another fully atypical form related to the census implementation. We will discuss the 1919 census course in detail, now we can say that those responsible didn't manage to implement census in the originally planned term. Finally, the decisive date was in August 1919, which significantly complicated the census implementation since the population that was mostly employed and earning from primary sector was mainly engaged in agricultural work and related migration. The form was named as "*Record of Persons Capable of Working outside of Slovakia as Seasonal Workers*". It was apparent that the form was prepared at the very last moment and it was printed out in Prague, contrary to the other forms printed in Slovakia, Bratislava.⁵⁰ There was no mention of this form in the census preparation process, nor was it stated in the detail report of J. Mráz. Thus, the organizers apparently responded only to the postponed census term. According to maintained reports and information from the regions, they were distributed during the census process, thus rather late.⁵¹ Work migration was remarkable mainly during the summer months and headcount of migrating persons was rather high even later during period between WWI and WWII when it has even increased. Average headcount of persons registered by job agents during this period reached as many as 36,823 persons in Slovakia (see Žák 1928:65; Chura 1936:192; Šprocha and Tišliar 2008b:124; 2014:145–169).

The form of seasonal workers was simpler than the basic house sheet. It contained only basic personal data (name and surname, gender, family status, age/birth year, and birthplace), and nationality and religion, which was included also in the house sheet. Thus, language skills, information about literacy or the ended war conflict weren't gathered.

Detail guideline was prepared for census commissaries under name, "*Podrobné poučenie pre popisujúcich povereníkov*" (Detail Instructions for Describing Trustees) that dealt mainly with method of filling in particular form sections. The guideline was divided in a few sections. The first section contained interpretation of selected terms (house part, institution, house sheet, flat owner, etc.) so as the commissaries could solve eventual issues during field work. The guideline defined the decisive time of census and exceptions so as persons weren't counted more than once. It applied mainly to persons that were on duty at the time of census, e.g. soldiers that were concurrently hotel guests, as an example. They were recorded directly in the hotels instead of home address. It was a principle of census of so called present population instead of inhabitant. Soldiers were also subject to special census terms; they were counted by military officers.⁵² Further parts of the guideline (2nd-4th part) described in detail the principles of filling in the house

⁵⁰ ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., The list of People who stayed outside of Slovakia during census, county Bojnice.

⁵¹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Brzotíne (Municipal Notary Office in Brzotín), 1883–1939 (ObNÚ Brzotín), administrative box No. 1917–1919, signature No. 357/19 adm.

⁵² ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm., Detail instruction provision..., §§ 1–4, § 7, p. 1–4.

sheet, including recommendations and check of house numbers that should be provided to the village commissaries. The last section contained explanation of method of gathered data summarizing and creation of village/municipal so called local or zone summary. Census commissaries had to deliver the filled in house sheets and summaries to competent district administrator or to the census committee.

Preparation of census by public administration

Along with the forms and mentioned guideline for census commissaries, communication with public administration should be resolved and organizationally prepared for census implementation process. Experiences from preceding censuses in the Hungarian part of Monarchy were mainly based on the use of public administration as a basic census implementation element. Entire public administration was involved in the organization work, along with census commissaries selected and appointed by the representatives of counties and districts. In relation to census, public administration comprised villages with their representatives on the local level where also the census committee could be and was created in many cases. Villages provided for house numbering check and house lists during preparation process also in the preceding censuses, but they mainly recommended suitable candidates for commissaries to competent district office, in cooperation with subordinate offices. The villages were expected to assume this responsibility also during census 1919.⁵³

The ministerial office with full power that district and subordinate offices reported to represented the highest administration authority in Slovakia at the time (Tišliar 2013:12).⁵⁴ All the mentioned units were engaged in the 1919 census preparation and implementation, as well as local and municipal notary offices through which the printed census forms and related guidelines were distributed.

MPS regulation dated February 20, 1919 represented a fundamental regulation that stipulated certain selected 1919 census issues.⁵⁵ The regulation determined also so called decisive census date as the midnight from March 23 to 24, 1919, and further work schedule. It also contained information on the gathered data and generally defined the census territory as the territory with deployed Czechoslovak army. Competent district administrators were empowered to perform main supervision of census procedures, based on the regulation. The regulation called on the municipalities to prepare a proper list of the houses and information required for filling in the village/municipal summary. It also confirmed the agreed average size of the census zones, corresponding to approx. 600 inhabitants and 100 houses per a commissary. Competent district administrator appointed the census commissaries through the letter of appointment with temporary position of a public officer. Performing the field work, a commissary had right to ask for military assistance if required. The office of commissary was defined in the regulation as a civil duty. Only a physician, provably ill person and the one

⁵³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 31346/1919.

⁵⁴ Act No. 64/1918 Coll.

⁵⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Magistrát mesta Jelšava (Town Hall Jelšava), 1299–1922 (f. MM Jelšava), administrative box No. 1919, signature No. 548/1919 adm.

older than 60 years of age were allowed to reject the office. Engaged persons were entitled to fully paid vacation and reward for discharge of the commissary office in the amount that depended on the census municipality. He was also entitled to per-diem allowance and travel expenses if applicable.⁵⁶ Accordingly, personal claims for census implementation were remarkable and, as we will explain later, entire census was accompanied with problems in this area.

The census regulation introduced sanctions up to 2,000 CZK or 3 months of imprisonment in case of failed following of rules, data falsifying or concealing and also in case of obstructions or spread of alarm information.⁵⁷ Sanctions that applied to census commissaries were much higher. In case of provable failure, a census commissary could be sanctioned up to 10,000 CZK or 1-year imprisonment.⁵⁸

Circulars were distributed to the district offices along with the main census regulation that operatively solved the selected partial tasks within the census preparation. The lists of houses were most important since they represented the basis for further planning of census municipalities and the lists of candidates for census commissaries. They contained name and surname of a candidate, info about his permanent address and language skills. Subordinate officer had to suggest particular census municipality in the list that should be similar to that during census 1910, if possible. A person suggested as a census commissary should be in ideal case aware of local conditions.⁵⁹ This stage of the preparation work in municipalities and districts should take 10 days and the district office had to check and approve all relevant draft lists. Afterwards, municipal offices sent the letters of appointment, approved lists and census notifications for the municipalities to the districts.

The public was informed on the census with census notifications issued by the authorised minister and distributed by subordinate counties. The notification contained basic info about census and explanation of its content. The notification also appealed to the inhabitants to cooperate and support the census.⁶⁰

In the light of methodology, the organizers prepared basic preconditions for census implementation during the preparation process, at least as seen from outside. Personal provision has remained troublesome even after the issuance of the census regulation that defined this function as mandatory. Entire public administration was activated, basic methodology was elaborated and it assigned the tasks, created schedules and particular census stages, and so called decisive census date was published that all following tasks were drawn from. However, the term was completely unreal and it was most probably a direct response to the commenced talks about the Czechoslovak - Hungarian state borders that were initiated in Paris on February 05, 1919 (Houdek 1931:298). It was interesting that even J. Mráz, as a head methodologist of census, wasn't aware of the term. He was acquainted with the term announcement on February 26, 1919 in Prague

⁵⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM, administrative box No. 1919, signature No. 548/1919 adm., § 12 of the Regulation No. 13 pres.

⁵⁷ Ibidem, § 9 of the Regulation No. 13 pres.

⁵⁸ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, without signature "Census 1919".

⁵⁹ Ibidem.

⁶⁰ Ibidem.

where he met V. Šrobár, empowered minister. At the time, the forms wording and instructions should be finalised and printed out, which was planned from March 01, 1919 on.⁶¹ Thus, it was logical that J. Mráz resigned from the office and didn't mean to be responsible for the census process and results, since a few important decisions had been made without his awareness.⁶² In his another report dated in the beginning of April 1919, he stated that the efforts made for data gathering for the peace committee caused underestimation of actual problems in a very short time, and overseeing physical capabilities of census commissaries.⁶³ How did the 1919 census process actually look alike?

About 1919 census process

MPS regulation dated February 20, 1919 specified so called decisive date that represented the set-forward point of census implementation. Daily printings published the information about the prepared census at the end of February. Brief remarks about the planned census were published in the Slovak National Paper and National Paper. The articles didn't specify particular census date⁶⁴ but more information was published at the beginning of March that mainly referred to the mentioned MPS regulation. The regulation set forth the decisive moment of census to the midnight from March 23 to 24, 1919 and it was contained also in the printed guideline for census commissaries.⁶⁵ Pursuant to schedule, field work should be made during period from March 24 to April 02, 1919.⁶⁶ However, census was announced too early and without preparation stage completion, not only in relation to the population but also from technical and logistic point of view that was fully forgotten, as it seems.⁶⁷ Not only printed out basic sheets were missing⁶⁸ but printing out German version of the forms and summary district overviews were missed despite of estimated printing at the printing company in Prague on April 04, 1919 at the earliest (Mráz 1920/1921:4-5). Along with these technical problems, we mentioned personal issues that have been articulated practically since the beginning of census planning. When sufficient headcount of suitable candidates couldn't be provided for in Slovakia, a new initiative appeared regarding rapid support seeking in the eastern part of the republic. However, the support was provided also too late. Published adverts and hiring of candidates for census commissaries mainly amongst teachers was organised in Czechia as late as from March 23, 1919 while V. Šrobár asked for such support already on February 20, 1919 (Mráz 1920/1921:5-6). Involvement of approx. 90 teachers from Czechia was expected and they should be deployed especially in Bratislava

⁶¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 17408/19.

⁶² SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. KÚ-No.1-1930-2.4.1. Report dated April 04, 1919.

⁶³ Ibidem, Report of J. Mráz dated April 04, 1919.

⁶⁴ *Slovenské ľudové noviny* dated February 28, 1919, volume 10, No. 9, p. 2; *Národné noviny* dated March 04, 1919, I. volume, No. 52, p. 2.

⁶⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918-1920, signature No. 331/1919 adm.

⁶⁶ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, without signature, MPS circular for subordinate offices.

⁶⁷ SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. KÚ-No.1-1930-2.4.1. Report dated April 04, 1919.

⁶⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 9223/1919; Ibidem, signature No. 10311/1919; Ibidem, signature No. 10727/1919.

and the surroundings.⁶⁹ Hence, German language knowledge was required.⁷⁰ Concurrently, public administration also reported some problems. Vacancies after the Hungarian officers' leave weren't adequately engaged in February and March 1919 in a few, mainly southern regions of Slovakia.⁷¹

Not only pending census preparation completion affected the failure of the census term in March, it was neither allowed by the situation in Slovakia. Change at political regime in the neighboring Hungary referred to another very serious problem that required response in March 1919 that finally resulted in war conflict between Hungary and Czechoslovakia.⁷² Communists took over power in Hungary and declared the Hungarian Soviet Republic on March 21, 1919 (Hronský 1998:173). Responding to these events, MPS declared martial law in Slovakia on March 25, 1919, representing stricter regime of controls and restricted personal freedom and movement.⁷³ Moreover, mobilization of birth years 1892–1898 was declared.⁷⁴ This caused political non-feasibility to implement the entire census.

Since all the above mentioned facts didn't allow for census implementation, considerations about a new term were made. A few new terms were suggested at the meeting of district administrators held during April 11–13, 1919,⁷⁵ including discussion about all major issues that should be resolved before. At first the meeting attendees started discussing the postponing of the census date by a month, mentioning April 23, 1919 (Konečný 1999:295). Another, later term was suggested in May 1919 because of persisting problems with completion of the lists of census commissaries. Maintained lists of census commissaries from particular districts were dated mainly in the second half of April and sometimes in the first half of May 1919.⁷⁶ Distribution of census sheets and forms continued also at the beginning of May 1919 with ascertaining that exact term of census would be specified soon.⁷⁷ On May 05, 1919, MPS again requested support from Czech teachers at the Ministry of education.⁷⁸ Finally, neither May 1919 was a quiet month. Worsening relations with the neighboring Hungary was proved as the biggest problem that finally culminated in the war conflict where the Czechoslovak army was at first pulling at shorter string. Crossing the demarcation line towards Hungarian Miskolc on May 23, 1919⁷⁹ created a formal pretense for offensive by the Hungarian Red Army that started on May 30, 1919 (Hronský

⁶⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 18941/19.

⁷⁰ Ibidem, signature No. 31346/19.

⁷¹ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 17, signature No. 4636/1920 pres.

⁷² NAČR, f. Ministerstvo sociální péče (Ministry of Social Care), 1918–1951 (f. MSP), box No. 148, signature No. 23839/1919.

⁷³ ŠABA, f. SÚ Trnava, box No. 5, signature No. 149/1919 pres.; ŠANI, f. Župa Nitra I., box 2, signature No. 132/1919 pres.; ŠABA, f. Služnovský úrad v Dunajskej Strede (Subordinate Office in Dunajská Streda), 1862–1922 (f. SÚ Dunajská Streda), box No. 3, signature No. 18/1919 pres.

⁷⁴ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3196, signature No. 168/1919; signature No. 422/1919.

⁷⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 255, signature No. 663/1919 pres. adm., SNA, f. OFVŠ, box No. 9, inv. No. 603.

⁷⁶ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, without signature.

⁷⁷ ŠABA, f. Župa Bratislava I., box No. 4, signature No. 1623/1919 pres.

⁷⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 31346/19.

⁷⁹ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3196, signature No. 500/1919.

1998:173).⁸⁰ The offensive was successful and Hungarian army has managed to annex the major part of Slovakia (Klimko 1979:71–73; Pacelt 1935:37). Since it was also propaganda and attracting ideas of revolution that started penetrating to our territory together with the army that gained positive response among some society circles in Slovakia, the Slovak Soviet Republic was declared in the annexed territory of the Eastern Slovakia in Prešov on June 16, 1919 (Hronský 1998:180; Mosný 1997:45). Duration of the Slovak Soviet Republic was very short and it definitely ceased upon gradually pushing of Hungarian army out of Slovakia at the beginning of July 1919.

These facts fully disabled any earlier implementation of census at that time. Martial law continued and the idea of a new census was replaced with rather military measures aimed at pushing the foreign army out of Slovakia and at least partial consolidation of the situation primarily in the internal administration. Thus, July 1919 became the month when especially the public administration made efforts to restore its regular activities. Following the Hungarian annexation, many officers left their posts and some of them returned in service as late as in the mid July (Pacelt 1935:68–69). Time was right in the second half of the month for new considerations of postponed census implementation and the Czechoslovak Press Agency announced another census term at the end of July 1919. However, this term had to be again postponed because of missing census sheets.⁸¹

Finally, definite census date was announced upon another MPS regulation dated August 08, 1919.⁸² The regulation was prepared in two versions, highlighting the fact that even MPS as the highest administration body wasn't sure about the situation in Slovakia. Shorter regulation contained only basic information about the new census dates and the longer one was practically similar to MPS regulation dated February 20, 1919 as to its wording. The new decisive census moment was determined for the midnight between August 20 and 21, 1919 and data should be gathered during period from August 21 to August 31, 1919. That means, the census regulation was again announced just two weeks before the census commencement. Therefore it was not surprising that the time was again insufficient for completion of proper preparation, as indicated in the preserved archive documents. Based on the regulation, the public administration had to provide to the public all necessary information. While official date stated on the announcements was August 08, 1919,⁸³ the population was actually informed literally just before the data gathering commencement at some places. For example, county chief officer in the county Spišská Nová Ves requested "hanging on" the information about census on August 18, 1919.⁸⁴ As for Rožňava, notaries and mayors were asked to announce census in the villages on August 19, 1919

⁸⁰ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3196, signature No. 555/1919.

⁸¹ SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. KÚ-No.1-1930-2.4.1; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 37844.

⁸² ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 329/1919 adm. MPS Regulation No. 2558.

⁸³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Jelšava, administrative box No. 1919, signature No. 548/1919 adm.

⁸⁴ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Stratená, administrative box No. 1918–1920, signature No. 329/1919 adm.

when the notaries had to hand over the letters of appointment to the census commissaries. There were cases when the census commissaries received the letters of appointment as late as on August 22, 1919, i.e. two days after the census commencement.⁸⁵ It seemed that even the public administration representatives didn't believe that census would be implemented; it was the fifth planned term since the end of March.

Daily printings responded equally late and incorrectly. They brought brief info about census in the mid July but without stating exact date thereof. In its column Reporter the *Slovenský denník* (Slovak Daily) published information on allegedly planned census at the end of July, aimed at identifying national situation in Slovakia.⁸⁶ The same daily published information at the beginning of August on implementation of census in the near future. Such published information had made the inhabitants only more insecure rather than giving more information to them. Interesting explaining remark was published in the Slovak daily on August 06, 1919 about impossibility to organize census earlier because "...Hungarians have destroyed entire printed material."⁸⁷ Actually not all printings were destroyed as stated in the daily. In fact, additional printing of more than 230 thsd. house sheets was ordered in the State Printing Company in Prague on August 09, 1919 with added further 20 thsd. pieces on August 23.⁸⁸ Accordingly, the number of sheets and forms was unsatisfactory even in August 1919.

More detail and particular call towards the population was published much later, on August 22, 1919 in the National Paper, thus at the time of ongoing census for two days. Information was published on the census commencement in the near future (!).⁸⁹

The lists of census commissaries wasn't adequately prepared even in August. It was generally known from March 1919 that finding a sufficient number of candidates was a huge problem. Despite of almost 6 months passed since the planned first census term, the situation has repeated. Lack of candidates should be solved by hiring volunteers from the western part of Czechoslovakia. While in March 1919 it was presumed that approx. 90 Czech teachers would be required and deployed especially in Bratislava and surroundings, a few groups were repeatedly required in August (total 350 teachers and officers) that should be deployed in a few Slovak regions in the south and north of Slovakia.⁹⁰ The Decree of the Ministry of Education and National Culture about the required volunteers was again published too late. The Decree was dated August 18, 1919,⁹¹ but the

⁸⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Brzotín, administrative box No. 1917-1919, signature No. 357/19 adm.

⁸⁶ *Slovenský denník*, July 20, 1919, No. 154, volume II., p. 4.

⁸⁷ *Slovenský denník*, August 06, 1919, No. 168, volume II., p. 2.

⁸⁸ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 277, without signature "Census 1919", delivery notes and confirmations of takeover of sheets.

⁸⁹ *Národné noviny*, August 22, 1919, No. 192, volume L., p. 1.

⁹⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 47115/19. Total 59 teachers were sent to Zlaté Moravce, 59 to Tekov, 10 to Šahy Hont, 24 to Prešov (Šariš), 79 to Košice (Abov-Turňa district), 12 to Rimavská Sobota (Gemery), 24 to Bratislava, 41 to Levoča (Spiš), and 42 teachers in the Zemplín territory.

⁹¹ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 259, signature No. 3365/19 pres. admin. decree No. 3444 pres.

daily papers responded thereto around August 21, 1919 (Mráz 1920/1921:6).⁹² It is logical that the field volunteers' turn-up was delayed. It was clear that data gathering wouldn't be finished till August 31, 1919 (Tišliar 2007a:34). Lack of Slovak public administration coordination also posed a problem. It was apparent especially in case of the "Czech support" when volunteers arrived in Slovakia and the competent district administrator claimed he didn't need them at all. Such cases occurred for example in the Abov-Turňa district and in the Gemer district where the district administrator even stated on August 22, 1919 that he was not aware of any census organised in Slovakia.⁹³ Thus, while census commissaries were lacked at some place, at other places they were sent home as not necessary.

The census preparations but also the data gathering process in some areas could be called as chaotic in many aspects. Moreover, we can state that the whole project was of strongly isolated nature and perceived in Prague as a local problem of Slovakia. It was proved by, for example, request of the Czechoslovak Government Presidium dated August 02, 1919 for the situation of census in Slovakia. The Presidium wanted to know whether the census related material has been delivered to the Statistical Office in Prague.⁹⁴ Thus, we should ask whether those in Prague were informed about census implementation at the end of August or not. Along with census preparation, even basic communication between Bratislava and Prague apparently failed. In the response, V. Šrobár specified the scheduled census date and promised to send the gathered material later to Prague.⁹⁵

The course of census 1919 was documented in detail in quantitative questionnaire research performed by the State Statistical Office in Prague from December 1919 till February 1920. Unfortunately no questionnaires have been preserved to date. We obtained information from detail report prepared by Josef Mráz (Mráz 1920/1921:120 et seq.), and also from later summarizing of the opinion poll dated in January 1921.⁹⁶ Statistical Office published to call for applying for participation on the opinion poll on December 11, 1919. It doesn't apply only to Czech but also to Slovak volunteers.⁹⁷ Almost 13% of former census commissaries

⁹² V. Šrobár additionally requested 50 more volunteers on August 21, 1919 especially for Zemplín district. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 39636/1919. The list of census commissaries from Czechia, who received reward, was preserved. According to the list, total 291 persons attended the census from the western part of Czechoslovakia, and the following headcounts from these districts: Tekov (59), Hont (10), Šariš (24), Abov-Turňa (79), Gemer-Malohont (12), Bratislava (24), Spiš (41), and Zemplín (42). Further 56 names were stated without allocation. They were probably persons that set out on the travel and when arrived in place, they realised they were not needed. Such cases occurred in Gemer and Abov-Turňa district. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 47115/1919.

⁹³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 40193/19; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 41245/19.

⁹⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 36471/19.

⁹⁵ Ibidem.

⁹⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 371/III./21.

⁹⁷ *Národní politika* dated December 11, 1919, No. 339; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 63470/19.

(625) responded to questionnaires distributed by the district offices⁹⁸ according to respective lists. The responders were mainly men, local teachers, officers but also female teachers but there were much fewer of them. Information popped up that also minor persons were counted in. For example, in Bratislava it was a 12-years old boy, a son of empowered commissary (Mráz 1920/1921:123). Total 5,500 counties were counted and the same number of commissaries but real situation was most likely completely different. While we don't know exact headcount of engaged census commissaries, we can presume much lower count of them. The opinion poll indicates that many of them gathered data in more than one municipality (75 commissaries); some of them even in more than 10 municipalities and in one case a commissary gathered data in total 24 counties. Many of them claimed that they weren't gathering data for the determined 10 days only but the deadline was prolonged. One of the commissaries was gathering data for 101 days from the commencement date. He started on August 25 and ended on December 04, 1919. He gathered data at the district Uh and counted together 12 thsd. persons. Such gathered data must have borne high risk of distortion especially because of the principles of the present population. A single person could be counted twice or not at all if people didn't remember where they were exactly on August 20 and 21, 1919 or if they meanwhile died or moved away during period from the decisive date on.

Speaking of curiosities, we should mention also the opposite extreme captured by the quantitative research. A commissary in Košice started counting people in already on August 19, i.e. two days before the census commencement date, and he finished with the work in the assigned municipality 34 days later than the end census date. Census took longest in big towns. Questionnaire revealed September 17 in Bratislava and September 21 in Košice as the last days of counting (Mráz 1920/1921:128). In fact, these terms could have been even later.

Another extreme represented allocation of Czech and Moravian volunteers in the regions with mixed languages. These areas were typical with huge problem with hiring candidates for census commissaries. It was a consequence of significant isolation of the newly created regional administration that was gradually engaged by new officers who were loyal to the Czechoslovak Republic (Tišliar 2013:12–13). Thus, lack of commissaries was substituted by persons who didn't know the local situation and weren't even able to communicate in local language. Results of the opinion poll indicated that in such cases the commissaries either tried to speak German with local people or they had to hire an interpreter (Mráz 1920/1921:128).

Total 36 commissaries talked about nuisance in case of declaring nationality, namely in various forms of oppression.⁹⁹ Exclusively the engaged Slovak and Czech commissaries mentioned it in the opinion poll. Rather low headcount of Hungarian commissaries applied for participation on the opinion poll. Allegedly, there were cases when the Hungarian commissaries “...counted Slovak people as the Hungarian ones when the people talked to them in Hungarian language (in Bratislava

⁹⁸ Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Banská Bystrica (ŠABB), f. Gemersko-malohontská župa I. (Gemer-Malohont District I.), (1784) 1786–1790, box No. 3, 893/1920 adm.

⁹⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 371/III./21.

district) or the commissaries started speaking Hungarian and many feared Slovak people claimed they were Hungarians (in Banská Štiavnica), or the commissaries entered random nationality of Slovak people (both Slovak and Hungarian) or simply as Hungarian people (Hont)." (Mráz 1920/1921:128). Furthermore, the report stated that these were rather unique cases. Some cases occurred in Košice and Bratislava when the inhabitants raised objections against the sheets that entered at first Slovak and later other language, eventually the commissaries encountered people who denied the knowledge of Slovak language.

As we indicated above, the public wasn't properly informed about the performed census. Report from opinion poll conducted among the commissaries partly contradicts it since they stated that persons claiming Hungarian or German nationality were aware of the census. On the other hand, the report revealed that poorer Jews in Bratislava didn't know about the census (Mráz 1920/1921:128). Nevertheless, the cases occurred when even local representations didn't know about already commenced census. It was the case of the areas in the Eastern Slovakia. Probably the worst situation occurred in the area of Šariš and Zemplín, and some problems were reported also at Tekov. (Mráz 1920/1921:127). Insufficient information provision was reflected in various responses of people that often related to spreading of false or partly true information. Many people responded to census in the context of just ended war conflict with the neighboring Hungary, and those were aware of potential army duty. Moreover, it was associated also with the mobilization of birth years 1892–1898 by the Czechoslovak Government, which was a response to the latest conflict with Hungary. Along with census, district offices required from the municipalities to prepare the lists of persons born in the stated period of years (Klimko 1979:51).¹⁰⁰ There was also nationally – oriented propaganda, especially at the near-state border regions. Rumor spread in the north of Slovakia that people claiming Slovak nationality will have to enter into army duty. (Mráz 1920/1921:133).¹⁰¹ False information also spread about introduction of new type of taxes, about requisitions, land dividing, supplies, etc. Literally nonsense was spread regarding literacy. It was stated that if a person is illiterate, he/she will have to start attending a school; and the one who claims Slovak nationality will be restricted to claim affiliation to the Eastern Orthodox religion. Such nonsense resulted in problems with lack of will of some landlords to sig the house sheets (especially in Zvolen and the surroundings). At Dobšiná (Gemerský Štvrtok), a part of Slovak and German people presumed it was a plebiscite and they claimed Hungarian nationality.¹⁰² In other places, inhabitants were rejecting or even aggressive towards the commissaries; in other places they decided to

¹⁰⁰ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Jelšava, administrative box No. 1919, signature No. 1068/1919 adm.; ŠABA, f. Župa Bratislava I., box No. 3, signature No. 1047/1919 pres.

¹⁰¹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Dobšiná, Administrative box No. 1919, signature No. 894/B/1919.

¹⁰² NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 371/III./21.

hide. Sometimes also military assistance was required (Mráz 1920/1921:135). Nevertheless, census wasn't successful in all places.¹⁰³

Further problems were associated with gathering of certain data. Especially the age of older people posed problems, so did the questions about the ended war conflict 1914-1918. Census commissaries confirmed also the existence of various campaigns and possible oppression when declaring nationality. Objection was raised in case of missing Jewish nationality in the house sheet despite of many people claiming it. Complaint was filed in this light in Bratislava on August 25, 1919 when a commissary failed to enter Jewish nationality.¹⁰⁴ Investigation revealed that it was a unique case. We should also mention the protest gathering in Humenné, initiated by the Ruthenian group against the census on August 28, 1919.¹⁰⁵ According to information obtained from MPS it was probably a complaint on not including Ruthenian teachers and priests among the census commissaries. As MPS stressed, many of them didn't express the interest in such office.¹⁰⁶

The mentioned problems were mostly caused primarily by consequences of insufficient campaign and education that should have been organised during census preparation stage, focusing on clear and understandable explanation of true census goals to the population. Census preparation was underestimated not only in the area of public campaign but incapability to pay higher attention to the lists of candidates for census commissaries seemed equally neglected. While there were also objective reasons that had made census preparation more complicated in many aspects, the census date was postponed for a few times and its implementation during summer months was neither a positive decision. Anyway, it was about underestimated situation and demand rate of the project in many aspects.

Thus, census was implemented in August, the part of the year that isn't suitable for a project of similar nature. As we stated, agricultural work culminated at the time, accompanied with significant workforce migration. Field errors have only cumulated because of too hastily preparation. Audit subsequently identified further issues, especially failure to count a few houses in, evtl. insufficient filling in of the sheets.

The enlisted problems clearly indicate that the census wasn't organised properly. It could of course affect the quality of data gathered. Primarily, the time spent for quality preparation that would gradually solve the revealed gaps and issues was insufficient, so was the will and organizational skills that were radically underestimated. MPS office didn't have any experiences with census and J. Mráz, invited from the Statistical Office, (later Statistical Agency) attended only the meetings in Žilina held in January 1919 but he didn't intervene in further

¹⁰³ They were current villages: Lipovce, Mokroluh, Dulova Ves, Mlynárovce, Olšavka (Šariš) and Klenová (Zemplín). The data were finally taken over from census 1910. *Soznam miest na Slovensku dľa popisu ľudu z roku 1919*. Bratislava: Ministerstvo s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska, 1920, Explanations.

¹⁰⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 56039/19.

¹⁰⁵ Ibidem, signature No. 43001/1919.

¹⁰⁶ Ibidem, signature No. 212/1920.

course of census preparation and organization. Weak interest in resolving the identified deficiencies represented another cause, as indicated mainly by long-term pending issue with the list of candidates for census commissaries, as one of the most serious problem of the entire census. Insufficient preparation and its underestimation was moreover complicated by serious foreign and domestic issues, multiplied by further pending problems at public administration where not all officers' posts were engaged during year 1919 and only temporary work was performed at a few offices.

Results of census

Major shift in census date postponing significantly affected the primarily defined census goal, i.e. provision of data about the population nationality to the Czechoslovak peace delegation. Doubts about the goal fulfillment because of time problems emerged already during meetings in Žilina, held in January when the data gathering deadline was unclear. Talks in Paris about the state borders commenced on February 05, 1919 and this fact can be considered an important milestone in the light of further events associated with census preparation (Houdek 1931:298). It became definitely the cause of rushing and outrunning the agreed schedule, aimed at implementing the census immediately. It occurred probably upon announcement of the census date in March that was made spontaneously and without notification of the head census methodologist thereon; exclusively decided by MPS.

Since the Czechoslovak delegation needed to operate some data on behalf of Slovakia, at first the statistics compiled of 1910 census results by Fedor Houdek and Igor Hrušovský was used in Paris. The table was dated February 20, 1919.¹⁰⁷ Another used statistics was dated May 22, 1919 and it also referred to 1910 census data. It was compiled and adjusted by estimation by F. Houdek.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the interest in preliminary census results was expressed in Paris. Minister of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia Edvard Beneš asked for provision of at least temporary census results from Paris on October 13, 1919. Of course he was mainly interested in the map of Slovak nationalities.¹⁰⁹ At the time, no results were available yet. The first results from census 1919 were presented by the empowered minister V. Šrobár on October 14, 1919 (Mráz 1920/1921:1).¹¹⁰ The results represented approximate and incomplete data because of missing data

¹⁰⁷ SNA, f. OFVŠ, box No. 13, inv. No. 690.

¹⁰⁸ Ibidem, box No. 34, inv. No. 221/1b.

¹⁰⁹ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 259, signature No. 5326/1919 pres. adm.

¹¹⁰ SNA, f. OFVŠ, box No. 13, inv. No. 690; NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 20664/1919 J. Mráz also mentioned it in his report. It was furthermore stated in preliminary results presented by V. Šrobár that approx. 120 thsd. Hungarian inhabitants were so called "maďarón", i.e. non-Hungarian inhabitant sympathizing with Hungarians, "...thus, we can count number of Slovak citizens referring to 2.067,000, i.e. 70.3%. There are less than 7,000 Polish inhabitants, approx. 240,000 Ruthenians but approx. 100,000 thereof claimed to be Slovak inhabitants." Finally, census results were completely different. Total 2.923,214 inhabitants, thereof 1.954,446 Slovak inhabitants (66.9%), 689,565 Hungarian inhabitants (23.6%), 143,466 German inhabitants (4.9%), 81,332 Ruthenian inhabitants (2.8%) and other nationalities (1.9%) with major representation of Jewish nationality – total 54,405 inhabitants.

from one district. This incomplete presented file revealed total 2.94 million of present citizens, thereof 1,940,980 Slovak inhabitants (66.3%), 665,703 Hungarian inhabitants (22.7%), 134,761 Ruthenian inhabitants (4.5%), 143,322 German inhabitants (4.7%) and 55,608 Jewish and other inhabitants (1.8%). Finally, definite results proved significantly different, indicating that not only data from a single district were missing but it was rather very rough estimation. The results weren't known in the following few months either. It was undoubtedly another specialty of the extraordinary census 1919 which wasn't accompanied by problems only during entire preparation but also during stages of processing and publishing of results. Since the primary goal of census wasn't reached, secondary goals were highlighted, i.e. mainly the use of data in the public administration activity. V. Šrobár made efforts to support the census project with further arguments and find better reasonability thereof at the end of May through suggested joining of census with filling in the election right forms. It should identify exact headcount of voters.¹¹¹ However, this idea was rejected by the Ministry of Internal Affairs as not suitable, which would make already bad situation even more complicated.

Finally, the official data from census 1919 were published in the form of topography - lexicon of settlements dated in 1920.¹¹² It was published under name *Soznam miest na Slovensku dľa sčítania ľudu z roku 1919* (List of Settlements in Slovakia according to Census 1919). Today we know that the lexicon was ordered for printing in 1920,¹¹³ but actually it was published much later, in the fall 1921. (Mráz 1920b:199).

Why was it published so late and why it was deemed practically fully useless? At first, we should mention that Czechoslovak Statistical Office started with active work during year 1920 within the process of preparation to the state-wide Czechoslovak census that was successfully organised in February 1921. The society was waiting for new census results from the whole republic. Census 1919 with missing publishing of results has become a useless project. Why to use the data from 1919 if we've got new, timely, easily gathered data that are, let's say, without bigger errors? Finally, the form of results publishing in the form of topography - lexicon of settlements represented another problem that caused the census results to be forgotten.

It was apparent immediately after the Czechoslovakia declaration that high quality lexicon of settlements with official names of villages and towns would be required to develop in Slovakia for official activities, including the overview containing information about administrative municipalities of the offices (Tišliar 2020:37-58). While older publications were issued by the imperial - royal statistical board in Vienna,¹¹⁴ nothing similar was available in the Slovak territory. Hungarianization of the names of villages and towns, especially dated at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, was non-transparent within missing aid of orientation in the process. There were efforts for preparation of a simple aid

¹¹¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 28820/19.

¹¹² *Soznam miest na Slovensku dľa popisu ľudu z roku 1919*. Bratislava: Ministerstvo s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska, 1920.

¹¹³ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 24550/1920.

¹¹⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 38057/19.

for the Slovak language environment already at the beginning of the 20th century. In this way, F. Houdek and also other authors started gradually publishing so called "Contributions to Topography of Slovakia" that represented a simple form of publishing the Slovak and Hungarian names of villages and towns in particular subordinate districts. (Houdek 1901; Podajovorský 1901; Bodnár 1902).

The office of empowered minister, as a top administration authority in Slovakia, was not aware of the need for such official aid. An idea was offered here to join publishing of basic 1919 census results with selected topographical data about particular settlements. What was curious was that the military department has independently worked at the V. Šrobár's ministry since 1918 on own topography. Captain Bohuslav Bezděk has performed there since 1919, who was inspired by the mentioned contributions to topography of Slovakia dated at the beginning of the 20th century but also by recognised thesis of the Czech ethnographer Lubor Niederle who has dealt with delimitation of the language borders of the Slovak population in Hungary since the beginning of the 20th century. In 1919, L. Niederle issued his own Slovak topography (Niederle 1919; Mráz 1920b:226–227; Niederle 1903).¹¹⁵ B. Bezděk also confronted his knowledge with older works of Ján Matej Korabinský (Korabinský 1786), András Vályi (Vályi 1796–1799), as well as other authors, and he published his topography at own cost in 1920. (Bezděk 1920). The Bezděk's topography didn't contain numerical data about the population,¹¹⁶ but particular words on local level had much higher narrative value in summary than the later Šrobár's topography.

V. Šrobár formally agreed with compilation of the Bezděk's topography,¹¹⁷ provided that his ministry would prepare a new, more precise and complex topography that would contain the results from 1919. This interesting idea announced by him to the Ministry of Internal Affairs on January 23, 1920, didn't find general support.¹¹⁸ Since two private lexicons were published during years 1919 and 1920 from L. Niederle and B. Bezděk, the Ministry of Internal Affairs didn't express the interest in investing in another, new lexicon.¹¹⁹ This decision has finally hugely affected the census 1919. The Šrobár's List of Settlements was published only in minimum circulation despite of announced 3 thsd. circulations by V. Šrobár (Šprocha and Tišliar 2015b:253–274).¹²⁰ Moreover, at the time of its publishing (1921) it was already outdated in some topographical parts. We should also add that a new group of historians and linguists has become forming at the beginning of the 20th century, centered in Bratislava, who started actively cooperating on the preparation of the official nomenclature of the settlements. Their work has later become the basis for the official topographies that were created and used during period between WWI and WWII (Tišliar 2020:50–51).

¹¹⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 22082/1919; 2091/1920.

¹¹⁶ NAČR, f. MSP, box No. 293, signature No. 45715/1919.

¹¹⁷ "The Bezděk's company is a private business" as stated on June 16, 1920 by MPS in the report to the Presidium of the Ministry Board. NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 10078/1920.

¹¹⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 6392/20.

¹¹⁹ Ibidem, box No. 250, signature No. 46172/1919; No. 25879/1920; No. 39521/1920.

¹²⁰ Ibidem, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 12061/20.

The list of settlements comprised seven parts. The most important was the topographical part where the settlements were ordered alphabetically according to particular administrative districts and subordinate districts. Self-governing municipal towns were enlisted separately (Bratislava, Košice, Banská Štiavnica a Belá, Komárno). The names of settlements referred to already mentioned L. Niederle's topography as well as to the older work of Ján Lipský dated at the beginning of the 19th century, originally prepared as a register of settlements attached to so called Lipský's Map of Hungary (Lipszky de Sedlicna 1808), capturing the original settlements names before hungarization. Along with Slovak name version, Hungarian name was stated in brackets, which was used around year 1910 for purposes of identification and possible use of the older topographies from the Hungarian part of the Monarchy. Another part of the topography contained the results of census 1919 on local level, gradually in the following order: number of houses, number of inhabitants, their gender, nationality and religion in absolute numbers. This information was completed with data about the nearest sites of Notary Office, Registry Office, district court of justice, tax and post office, telegraph, as well as railroad and police station, and parish. Further parts related to overviews of results and summaries of the census 1919. District overviews of the 1919 census results about nationality were retrospectively recalculated and compared to the results from the preceding censuses 1880–1910, and about gender, recalculated and compared to the results from censuses 1900 and 1910. The district overview was completed with the table containing the number of villages and towns with prevailing inhabitants with Czechoslovak nationality. Similar table was compiled on the administration district level. Table 1 shows basic census results:

Compared to the preceding censuses, the results introduced rather interesting changes. They were for sure a result of mistakes made during the census organization, but such an explanation would be too simple. The state-law changes were expressed in the society life especially in the differences in the resulting Hungarian and Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality. They stemmed from migration movements during years 1918–1919 when many people with Hungarian language as a mother language migrated from Slovakia to Hungary. It was apparent in educational sector but primarily in Hungarian apparatus where vacant posts in Slovakia could be only hardly found. Vacant positions couldn't be simply engaged by domestic officers since there weren't enough of them (see Tišliar 2013). Thus, jobs were mainly engaged with Czech officers and teachers, and it was expressed during the period between WWI and WWII with increased headcount of persons with Czech nationality in Slovakia. Migration movement wasn't only out of the Slovak territory. Repatriation of the inhabitants occurred after the Czechoslovakia declaration. Increments or decrements of total population in Slovakia during period of years 1911–1920 compared to period of years 1901–1910 are presented in the table 2. The table shows both the migration and also pre-war work migration that bothered the population in the Slovak territory as a result of agricultural nature of the country with insufficiently developed industry. (see Vanek 2021a; 2021b and 2022).

Table 1: Slovakia - wide results of nationality structure from the extraordinary census 1919 compared to the preceding censuses

Year	Headcount of inhabitants	Mother language/nationality				
		Slovak (Czechoslovak)	Hungarian	German	Ruthenian	other
1880	2.455,928	1.498,808	549,059	225,059	78,941	104,061
1890	2.587,485	1.600,676	642,484	232,788	84,787	26,750
1900	2.792,569	1.700,842	759,173	214,302	84,906	33,346
1910	2.926,833	1.685,653	896,338	196,948	97,014	50,880
1919	2.923,214	1.954,446	689,565	143,466	81,332	54,405
%						
1880	100	61.0	22.4	9.2	3.2	4.2
1890	100	61.9	24.8	9.0	3.3	1.0
1900	100	60.9	27.2	7.7	3.0	1.2
1910	100	57.6	30.6	6.7	3.3	1.7
1919	100	66.9	23.6	4.9	2.8	1.9

Table 2: Increments/decrements of Slovak population in the form of natural changes and migration during period of years 1901-1920 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:34)

	Increment (+) or decrement (-) of population					
	total		natural changes		migration	
	abs.	in %	abs.	in %	abs.	in %
<i>Period of years 1901-1910</i>						
Slovakia	135,656	4.9	350,502	12.6	-214,846	-7.7
<i>Period of years 1911-1920</i>						
Slovakia	74,046	2.5	171,320	5.9	-97,274	-3.3

The changes at nationality structure represented by nationality in 1919 (versus mother language in the preceding censuses) wasn't caused only by migration. The new state-law situation also shared the changes that were in favor of the Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality, despite of weakening of this moment by the agitations about soon to occur return of the territory and restoration of the old Hungary. This "Hungarian irredentism", as named by the public administration in Slovakia, performed during the entire period between WWI and WWII, was logically rather in favor of population claiming Hungarian nationality. On the contrary, ending of hungarization, changes at holding offices, at teaching language, etc. represented a positive aspect for the Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality. Year 1919, when a short war conflict broke out with Hungary as we mentioned, was rather in favor of tendency to "choose" Hungarian nationality. The nationality based on the will of the person requested, was perceived at this moment as a possibility to calculate and consider "what would be better". Therefore it is more suitable to evaluate 1919 census as rather a tendency that started to shape after the Czechoslovakia declaration, and refer rather from the following census 1921 at demographical characteristics. Already simple comparison of basic results of both censuses definitely sounds affirmatively. This applies to the tendency of

changes at the nationality structure where, compared to censuses 1900–1910, overall decrease of persons with Hungarian nationality and increase of persons with Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality was confirmed. We should mention, however that nationality or its form instead of mother language was questioned also in the following census in 1921. While the mother language conditioned the nationality, the will of the respondent was what counted in Slovakia.

We conducted the detail analysis of summary results on regional and local level in a few previous theses (Tišliar 2007a; Čéplö et al. 2017). The view on the nationality map if Slovakia compiled from the results of 1919 census confirmed remarkable parallels with the mentioned census 1921, as well as with year 1880, especially when seeking ethnic language borders and protrusions. It was a period of gradual onset of more distinctive efforts for hungarization in Hungary.

Overall delay in 1919 census results processing and publishing, as well as the form of publishing caused lack of interest in the census results. Problems at which the census was implemented undoubtedly contributed thereto. Thus, census 1919 was very soon forgotten and save a few exceptions, statistics from Czechoslovak censuses organised between WWI and WWII (in 1921 and 1930) was used exclusively. Accordingly, extraordinary census 1919 was mostly evaluated and unnecessarily organised. A few thousands of persons were involved in the census, high funds were spent for this purpose and the result was forgotten practically instantly after the census completion.

Meaning of census 1919

Census 1919 represents rather a curiosity in the history of Slovakia. Its implementation was accompanied by huge problems that resulted in extensive incorrectness of the results. Therefore the data should be confronted, best with the following census in 1921, as we mentioned. The census 1919 was probably the most beneficial for the census 1921 that was of the republic – wide nature.

During preparation for census in the spring 1919, the Statistical Office was actively interested in the entire process. We already stated that J. Mráz disavowed from the project immediately when he realised that a few actions were made in Slovakia that contradicted the agreed schedule of census. Therefore, the State Statistical Office in Prague called on the Ministry of Internal Affairs at the beginning of April 1919 with request for cooperation on obtaining the whole preparation material related to the Slovak census. At the time, people in Prague thought that the census was completed. The Statistical Office repeated the request once more at the end of July. The new Czechoslovak census was scheduled in the mid 1919 for the beginning of 1921 and the provided material from the preparation process should have helped the Statistical Office ensure thorough preparation not only in relation to Slovakia.¹²¹ They were interested in everything important: methodology, printings and forms, as well as regulations, circulars, flyers and calls towards the population. The State Statistical Office and the Ministry of Internal Affairs in its name expressed a special interest in the material that was used for preparation of instructions for census commissaries.

¹²¹ SNA, f. KÚ, No. 490, signature No. KÚ-No.1-1930-2.4.1.

This probably included also provision of older instructions and methodologies from the Hungarian Monarchy. The Ministry of Internal Affairs also required the information about eventual cooperation and collaboration of other offices and bodies outside of the public administration.

The State Statistical Office insisted on excluded right for the 1919 census material processing pursuant to the Act on Statistical Services. V. Šrobár and his MPS probably didn't respond to such request at all. Probably for this reason, request of the Ministry of Internal Affairs was repeated in July 1919 and together eight times more.¹²² The Šrobárs' didn't respond to the offer for census processing as preparation of the lexicon of settlements by the State Statistical Office and they worked on it by themselves.¹²³ However, it is more than likely that MPS didn't provide the material to the State Statistical Office before 1921 since selected results of census were published as late as in 1921. Mention dated September 19, 1929 was found in the archive documents on takeover of the whole file of census forms by the Ministry of Internal Affairs from the State Statistical Office.¹²⁴ Till then, the State Statistical Office had probably partly disposed of the material from 1922.¹²⁵ Complete file of the census sheets was mentioned in Prague as late as from the beginning of 1923.¹²⁶ So far we haven't obtained detail information in what extent the work with the census sheets or summaries continued. The file of the census sheets from the Šrobár's census 1919 finally ended in the waste raw material collecting company since the Slovak State and Planning Office together with the Committee of the Internal Affairs in Bratislava didn't express the interest in transport of the file to Slovakia. Thus, the waste raw material collecting company paid total CZK 1,685 on July 05, 1950 for 3,370 kg of "old paper".¹²⁷ Anyway, a single numerous file of census sheets was preserved in Slovakia that related to the Nitra administration district. It is stored in the State Archive at Ivanka pri Nitre. The file consists of 55 settlements and army garrison force (890 men), which was dislocated in a few objects of the subordinate district Nitra. (Tišliar 2011a:3-22; Tišliar 2007b:166-174).

Currently we don't know why it was census sheets file from Nitra that was returned to Slovakia, and whether it has been sent to the State Statistical Office in Prague at all. Anyway, today the file represents a significant reminder of census 1919, and also a suitable file intended for deeper statistical - demographical, as well as historical-genealogical analysis on local and micro-regional level. There's no other file of preserved census sheets from 1919 available in Slovakia.

Census sheets from 1919 were directly used once more in relation to the issues that occurred during census 1921. At the time, census sheets from district

¹²² NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 24358/1923.

¹²³ Ibidem, signature No. 30470/1920. Statistical Office was informed on the preparation of lexicon in November 1920 and offered to overtake this activity to own hands.

¹²⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, without signature.

¹²⁵ The mention of census sheets returning for completion came from the State Statistical Office in Prague from 1922. SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. 9484/22.

¹²⁶ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 11761/III.-20.

¹²⁷ Admission letter No. 4290. NAČR, f. Ústřední archiv Ministerstva vnitra (Central Archives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs), 1949-1950, box No. 41, signature No. 221-2513.

Giraltovce and region Orava were lost temporarily. While majority of them was found in year 1922, missing sheets from town Krompachy were replaced with additional review of census sheets from 1919.¹²⁸ Therein, mainly the changes were added that occurred during years 1919–1921, as well as data that weren't gathered during census 1919. The review was held at Krompachy during period from June 06 to June 15, 1922.¹²⁹

The results about nationality served also for certain time from 1922 in the area of justice where they became the basis for determination of 20% language limit in respective jurisdiction,¹³⁰ since even preliminary results of census 1921 weren't available at the time.

¹²⁸ SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. 8659/22; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 6660/22, Ibidem, signature No. 47702/22.

¹²⁹ SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. 9822/22 a signature No. 10082/22.

¹³⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 98423/22, pursuant to the Language Act No. 122/1920 Coll.

Czechoslovak census 1921

Background of the 1921 Census with emphasis on the relationship with Slovakia

With the statistical service establishment in Czechoslovakia, especially during 1919, the prerequisites for the proper fulfilment of its mission were created. This involved, alongside other statistical surveys, the organization of proper population censuses. Czechoslovak statistics quite logically tried to follow the older Austrian and Hungarian censuses, which were held in 10-year cycles in years ending in zero. From this point of view, year 1920 seemed to be the framework date for the new census, which was initially envisaged.

The first discussions began already in 1919, in which the possibility of applying the results of the Slovak extraordinary census 1919 was also considered. This was also the main reason why the Statistical Office repeatedly contacted the MPS in Bratislava during 1919 and requested not only the results, even the interim ones, but especially all the accompanying and methodological material for this census. The latter would both clarify in detail the manner in which the census was carried out, but also point out the more significant problems that had to be solved in its implementation. Initially, there was talk about possible financial savings if the 1919 results were applied to Slovakia. But very soon complaints began to multiply, pointing rather to a preliminary and extraordinary character of the 1919 census, mentioning its mistakes and major shortcomings. In particular, the fact that the 1919 census completely omitted some of the features and characteristics commonly found in modern censuses, and which would thus be absent from a large part of Czechoslovakia, became an important argument.

For the emerging Czechoslovak statistics, the different statistical practice of the former Austrian and Hungarian statistics became a greater problem. These were mainly problems related to the different development of the two parts of the dual Austro-Hungarian monarchy, which had developed independently and differently in selected areas since 1867, especially in social and cultural development. This dualism, which we have already discussed in part in the previous chapter, was most apparent in legal dualism in particular, but it has gradually become relevant in other areas of social development as well. Thus, for example, in statistical practice, national statistics were perceived and thus reported differently, but there were also different methodologies in case of economic characteristics, or in terms that were understood differently (Šprocha and Tišliar 2015a:375–387). This became one of the more significant starting points when discussions about the nature of the new census began. Antonín Boháč,

working at the Statistical Office in Prague, became a major figure in the interwar Czechoslovak censuses and population statistics in general.¹³¹

The organization of the Czechoslovak Statistical Service was governed by a special law from the beginning of 1919.¹³² It created both the Statistical Office as an executive body and the National Statistical Office as an advisory body to the government in all essential areas of state statistics, drawing up the plan and direction of state statistics.¹³³ As the Statistical Office was not active for a long time (Boháč 1924:7*)¹³⁴ and its Population Committee did not become active until 30 March 1920 (Boháč 1920a:196),¹³⁵ the Statistical Office in cooperation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs was primarily responsible for the preparations of census. As late as at the end of 1919, the Ministry of Internal Affairs issued a circular on the revision of municipal numbers, the creation of house number lists and a list of settlements, local districts and villages in the western part of Czechoslovakia. For Slovakia, a similar circular was issued by the MPS (Boháč 1920a:89; Boháč 1924:7*).¹³⁶

The Statistical Office was responsible for preparation of the new census concept, which began its work in the field of basic legislation. In Slovakia, Hungarian legal standards were in force, and these were dealt with separately in case of censuses by special laws for each census. In Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, even older Austrian law dated March 29, 1869 (Boháč 1920a:94), which A. Boháč criticised in several areas, was in force. He recommended preparing new legislation for census, a new fundamental law stipulating mainly general principles, which would then be followed up at each census by more detailed implementing regulations in the form of governmental decrees on the implementation of census. It also proposed replacing the usual and customary 10-year periods with a 5-year cycle of censuses, arguing that their results would be more representative and up-to-date in view of diversified nature of the Czechoslovak population. At the same time, he was aware of the obvious disadvantages of such a change, which were primarily related to the costly census financing. A. Boháč also criticised the decisive day, which was set on December 31 in a year ending in zero (Boháč 1920a:194) since 1869. Here, he argued with higher migration of the population and suggested

¹³¹ NAČR, f. Státní úřad statistický (National Statistical Office), (1916) 1919–1946 (1950) (f. SÚS), box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

¹³² Act No. 49/1919 Coll.

¹³³ Ibidem, § 1. The rules of procedure, composition and competences of the Statistical Office were determined by the Governmental Decree No. 634/1919 Coll.

¹³⁴ It was not established until March 24, 1920. The members of the committee were: Jan Auerhan, Josef Beneš, Karl Berthold, Antonín Boháč, Josef Gruber, Emil Heindl, Cyril Horáček, Fedor Houdek, Igor Hrušovský, Jaroslav Janko, Václav Joachim, Václav Johanis, Václav Johanis, Antonín Kalbáč, Jan Koloušek, Jan Kopfmahler, Dobroslav Krejčí, František Kulhavý, Leopold Langr, Václav Láska, Jiří Metelka, Vilibald Mildshuh, Josef Mráz, Adolf Němeček, Karel Petr, Antonín Prokeš, Heinrich Rauchberg, Gustav Rosmanith, Jaroslav Schiebl, Emil Schönbaum, Emil Stodola, Karel Svoboda, Josej Šiška, Rudolf Šiška, Rudolf Tayerle, Františej Weyr (chairman of the committee) and Bohdan Živanský.

¹³⁵ Zpráva o činnosti výborů Statistické státní rady v době od 24. března do 13. června 1920. Výbor pro sčítání lidu. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, 1920, p. 331.

¹³⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 8418/19.

rather considering the term when the population was more stable and settled. He considered the last day of November or February to be the most appropriate date in this respect (Boháč 1920a:197).

The delay in the establishment of the Statistical Office was also reflected in the later Census Act adoption. It occurred on April 08, 1920¹³⁷ and there is no doubt that many of the recommendations and views of A. Boháč's opinions were eventually incorporated into this law. However, the law was not comprehensive. It defined only very general and framework principles of the first census to be prepared in Czechoslovakia. It had to be held between November 01, 1920, and March 31, 1921. Exact date of the decisive day had to be announced by the Government upon the Statistical Office recommendations. The new law thus introduced a new 5-year census period and abolished all previous census standards.

Implementing regulation for the census was adopted on October 30, 1920 in the form of government decree and it was considerably more detailed than the law.¹³⁸ It set the decisive census day for February 15, 1921 and the public administration was responsible for the census implementation. It also applied to Slovakia and Ruthenia.¹³⁹ Among the reasons why the results of the 1919 census were not finally used, apart from its incompleteness and the absence of the population occupation data, we can certainly mention the unavailability of census sheets, which did not reach the Statistical Office until 1922/1923. In 1920, there was thus no other option but to deal with the census across the whole Czechoslovakia without exception. The text of the regulation represented an outcome of 4 meetings of the subcommittee – the Census Committee, chaired by the aforementioned A. Boháč.¹⁴⁰

In the area of preparation, the Government Decree laid down the methodology for the creation of census districts, which the appointed census commissaries had to be in charge of.¹⁴¹ They had to be autonomous, adult and fit for the office and could assume the office upon the oath. The census commissaries were given a special authorization to fulfill their duties, which entitled them to carry out the census. Their field work (patrolling) had to begin on February 16, 1921. They could record or check the data with the knowledge of the head of the household concerned. In doing so, they could require a proof and documentation of the reported signs and characteristics. Field data collection should last until February 19, 1921 and until February 21, 1921 in the villages where the housing census was also held (Boháč 1924:16*).

The Government Decree defined the following as the basic characteristics and features to be collected about every individual: gender, age, marital status, nationality, religion, home affiliation, and occupation. The data were to be filled in either on a census sheet, which the owner of the dwelling (landlord) was

¹³⁷ Act No. 256/1920 Coll.

¹³⁸ Government Decree 592/1920 Coll.

¹³⁹ ŠANI, f. Slúžnovský úrad v Prievidzi (Subordinate Office in Prievidza), 1851–1922 (f. SÚ Prievidza), box No. 4, signature 330/1920 pres.

¹⁴⁰ Zpráva o činnosti výborů Statistické státní rady..., p. 331.

¹⁴¹ Government Decree 592/1920 Coll., § 13.

responsible for, or on a conscription sheet, which had to be filled in by a census officer. The Ministry of Internal Affairs had to determine the type and reason of particular sheet use. The use of census sheets or individual census cards was also considered by Antonín Boháč in his paper (Boháč 1920a:268–272). Indeed, in the western part of Czechoslovakia, the older Austrian censuses used the so-called notification slips (Anzeigezattell) and conscription sheets (Aufnahmsbogen), with the notification slips being filled in by the population and the census sheet by the census commissary. This was different from the Hungarian statistical practice, where individual census cards were used, supplemented by a house sheet. The advantage of the data collection system in Hungary was a faster way of summarizing the results. Individual slips were used in Hungary as early as 1869 and were then generally used from the 1880 census onwards (Boháč 1920a:269). The Census Commission eventually recommended the use of the Austrian model of census sheets, with the proviso that the census sheets were to be filled in by the owner of the dwelling for all the occupants of the dwelling and the conscription sheets were to be filled in directly by the census commissary and had to be used for the whole house. This system was thus also adopted by the government's census regulation.

The sheets had to contain the details of all persons present in the apartment in question at midnight of February 15–16, 1921. This census also captured the population present. The census also covered the persons working at night at the time or those who were away from home for entertainment. These were counted in at the place of residence. It did not, however, apply to those who were travelling or away for longer periods of time. They were registered at the hotel or apartment where they stayed overnight or 'arrived'.¹⁴² A special regulation laid down the principles for facilities and institutions where several people were present, i.e. hotels, barracks, prisons, monasteries, hospitals, etc. Hotels were required to record the persons who were guests of the facility on the relevant day on separate sheets, which were then used to fill in a sheet for the entire hotel. In other institutions, individuals were entered directly on the sheets by the director or head of the institution or the commander of the military barracks. Thus, members of the Czechoslovak army had to be a direct part of the census, which was then also reflected in the regional and local results, especially in terms of gender ratios and structures according to nationality and religious affiliation.

Nationality was undoubtedly the most problematic characteristic. This was apparent already in the 1919 census, for which the national statistics was one of the main objectives. Even in the 1921 census, national statistics were among the most important data to be collected. The national structure was seen by many as one of the justifications for the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic. Accordingly, it received considerably more attention than other features. Nationality was defined as a tribal affiliation, the outward sign of which is usually the mother language.¹⁴³ The Jewish population was an exception to this definition which was not tied to either language or a religious community or to any other feature that could

¹⁴² Government Decree No. 592/1920 Coll., § 6.

¹⁴³ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

objectify the observed data. The methodology refused to confuse tribal affiliation with belonging to a particular territory (Horáček 1920:184).¹⁴⁴ The aforementioned definition of nationality was the result of a vote of the State Statistical Office. It was approved by a single vote, 8 to 7, and became more problematic especially in the western part of Czechoslovakia, where a large German minority lived (Boháč 1930:3).¹⁴⁵ The proposal to survey nationality directly instead of mother language was made at the Statistical Office by Vilihald Mildshuh, who was strongly supported by Dobroslav Krejčí, a head of the Statistical Office until the beginning of 1920 (Krejčí 1920:275–285). D. Krejčí was clearly convinced of the direct choice of nationalities and tried to defend its simplicity and subjectivity, although at the same time he recognised the risks that such a survey entailed (Krejčí 1921b).¹⁴⁶ He saw language as a possible means of authentication and linked knowledge of it to nationality. D. Krejčí assessed the cases in which a person did not know how to use the language of the nationality to which he claimed to belong to as a mistake and misunderstanding.¹⁴⁷ However, insofar as the census was intended to give a picture of the national situation in Czechoslovakia, it must not, according to D. Krejčí, no one was prevented from freely declaring the nationality which he/she identified him/herself with. D. Krejčí spoke out against the linguistic nationality of Cyril Horáček, but also against the concept of mother language of A. Boháč, who preferred language in the statistical series.

Mainly the aforementioned A. Boháč, but also Jan Auerhan, a lawyer who later headed the Statistical Office in Czechoslovakia, (Boháč 1920a:272) were the opponents of such an approach.¹⁴⁸ A. Boháč perceived national statistics as a problem that stretched back for a long time since the mid-19th century, practically in two streams of different understanding. The first argued that nationality was a subjective state, a feeling akin to religious belief, which each individual was inwardly convinced of. The second view identified nationality with tribal affiliation, where language is the decisive feature. A. Boháč advocated language as an objective sign of nationality, which is not subject to such frequent changes. The proposal that only the mother language should be surveyed in the census, the main feature of which was to be nationality, i.e. the opposite of the final wording, was made in the discussions as one of the original ones.¹⁴⁹ A. Boháč also tried to push for a compromise solution that both features, i.e. nationality and language, should be surveyed in the 1921 census, but this proposal was not accepted. The reason was that the results of both surveys would probably be identical (Boháč 1930:4).

¹⁴⁴ Cyril Horáček distinguished a dual nationality, political, which is the nationality, and tribal (ideological), whose main feature is the tribal community, cultural community and linguistic community.

¹⁴⁵ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 30806/1922; also NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248.

¹⁴⁶ NAČR, f. Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí-výstřižkový archiv (Ministry of Foreign Affairs-clipping archive, 1916–1944 (f. MZV-VA), box No. 2329.

¹⁴⁷ "If, however, a man declares himself a member of a nationality in the language of which he is unable to express himself properly, it must be assumed that there is an obvious mistake, either that he has misunderstood the question or that his declaration is not really free."

¹⁴⁸ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

¹⁴⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 56051/1920.

The Slovak members of the Committee on Population Statistics, Emil Stodola, Fedor Houdek, Igor Hrušovský, also took a special and interesting position on this issue. They recommended to the Statistical Board to objectify nationality by surveying the mother language.¹⁵⁰ They justified this on “*specifically Slovak national and political grounds*”. One can only assume that this was the experience of the 1919 census, where the problem of recession by stating nationality was directly revealed. On the contrary, in Ruthenia there were voices in favor of direct ascertainment of nationality, justified by the fact that the local Ruthenian population, including the intelligentsia, was largely “hungarianised” in Hungarian schools and used Hungarian language in their everyday communication. Another argument was the predominance of the Jewish population in Uzhorod and Mukachevo, whose colloquial language, in addition to German, was mainly Hungarian.¹⁵¹

The discussion about the nature of statistical practice with regard to nationality continued in the autumn of 1920. The German members of the Statistical Office (Anton Roscher and Franz Macoun) lodged a protest as early as in September 1920, in which they disagreed with the direct declaration of nationality and joined the idea proposing the mother language as the basis for nationality statistics.¹⁵²

When the virtually straightforward choice of nationality as the basis of the surveyed attribute for the 1921 census was finally voted for by the Board of Statistics on October 08, 1920, a few members of the Committee on Population Statistics filed written protests against the non-adoption of a strict language policy.¹⁵³ The reason given was not only the language law, which had earlier been mentioned as one of the main arguments by A. Boháč in his comments (Boháč 1920a:274),¹⁵⁴ but also the negative experiences from the preliminary census in Slovakia in 1919, where the direct choice of nationality could also be abused due to agitation, were mentioned.¹⁵⁵ Another problem of the incorrectness of the adopted principles was also seen in the case of defining the Jewish nationality. D. Krejčí advocated the direct declaration of Jewish nationality as long as persons over 14 years of age freely declared it, without any other conditions. At the same time, exceptions should apply to Jewish nationality which do not take into account knowledge of the mother language, i.e. “the Jewish language”. The nationality of children under the age of 14 had to be determined according to the parents, in case of difference, according to the mother (Krejčí 1920:280). At the same time, the problem of Jewish nationality and its application in the interwar censuses must be viewed through the lens of the consequences it had brought. Indeed, the possibility to declare this nationality resulted in a significant statistical reduction of the primarily German

¹⁵⁰ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 26588/1922.

¹⁵¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 33047/1920.

¹⁵² Ibidem, signature No. 56051/1920.

¹⁵³ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 26588/1922; f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 70426/1920.

¹⁵⁴ Act No. 122/1920 Coll. dated February 29, 1920 speaks of linguistic and national minorities, while the courts of justice and public offices are administered in languages which, according to the last census, proved that at least 20% of the minority of languages other than Czechoslovak lived there.

¹⁵⁵ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3285, signature No. 26588/1922; f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 70426/1920.

and Hungarian population in Czechoslovakia (Jelínek 1999a:66; 1999b:79), as it was these languages that the majority of the population of the Jewish religion had declared themselves to be in previous censuses (Šprocha and Tišliar 2018:363). The possibility of using the declaration of Jewish nationality was eventually actively supported by the National Council of Jews in Prague, which expressed that it was a common interest with the Czechoslovak state. However, they drew the attention of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to anti-campaigns and statements from the German and Hungarian side, which frightened people that their children would not be able to attend German and Hungarian schools and to make official requests in German and Hungarian if they did not declare their German and Hungarian nationality.¹⁵⁶

From the above brief overview of opinions, it is apparent that in virtually all cases the national statistics were viewed with a particular goal or even personal interest in mind, i.e., who was more comfortable with what. When the controversy over nationality and national statistics began, the interpretation of the terms *nation*, *nationality*, and the definition of the concept of mother language were not settled in Czechoslovakia, and this was also reflected in further legislative activity. The interpretation to the 1920 Constitutional Law left it to the free will to declare one's nationality regardless of religion, language or race.¹⁵⁷ However, the language law, adopted at the same time as the Constitutional Law of 1920, was different. It set a 20% linguistic threshold for holding office in a minority language.¹⁵⁸ Act No. 109 of the Supreme Administrative Court of the Czechoslovak Republic (SAC) dated January 07, 1925, on the interpretation of the language law, stated the identical understanding of nationality and language. The SAC viewed the two as synonymous. (Boháč 1930).¹⁵⁹

In any case, the above-mentioned formulation was adopted for the forthcoming census that nationality is generally linked to mother language, and the census sheet indicated "nationality (mother language)" next to nationality. The vote of the Statistical Office, but especially the instruction to the census commissaries, together with the governmental regulation on the 1921 census, went in a more declaratory direction.¹⁶⁰ According to this, the head of the household was obliged to enter in the census sheets that nationality which the members of his family themselves declared as their own. In the same way, the head of the household was required to state to the census commissary the nationality of minor and non-sui juris persons. Adults had to declare their nationality themselves. If any person stated two or more nationalities, the Census Commissary was obliged to instruct him/her properly, and if *'the answer was not satisfactory even after such instruction,*

¹⁵⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 9575/1920.

¹⁵⁷ Parliamentary Printing No. 2421, Report of the Constitutional Committee on the Constitutional Charter of the Czechoslovak Republic, section on the protection of minorities. Session of the National Assembly of 1920.

<<https://www.nrsr.sk/dl/Browser/Document?documentId=15152>> [online, August 11, 2023]

The Constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic was approved as Act No. 121/1920 Coll.

¹⁵⁸ Act No. 122/1920 Coll., § 2.

¹⁵⁹ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

¹⁶⁰ Government Decree No. 592/1920 Coll., § 20.

the Census Commissary should determine the nationality of such persons according to their mother language'.¹⁶¹ Persons who belonged to the household concerned, i.e. subordinates, lodgers, etc., had to be asked directly by the Census Commissary as to their nationality. The census commissary could change the nationality figure under the government's census regulation if there was a "*manifest inaccuracy*", but this was not defined. However, the change could only be made with the consent of a person concerned who had to confirm it with his/her signature. If the counted in person disagreed, the decision was up to the relevant subordinate (district) office.¹⁶² Hence, the emphasis should be on nationality or the declaration of nationality, instead of the language. The language itself had to be used mainly secondarily, if someone was not sure of his/her nationality. Thus, the rules advocated in the Statistical Office prior to the enactment of Legislation D applied (Krejčí et al.). Also in the instructions for filling in the census sheet, and for the census commissary (reviewer), it was recommended to write down the nationality directly, according to the free declaration of a person over 14 years of age. (Boháč 1924:13*¹⁶³).¹⁶³ However, direct declaration of nationality had its limits, and if the commissary and the counting officer did not find a match, the political office, i.e. in Slovakia the subordinate's office, had to decide.¹⁶⁴ When it was found out that a counted in person did not declare the nationality correctly, i.e. that for some reason he/she deliberately stated a wrong figure, he/she could be fined from 20 to 10,000 CZK, according to the Government Decree.¹⁶⁵

What did this look like in practice and when did cases arise where the census commissary or the reviewer demanded the nationality change? A number of cases have survived as complaints against the decisions of administrative authorities in the matter of nationality determination to the SAC. As an interesting example of doubts in declaring nationality, one can mention the case of František Kříž of Kyselová, who was sentenced to 48 hours of imprisonment by the District Office in Olomouc (now the Czech Republic) on March 18, 1921 for violating the principles of the census because he had deliberately misstated his nationality.¹⁶⁶ On February 15, 1921, the claimant, F. Kříž, stated his nationality as German, but the census counting officer and subsequent investigations revealed that his parents were Czech, that he had been brought up in Czech speaking environment and that he should therefore be of Czech nationality. However, F. Kříž stated that he insisted on declaring his German nationality because he had been living in a German village among the Germans for 22 years, he spoke both German and Czech languages, his wife was German and he had brought up his five children in German. He was therefore a Czech descent, but in view of the above facts it cannot be said, to his opinion that the confession of German nationality "*which was his good right*" was knowingly misstated. The SAC stated in its ruling that:

¹⁶¹ Government Decree No. 592/1920 Coll., § 20.

¹⁶² Ibidem.

¹⁶³ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

¹⁶⁴ Government Decree No. 592/1920 Coll., § 20.

¹⁶⁵ Ibidem, § 12.

¹⁶⁶ NAČR, f. Nejvyšší správní soud (Supreme Administrative Court), 1918–1951 (f. NSS), box No. 104, signature No. 5721/1922.

“...it cannot be considered correct to take the view, also defended in this complaint, as if, as regards the entry under the heading ‘nationality’, only the will of the census counting officer decides what nationality he wants to give, and that, on the contrary, it is the party’s duty to admit himself to the nationality to which, according to the objective features relevant for the assessment of the nationality, he belongs. However, it is also stated that the authorities are under the obligation to establish impeccably whether there is in fact a deliberate mistake and that the circumstances alleged by the claimant in the administrative proceedings are not irrelevant to that finding. ...The defendant authority took the opposite view, holding that only the origin of the claimant, who was undeniably born of Czech parents and brought up in Czech, was decisive. In the cited award, however, it is assumed that this is not the only objective characteristic of nationality (emphasised by the PT), that such characteristics may also be other characteristics, e.g. the environment in which a person has lived for a long time; the tribal affiliation and the vernacular of the wife, the manner of bringing up the children, the long residence in a certain place, etc., i.e. the circumstances which the claimant has just alleged and from which he has inferred that the statement of his nationality is not false, still less deliberately incorrect.” The SAC therefore annulled the previous decision for illegality. It is thus clear from the foregoing that the largely vague and ambiguous formulation of nationality could and did lead to misunderstandings in some cases. Defining nationality as a tribal affiliation, the outward sign of which is generally, and therefore not exclusively, the mother language, thus gave the possibility of other circumstances being invoked. The reasoning of the SAC directly stated that the next census should contain a comprehensive list of the essential characteristics to be ascertained. “...it is therefore not a correct view that anyone can give any nationality, but nationality is ascertained as a sign of certain tribal affiliation...”¹⁶⁷ Problems with the indication of nationalities began to manifest themselves during data collection and were equally the subject of further proceedings as soon as the census was completed. The Provincial Political Administration in Prague, in a circular dated March 01, 1921, instructed the district administrations in Bohemia how to proceed with complaints about recorded nationalities.¹⁶⁸ “...in answering the question of the parties’ nationality, the material truth is to be decisive, that the parties are not at liberty to give their nationality completely arbitrarily (emphasis in the original, PT) and to transfer, perhaps completely independently of factual assumptions, from one nationality to another, but that they are obliged to report the truth in this field as well as about other personal facts. The law wants to establish facts statistically and not mere fictions based on personal temporary motives and misinterpretations. ...in case of persons who, in declaring their nationality, have been led by faulty assumptions or by personal considerations of various moments irrelevant to tribal affiliation (emphasised by PT) (vernacular speech, attendance at schools, marriage, etc.), to opt for that nationality for which, firstly, the blood relationship due to birth, and, above all, the mental disposition of the person concerned speaks, i.e. i.e. the circumstance to which nationality, by virtue of blood relationship and family tradition, the person in question is or would be inclined by his or her true and unbroken convictions, if all other factors which limit his or her absolute

¹⁶⁷ NAČR, f. NSS, box No. 104, signature No. 5721/1922; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248.

¹⁶⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 27791/1921.

freedom of choice were to cease to affect him or her, and if the person were to find himself or herself once again in his or her own environment."¹⁶⁹ Thus, from the above quotations it is apparent that the practice did not strictly follow the legislation, and in certain circumstances it was possible not to recognize the will of a counted in person, which had not to stand only on the inner feelings of the counted in person, but also the nationality had to be considered as a certain fact. On the basis of the above-mentioned controversy and the diversity of opinions and interpretations, it can be pointed out that the significance of the census results in the field of national statistics has been considerably weakened. The bipolarity of the professional, but also of the lay public interest required rather to consider the adoption of new and clear principles of national statistics, in which the methodology would precisely specify the conditions of the nationality indication. Alternatively, the possibility of obtaining data in two ways, i.e. by declaring the nationality and separately by mother language, was offered, which would probably be the most reasonable in the given situation. The 1921 census was thus ultimately based on a not entirely unambiguous definition of nationality, which subsequently gave rise to various problems (Boháč 1926:15).

The Government Decree on the census further defined the method of the census revision preparation in its fourth part. All census material was subject to thereto, and census reviewers were appointed to the revision under similar conditions as census commissaries.¹⁷⁰ Once the revision was completed, the reviewers had to compile the zone and municipal summaries, which were then sent to the relevant subordinate districts in Slovakia. There, the district survey was conducted.¹⁷¹ The Statistical Office was responsible for supervision of all census materials¹⁷²

The governmental regulation also established fundamental principles of the census funding. The state was responsible for the printings, sheets, instructions, summaries and forms, which supplied them to the public administration to carry out the census. The municipalities were obliged to prepare the lists of candidates for census commissaries, and thus to decide, in cooperation with the census offices, on the number of census districts. The municipalities then financed their own staff and the districts financed the census commissaries and reviewers from their own budgets.¹⁷³

In addition to the regular population census, a parallel census of dwellings in urban areas in settlements with more than 20,000 inhabitants was conducted. Here, the census was carried out on the basis of the Government Decree on the census on special housing lists.¹⁷⁴ In Slovakia this applied to only a few towns, namely to Bratislava, Košice, Trnava, Nové Zámky, Nitra and Komárno.¹⁷⁵

¹⁶⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 27791/1921.

¹⁷⁰ Government Decree 592/1920 Coll., §§ 24–26.

¹⁷¹ Ibidem, §§ 27–28.

¹⁷² Ibidem, § 30.

¹⁷³ Ibidem, §§ 31–34.

¹⁷⁴ Government Decree 592/1920 Coll., § 7.

¹⁷⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 76783/1920; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Rožňava, box No. 219, signature No. 290/1921 adm.

Basic forms and sheets

The Austrian and Hungarian censuses of 1910 represented the starting point, which was also followed in the preparatory stage of the 1921 census and served as a model (Boháč 1924:8*). The following data were subject to the survey in the census sheets: gender; surname (family) and given name; marital status; date of birth (day, month and year); place of birth (municipality, judicial/political district, country); length of residence in the census municipality; home and nationality (municipality, judicial/political district, country);¹⁷⁶ nationality as a tribal affiliation, the outward sign of which is usually the language; religion; literacy (reading and writing); type of main occupation; position in the occupation; details of the factory (establishment, institute, office) in which the occupation is performed;¹⁷⁷ relationship to the owner of the dwelling (in the case of subletting, to the head of the household). Other questions related to the pre-war occupation, namely, what occupation the person performed on July 16, 1914, indicating the type of occupation and position therein as of that date.

More detailed instructions for completion of the census (conscription) sheet were also prepared. It was directly included in the census sheet and contained a simple interpretation of the principles defined by the legislation (law and governmental regulation) (Boháč 1924:12*). It was supplemented by another instruction which specified the individual items of the census sheet. It went through the columns (headings) in turn, indicating possible examples or options. To fill in marital status, date of birth, place of residence and home and nationality, the data had to be verified in relevant documents (birth or baptismal certificate, abstract from the civil registers, home certificate, passport, school certificate, etc.) (Boháč 1924:13*). Literacy was only ascertained at persons aged 6 years and above. Children under the age of 6 were enrolled only by indicating a horizontal line.

Religion was indicated by specific religious affiliation, including a declaration that the person was non-denominational. (Boháč 1924:82*¹⁷⁸). The instructions for completing the census sheets gave more specific examples of how to specify religion.¹⁷⁹ Compared to previous censuses, non-state-recognised religions could also be enrolled, since the Constitution guaranteed the possibility of freedom of belief. (Boháč 1924:82*; Petranský 2017:32).

The occupation of the population was focused on the main occupation, i.e. the occupation from which the main earning activity (livelihood, pension, annuity...) was recorded. The type of personal activity or occupation had to be indicated as

¹⁷⁶ In the Hungarian census, only nationality was ascertained.

¹⁷⁷ This complied with the Austrian, not the Hungarian, census of 1910.

¹⁷⁸ Religion in the 1921 census was also a subject of an interpellation by MPs, headed by Theodor Bartosek, who asked the Minister of Internal Affairs for clarification regarding the documentation of leaving the church, which was linked to the announcement of leaving the church. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 12182/1921. Print 1391, 1st term, Chamber of Deputies of the National Assembly, January 25, 1921. In the western part of the Czechoslovak Republic (Bohemia and Moravia and Silesia), Act No. 277/1920 Coll., as amendment to the older Austrian Act No. 49/1868 Coll., was applied. However, it was valid only in the western part of the Czechoslovakia.

¹⁷⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Muráni (Municipal Notary Office in Muráň), 1908–1946 (f. ObNÚ Muráň), administrative box 1917–1924, unorganised archive fund.

precisely as possible. Examples included agriculture, forestry, but also the type of craft: shoemaking, cotton spinning, ore mining, coal mining, iron trade, travelling trade, medicine, sculpting, etc. (Boháč 1924:13*) The occupation had not to be associated with a particular institution, enterprise or institute, but neither had general terms and titles, such as laborer, merchant, wage earner, clerk, engineer, etc., to be used. Unemployed persons entered their previous occupation, and those who didn't perform an earning activity indicated the nature of their income (retired, pensioner, landlord, inmate of a workhouse, etc.). Occupational status defined the social status of economic activity of the population. Either an independent status (owner or proprietor of a house, business, independent peasant, self-employed, etc.) or whether employed, in a service, wage-earning, official position, etc., was indicated. Public officials and soldiers indicated their rank. Special attention was also paid to family members who help the head of the household with earning employment. If the family member was only helping without pay, it was entered on the sheet: '*helps*'; if he was paid for his help, it was stated that he was '*helping for pay*'. This category of people was particularly numerous in Slovakia, since the primary sector was the basis of the population's economic activity throughout the inter-war period. The group of domestic helpers was particularly numerous. In their case, it was rather difficult to quantify statistically whether they only helped or also directly received some special income for the joint household. (see Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:209; 2018:320–326; Tišliar 2011b:33–60; 2011d:343–364).

For simplicity and better orientation, the instructions were supplemented in the margins by simple but essential questions for the census commissaries and auditors.¹⁸⁰ They defined persons conducting the census, those supervising it, which forms (sheets) had to be used and their purpose. The instructions also included a clear list of the forms that the census counting officer had to receive before starting the data collection in the field. Thus, his permit, a list of house numbers in the census district and a house sheet for familiarisation with its contents were also mentioned. In addition, on the day of counting, the Commissary had to receive the conscription sheets (housing sheets), the house collection sheets and the counting district summary sheets. The census counting officers, unless they were directly filling in the data for the landlord, checked the completed census sheet on the spot to check whether anything was omitted or incorrectly filled in. They should have paid special attention to rounding the year of birth of a counted in person (a tendency to round to years ending in zero or 5), (Šprocha and Tišliar 2009b:36–37), especially for the elderly, who found it more difficult to prove their age and were more likely to round it. It was generally recommended to examine the date of birth according to some relevant document (Boháč 1924:16*).

The reviewers checked with the commissaries, in particular whether all the population was counted in within a week of the sheets being handed in at the latest. Therefore, the inspection focused primarily on the completeness of the registration of houses and dwellings and on the completion of all fields on the census (conscription) sheets. The check also covered overwriting and corrections

¹⁸⁰ ŠANI, f. Slúžnovský úrad v Nitre (Subordinate Office in Nitra), 1885–1922 (f. SÚ Nitra), administrative box, signature No. 2878/1922 adm., unorganised archive fund.

to the sheets. If the reviewer found errors, he could correct them. After the revision, the reviewer compiled the processed municipal survey.

In Slovakia, the house sheet was filled in by the census commissary. It contained data for individual dwellings and also whether the dwelling was occupied/vacant; the name of the owner of the dwelling, and total number of persons present. The dwelling sheet, in turn, contained information about the dwelling, namely whether it was occupied/vacant; whether it was also used for carrying out a trade, or what else it was used for besides housing; data about the owner of the dwelling; data about the persons that lived in the dwelling and whether they were a part of the dwelling owner's household or only sublet; where the dwelling was located (floor, basement, etc.); and whether they were a part of the dwelling owner's household or only sublet; where the dwelling was located (floor, basement, etc.); number of rooms and their characteristics; number of ancillary rooms (bathroom, laundry, pantry, toilet); cellar and attic; gas use in the flat (cooking, lighting, industrial purposes); electric lighting; drinking and utility water (if available elsewhere in the house); garden; rent; how many rooms were rented. (Boháč 1924:24–25*)

The census form used for guests in hotels, inns and lodging houses collected essentially all the relevant data as a regular census (conscription) sheet, except not listed apartment/house, but the hotel and its address.

In addition to the basic census sheets, overview forms have also been prepared. Firstly, for summarizing the census zone, but also as a municipal and district summary. The zone summary contained the name of the settlement, the house number, information whether the house was occupied, the name of the owner, the number of residential premises and the number of persons present. It was prepared by the census counting officer. The municipal survey contained similar headings. It stated the name of the settlement, the census zone and the name of the census counting officer, the number of houses (occupied/uninhabited), dwellings and persons present. As stated above, this summary was compiled, by the reviewer. The census district to be counted was generally intended to consist of approximately 500 persons using the census conscription sheet and up to 1,000 persons using the census counting sheet.¹⁸¹ At the district level, a district survey was compiled by the subordinate office. This survey included the name of the village, its settlements (if any), the number of houses (inhabited/vacant), the number of dwellings and the population present (Boháč 1924:29*).

Compared to the older censuses, the recording of nationality has been modified, but also some statistically surveyed indicators such as disability, numbers of the deaf-aphrasic, the blind, and mentally ill persons were omitted, as well as secondary occupation and related information, temporary and permanent residence, and language skills. In Slovakia and neighbouring Ruthenia, only

¹⁸¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 75341/1920; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Muráň, administrative box, signature No. 75341/1920; Ibidem, signature No. 990/1921, unorganised archive fund; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Magistrát mesta Revúca (Municipality of Revúca), 1612–1922 (f. MM Revúca), administrative box No. 1921, signature No. 178/1921 adm; ŠANI, f. SÚ Nitra, administrative box, signature No. 2878/1922 adm., unorganised archive fund.

conscription sheets were used, which were filled in by the census commissaries in coordination with the heads of households (Boháč 1924:9*).

Implementation of census

Practical implementation of the 1921 census was different from that of the previous extraordinary census in 1919. The reasons thereof are to be found mainly in the different conditions under which the new census was held and what preceded it. The 1921 census was carried out methodically by the Statistical Office, which was also involved in the processing of its results. The census was held in a peacetime, when there was neither military conflict nor any significant migration of the population. Starting with the legislation, the entire preparatory process was carried out in a good time.

This was also reflected in the basic information campaign, which was disseminated both through the public administration already functioning as standard in Slovakia since the end of 1919, and also through the daily press.¹⁸² A campaign had been also conducted at schools just before the census, where the importance of regular censuses was particularly discussed.¹⁸³ There was thus no emergency, the targets were not set unilaterally and, moreover, time stress was completely absent. The timetable adopted by the Statistical Office was adhered to and the data collection was carried out without any major incidents. Nor are we aware of any major problems directly related to the shortage of candidates for census commissaries. The national need for commissaries was estimated to be approx. 12 thsd. and further 6,000 reviewers.¹⁸⁴ However, Czech assistance was also used in Slovakia for this census, although probably on a much smaller scale than during the 1919 special census.¹⁸⁵ In contrast, Ruthenia reported more significant staffing problems.¹⁸⁶ At the same time, there was a serious suspicion that underaged students performed counting in Ruthenia, but this was not confirmed by the investigation.¹⁸⁷

In the preparatory process of the census, the Ministry with Full Powers for Slovak Administration also participated, actively cooperating in particular with the Ministry of Internal Affairs. As early as on January 13, 1921, the MPS announced that the preparations for the census in Slovakia were practically complete. Instruction courses for census commissaries were still to be prepared at that time. But this was not entirely true, as shown by the instruction of the MPS to the county and subordinate offices dated January 22, 1921 concerning the method of preparing the lists of census commissaries and reviewers.¹⁸⁸ The forms

¹⁸² NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

¹⁸³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 8516/1921.

¹⁸⁴ Ibidem, box No. 246, signature No. 47099/1920.

¹⁸⁵ Several requests for the appointment of people from the Czech Republic as census commissioners in Slovakia or Ruthenia have been preserved. See e.g. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 6386/1921.

¹⁸⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 9566/1921.

¹⁸⁷ Ibidem, signature No. 12181/1921.

¹⁸⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Muráň, administrative box 1917–1924, signature No. 900/1921, unorganised archive fund; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Revúca, administrative box 1921, signature No. 178/1921 adm.

and other printed matter were already prepared at this time. They were printed in several printing companies in Bratislava, not only for the Slovak territory, but also for Ruthenia.¹⁸⁹

During the preparatory work, the MPS drew attention particularly to the problems that arose in connection with the different organization of public administration in Slovakia. In particular, these related to the compilation of lists of municipalities, which could not be carried out according to judicial districts, as these districts did not correspond to the districts or the subordinate districts in Slovakia. These were established in the census methodology as the basic units for the preparation of lists of municipalities. Another difference referred to different classification and categorisation of towns, villages or settlements. In Slovakia, categorization of small and large municipalities was used, which were covered by notary offices in the districts, which was also taken into account in the past in the Hungarian statistics.¹⁹⁰ The lists of villages and towns had to contain data on the number of inhabited buildings by street (settlements, villages) and had to serve as a basic aid for the census commissaries as well as for the delimitation of census districts. The Statistical Office did not have these lists for Slovakia and Ruthenia even on August 11, 1921, half a year after the census. That is why they were requested as material that should have been prepared before the census itself.¹⁹¹ He requested them for purely practical reasons, to process the results of the new census. While the lists were sent from Ruthenia without further delay,¹⁹² it is interesting that the Slovak MPS offered the already known List of towns according to the 1919 census on November 05, 1921, instead of these lists. It even stated that the lists requested by the Statistical Office would require additional revisions according to this new local census.¹⁹³ However, the Ministry of Internal Affairs was interested in the lists from the preparatory stage of the 1921 census.¹⁹⁴ These delays were finally resolved during 1922 and early 1923.¹⁹⁵ From the preserved archival documents in Slovakia, it is clear that not all the preparations were complete in Slovakia by early 1921. In some places, the lists of villages and towns, which were to be officially completed by September 1920 at the latest, were missing.¹⁹⁶ Nor were all the census districts established, which was additionally urged in January 1921 through the county offices.¹⁹⁷

Already during the preparatory stage of the 1921 census it was obvious that the biggest problems would be caused by the national question. The census process was not without national propaganda of various kinds, even in Slovakia. The national statistics were intended to confirm the validity of the foundation of

¹⁸⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 22052/1920.

¹⁹⁰ Ibidem, signature No. 30986/1920.

¹⁹¹ Ibidem, signature No. 61756/1921.

¹⁹² Ibidem, signature No. 67682/1921; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 250, signature No. 55598/1921.

¹⁹³ NAČR, f. MV, box No. 246, signature No. 86041/1921.

¹⁹⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 88913/1921; No. 88913/1921.

¹⁹⁵ Ibidem, signature No. 81558/1922. As late as on October 21, 1922, the MPS was still sending out some lists of towns.

¹⁹⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. MM Rožňava, box No. 219, signature No. 290/1921 adm.

¹⁹⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObNÚ Muráň, administrative box 1917–1924, signature No. 990/1921, unorganised archive fund.

Czechoslovakia. It was therefore one of the most expected results of the census in Slovakia as well. Propaganda was therefore official, but it must be said that it was on both sides. In case of minorities, the situation was probably more difficult in the western part of Czechoslovakia, where a large German minority lived. There is a great deal of information on complaints and various campaigns that were conducted before and during the census on the nationality issues. This can be traced both in the archives, but also on the pages of the daily press (see in more detail Kadlec et al. 2016:168–179).¹⁹⁸

For Slovakia, where there was a large Hungarian and German minority, it became essential to accept the possibility of declaring Jewish nationality. This subsequently affected the numbers of the aforementioned national groups. In addition, unlike in the 1919 census, the Ruthenian nationality was not measured directly, but it was included in the broader group of Russian, Great Russian, Ukrainian and Carpatho-Russian nationalities, measured as a whole. The formation of this broad nationality group was due to the influence of the larger and more influential Russian minority that emigrated to Czechoslovakia. One of its representatives, Alexei Petrov, a Russian demographer living in Prague, who was also actively involved in the development of the Ruthenian population in Slovakia, strongly criticised the preliminary results of the 1919 census. In particular, he argued that the Russian nationality was correct but the Ruthenian. Moreover, he was convinced that the Slovak-Russian (Ruthenian) ethnic boundaries had not changed since the end of the 18th century, and thus the results of 1919, which captured a reduction in the number of Ruthenians compared to the 1910 census, were already incorrect in his view (Petrov 1923:115). The results of the 1921 census were equally disappointing to the Ruthenian side, as they confirmed the data from the 1919 census rather than the results of previous Hungarian censuses. Therefore, the Ruthenian political leadership described them as incorrect and accused the Slovak (Czechoslovak) party of disorientation and coercion (Švorc 2003:191–192). In connection with the 1921 census, other prejudices originating from the Ruthenian camp have also been preserved. Ruthenian areas in Slovakia were exposed to agitations for a longer period of time, not only by some Ruthenian (Russian) politicians, but especially by the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church. In it, the opinion that all the Eastern Orthodox Catholic population is Ruthenian, or Russian, but the Slovak, has been more frequently expressed.¹⁹⁹ In this connection, the Governor of Ruthenia, Grigory Žatkovič also demanded the appointment of Ruthenian census commissaries in his memorandum dated February 10, 1921, which were to act jointly alongside the Slovak ones, especially in the Šariš, Zemplín and Uzhorod counties.²⁰⁰ This was an obvious expression of mistrust. In the period just before the start of the census, the Central Russian National Council in Uzhorod lodged a complaint against the Zemplín county governor,

¹⁹⁸ In the Czech National Archives in Prague, the archival fonds of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs-clippings archive preserves a rather large set of newspaper clippings concerning the responses to the censuses of 1921 and 1930. However, the vast majority of them related to the Czech environment and Slovakia is mentioned more sporadically.

¹⁹⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 56051/1920.

²⁰⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 12131/1921; signature No. 2702/1921.

Michal Slávik, who, as early as on February 04, 1921, published a leaflet in which he reacted to the pro-Russian (pro-Ruthenian) propaganda concerning the inappropriate conflation of religion and nationality.²⁰¹ In the leaflet he stated that it was not true that every Eastern Orthodox Catholic was a Russian or Ruthenian: *“...for one cannot be a Russian who does not know Russian language, and who speaks/speaks/speaks/Slovak just as much as his neighbour, a Roman Catholic, a Calvinist or an Evangelical... It is true that they have another faith, the Eastern Orthodox Catholic faith, which they nickname the Russian faith, but that is why they do not remain and are not Russians, just as Roman Catholic Slovaks, Calvinist or Evangelical Slovaks are not Hungarians or Germans. Let each of us hold back and proclaim our faith, but let all Slovak-speaking Zemplín people boldly and proudly proclaim themselves Slovaks.”* This tendency of linking religion with nationality also occurred later in the interwar period and affected the relationship between Eastern Orthodox and Russians (Ruthenians), as Orthodoxy began to spread more significantly in the interwar period among the inhabitants of eastern Slovakia (Tišliar and Šprocha 2017a:118).²⁰² This identification meant that Ruthenian propaganda considered the whole territory where the Eastern Orthodox Catholic population lived as Ruthenia, i.e. as far as Poprad in northern Spiš (Letz 2000:104). The fact that the Eastern Orthodox Catholic religion could not be identified only with the Ruthenian ethnic group was clearly demonstrated already at the beginning of the 20th century by the Slovak linguist Samuel Czambel (Czambel 1906) and later in the 1920s by Jan Húsek, who studied the Slovak-Ruthenian borderland and considered the main problem of the Ruthenians to be their very low national awareness (Húsek 1925:87,345; Konečný 1999:290). The agitation in eastern Slovakia was all the more significant because of the governor of Ruthenia, G. Žatkovič. In the district of Sečovce in Zemplín, he distributed leaflets in this way on February 12, 1921, asking the inhabitants to declare themselves Ruthenians.²⁰³

It is interesting how the Czech press perceived the northeastern Slovakia in connection with the 1921 census. *Národní listy* of March 19, 1921, in the article *Poměry v severní Šariši* (Conditions in northern Šariš region), drew attention precisely to the problem of faith and ethnicity identification, but also to the complex social and societal problems in this area of Slovakia. *“The census commissaries in northern Šariš had the saddest experience. The landscape is all forest and mountains. The misery is extreme. There is no flour, groundnuts like peas. The people grind their own grain in hand mills. Education is certainly the lowest in the whole country. Most people can't read or write. ...There are 9 teachers for every 60 villages. In most of the villages, an Eastern Orthodox Catholic priest is the only master. The parish priest thrives because the whole village, 2-3 at a time, actually work for him alone. ...the parish priest greeted the census commissaries by saying: ‘You've come to take the census? You come for nothing. We have the people on our side’. The people mostly answered the commissaries as the*

²⁰¹ SNA, f. MPS, box No. 37, signature No. 2222/1921 prez.; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 17093/1921.

²⁰² The proposal for the organization of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Slovakia and Ruthenia was initiated by the Czech Orthodox Religious Community in Prague on May 17, 1922, NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 260, signature No. 46844/1922.

²⁰³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 29077/1921.

parish priest had taught them: 'I am a Ruthenian, my faith is Russian. I hate the Slovaks because they take away our faith. We want to join Ruthenia'."²⁰⁴ The conditions in northeastern Slovakia were undoubtedly complex, and although the above article exaggerated at some points, it certainly captured the essential point, namely the aforementioned conflation of faith and affiliation, which occurred in subsequent censuses thereafter as well.

The complaint of some members of the National Assembly (Szillasy, Lelley, Szentiványi, Ekes and Tobler) and representatives of the Slovak, Ruthenian, Hungarian and German associations represented a more significant pride in the course of the 1921 census, who complained at a meeting held on February 14, 1921 in Piešťany that the proposals of the municipalities were not taken into account in the appointment of the census commissaries. They accused the government of "...trying to influence the result of the census and acting to the detriment of Slovaks, Hungarians and Germans".²⁰⁵ Similar voices were heard from Kežmarok, where there was dissatisfaction with the appointed commissary and reviewer, and also in Bratislava, but the case of Komárno, where persons who did not speak the state language were appointed as commissaries, was also publicised.²⁰⁶ However, this was more a case of individual dissatisfaction. Eugen Lelley MEP had tabled an interpellation concerning the illegal action of two police captains from Zvolen and Banská Bystrica and the Banská Bystrica mayor, who had punished the bookseller Gejza Horváth and the merchant Artur Gereger because they had put up posters in their shops, the content of which they considered to be an offence against the Census Act. In the case of merchant A. Gereger, it was an appeal to the population to declare their Hungarian nationality. According to the MPS report, the wording of this appeal caused outrage in Banská Bystrica. After A. Gereger appealed against the sentence, the decision was confirmed by the Mayor of Volen, who also appointed Hungarian-speaking census commissaries to the census. A. Gereger therefore appealed to the SAC. G. Horváth also committed a similar offence, with practically the same result. G. Horváth appealed to the Minister plenipotentiary. However, a similar agenda was also observed in the Komárno and Hontian counties, especially in the environment of economically better-off persons. The MPS stated that the punishment was imposed within the limits of the legal provision.²⁰⁷

While in the Czech Republic there are better known cases of larger and more numerous protests among the German minority,²⁰⁸ although there were also

²⁰⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 23302/1921.

²⁰⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 12697/1921; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 46966/1921.

²⁰⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 15870/1921. *Národní listy*, February 24, 1921.

²⁰⁷ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 254, signature No. 70687/1921; signature No. 54963/1921. Interpellation 2487 of March 31, 1921.

²⁰⁸ The news of the arrival of 400 university students from Austria to strengthen the German element in Znojmo represented an interesting example. The administrator of the political exposition in Znojmo ordered the train to be turned back unless the foreigners could prove the necessity of their stay in the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 12892/1921.

problems on the Polish borderlands,²⁰⁹ in Slovakia no such escalated situation is mentioned directly from the 1921 census. There is information that the German population of Teplice in Bohemia (the *Sebstverwaltungskörper* association) also tried to contact Germans and Hungarians in Slovakia and Ruthenia to encourage them to speak out and complain against the censorship,²¹⁰ but we have no further information about the reaction in Slovakia. There was rather lack of information in the press about Hungarian or German agitation in Slovakia as well.²¹¹ In the interpellation of German deputies headed by Rudolf Lodgman on the illegal acts of the 1921 census, the territory of Slovakia was mentioned in connection with the appointment of unfit persons as census commissaries in Bratislava; the non-counting of the German population in Bratislava, Vol. Jur, Pezinok and Grinava; and the violation of official confidentiality in Bratislava.²¹² In detailing the problems and grievances, the deputies noted that the census in Bratislava was not taken until March 11, 1921, nor February 22 as the deadline for the completion of the data collection had been set. They also objected that the census was carried out in villages where there was a large German and Hungarian minority with only conscription sheets, which were only entered by the census commissaries. However, this information was untrue, since the census sheets and the census commissaries as recorders were used throughout the whole Slovakia. The Members further objected that Czech and Slovak students aged 17 through 19 were appointed as census commissaries, whereas in the case of Hungarian and German students the adult age was required. They also argued that German, Hungarian and Slovak commissaries wanted to give up their posts in Bratislava after the Bratislava County Office required knowledge of the state language as a condition for serving as a commissary. Finally, as a direct rebuke, the deputies stated that the entire census in Bratislava had been carried out carelessly and with errors not only in recording nationalities and other characteristics, but also in omitting entire houses. They said that no revision was carried out, but that was not true either. Members commented that in case of some settlements with higher proportion of German inhabitants, the census counting officers entered Germans as Slovaks if they had Slovak wives or Slovak names, and they did the same with the children of mixed marriages.

The statistical office was aware of some real problems in Bratislava. In fact, Fedor Houdek, a member of the Statistical Office and former Minister of Supplies, who was present at home in Bratislava at the time of the census, was also left out of the census. When he applied for additional enrolment at the county house, he was enrolled there together with 40 to 50 other persons in a special sheet, but without any other data.

²⁰⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 248, signature No. 37170/1921. The Polish Embassy in Prague responded to the imposition of fines on persons of Polish nationality with a verbal note.

²¹⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 12181/1921; box No. 248, signature No. 10130/1921.

²¹¹ E.g. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 9992/1921. *Večerní české slovo*, January 29, 1921; also, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

²¹² NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 254, unsigned. Interpellation 3128 to the Minister of Internal Affairs, May 19, 1921.

A. Boháč, on behalf of the Statistical Office, stated just the opposite, that “...the Hungarians and Germans in Bratislava deliberately concealed the Czechoslovaks living there.”²¹³ Surviving archival documents describe a few similar cases. Bratislava had therefore become problematic from a census point of view even before the summer of 1921, and the Statistical Office demanded proper investigation of such and similar cases. Accordingly, they requested sending all census material to the Statistical Office. The review of Bratislava had already begun on March 31, 1921 with the result that “...it is quite true that some civil subordinates were omitted in the counting of people, since these spend almost all time in the office every day, and the census commissaries were therefore dependent on the information from owners, house managers or landlords, which was in places incomplete and even incorrect.” Efforts were made to correct the errors, and some other cases reported in the media were also checked, but not confirmed.²¹⁴

Speaking of national propaganda, we cannot skip the state censorship policy. We have already mentioned that the use of national statistics to support the existence of an independent Czechoslovakia represented undoubtedly one of the important objectives, which in practice meant the demonstration of clear predominance of the state-forming population. This concept was well served by the idea of a unified Czechoslovak nationality and language with Czech and Slovak branches, which was also enshrined in the Constitution of 1920. At the same time, there was talk of “correcting the mistakes” of the last census of 1910, especially in relation to language statistics in Slovakia. The adoption of the principle of recording Jewish nationality by the state, which we have already mentioned several times, and which was also outside the official definition of nationality in the 1921 census, was also a significant cause of changes in national statistics.²¹⁵ Even in connection with the preparations for the census, the prevailing opinion in Ruthenia was that if the census was carried out according to nationality, the Jewish population would certainly declare itself to be Jewish: “...this circumstance will weaken the very unfavorable part of the Hungarian nation, which, especially in towns, has a majority, for the statistics of the Czechoslovakia.”²¹⁶ It was therefore an intention that was simply known in advance. The establishment of the Census Committee of the Czechoslovak National Council, which was set up in December 1920, is in a similar vein.²¹⁷ Karel Baxa was a chairman and Igor Hrušovský, Jan Máša and Emil Hrubý were members of the Committee. The census committee came to conclusion that: “...it is in the interest of our entire republic... that census commissaries should be appointed solely and exclusively from among absolutely reliable and loyal citizens not only knowledgeable of the Czechoslovak state language, but also explicitly of the Czechoslovak nationality, so that in this way it would be absolutely safe to ensure that the number of actual members of the Czechoslovak nationality wouldn't be reduced during the performance of the census...”. The same demand was made with regard to the reviewers. On January 15, 1921, the Czechoslovak National Council in Prague, in

²¹³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 44661/1921.

²¹⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 34304/1921.

²¹⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 247, signature No. 21208/1921.

²¹⁶ Ibidem, box No. 248, signature No. 33047/1920.

²¹⁷ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 51/47.

cooperation with its branches in Brno, Opava, Bratislava and Užhorod, published an appeal to Czechoslovak citizens in ethnically mixed areas not to be afraid of declaring their nationality.²¹⁸ This was practically the same agitation attempted by representatives of other nationalities, except that it was not followed up here.

The case of Jelšava, which affected the Hungarian population, proved to be a bigger problem. In August 1921, an article appeared in the magazine *Bohemia*, stating that there were by 400 Hungarians fewer in Jelšava at the last census (505 instead of 905).²¹⁹ As this article was also published in Hungarian in the weekly newspaper *Gömör* in Rimavská Sobota, the Ministry of Internal Affairs also became interested in this problem. The report of the empowered Ministry shows that a major revision was carried out in Jelšava on March 12–16, 1921: “...namely in the sense that those who had registered as Slovaks in the 1919 census and as Hungarians in the last census of 1921, such nationality was examined and ascertained. Similarly, the Jews who registered as Slovaks in 1919 and as Hungarians in the 1921 census had their Jewish nationality established.”²²⁰ However, no further action was taken in this matter, as no official complaint was received by the MPS, nor by the County Office in the Gemer-Malohont County, that anyone had objected the fact that he was registered as a Slovak. The probable basis for the article seems to have been a private census, which was carried out along his own lines by a local Catholic parish priest, Albert Šoltesz, together with several fellow citizens from Jelšava.

It is therefore clear that errors and misunderstandings also accompanied the 1921 census. It is questionable whether the revision in question was carried out with the consent of the population concerned. In any case, this case also casts a shadow of doubt on the overall quality of the national statistics obtained.

Processing, publication and quality of the census results

The processing of the census material began on February 21, 1921, and the Statistical Office was entirely responsible for it.²²¹ The first preliminary results were published in July 1921 on the basis of municipal and district surveys.²²² Sorting punching machines were used for the detail processing of the data working with the census sheets (Boháč 1924:29*; 1920b; Krejčí 1921a).²²³

Although the census processing started almost immediately after the data collection, it took quite a long time for the statistical office to obtain all the census material for processing. As late as on January 17, 1922, the Statistical Office urged the delivery of several census records, mainly from the territory of Slovakia. In particular, the entire Orava County, the municipal towns of Banská Štiavnica and Banská Bela, the districts located in Malacky (Bratislava County), Giraltovce

²¹⁸ Ibidem, box No. 249, signature No. 35585/1921.

²¹⁹ Ibidem, box No. 253, signature No. 65943/1921.

²²⁰ Ibidem, signature No. 12541/1922.

²²¹ Ibidem, box No. 250, signature No. 37058/1922. *Zpráva o činnosti Statistické rady státní a Státního úřadu statistického za rok 1921*, pp. 8–9.

²²² NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 38530/1920; *Předběžné výsledky sčítání lidu z 15. února 1921*. Praha: SÚS, 1921, with 4 cartograms.

²²³ NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

(Šariš County), Krompachy from the Gelnica District (Spiš County),²²⁴ which we have already mentioned were originally lost, and therefore it was necessary to carry out a revision of the sheets from the preliminary census of 1919.²²⁵ The revision took place still in August and September 1922.²²⁶ For these reasons, among others, it took a long time to summarize the results and process them, and the first definitive data were not published until 1924.

Preliminary results of the census for Slovakia, compiled on the basis of district surveys, were already known in the summer months of 1921. They were also reported in the daily press.²²⁷ The final results of the 1921 census, however, only became a part of the source work *Československá statistika*, which was published by the Statistical Office from 1922. This source work became the most important edition in which the Statistical Office published all the essential statistical information collected by the Statistical Service in the field of population statistics, the judiciary, the broad field of the economy, and also social statistics.

The basic results were published in 1924, when the first volume (Volume 1) of the results of the 1921 census was published as Volume 9 of the Czechoslovak Statistics.²²⁸ Other volumes and notebooks followed in succession.²²⁹

While the main results of the 1921 census were published mainly in a regional perspective, the municipal level was given space in a separate statistical and administrative lexicon. The lexicons of settlements for individual parts of the Czechoslovak Republic were planned as a direct part of the published results, practically following in this respect the practice of previous censuses. A simple overview of the number of inhabitants, houses and population growth/loss, compared to the previous census of 1910, was already included in the published preliminary results of 1921. However, these were compiled in a municipal overview only for settlements with more than 2,000 inhabitants according to the 1921 census.²³⁰

A. Boháč in August 1922 informed the Ministry of Internal Affairs on the work progress on the lexicons of the municipalities. The lexicons had to contain only statistical data, which he justified by the desire to speed up their publication.

²²⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 246, signature No. 6660/1922; SNA, f. KÚ, signature No. 8659/1922 adm.

²²⁵ SNA, f. KÚ, box No. 490, signature No. 8659/22; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 6660/22, signature No. 47702/22 and signature No. 44204/1922.

²²⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 67620/1922, signature No. 72978/1922.

²²⁷ NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

²²⁸ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 1. díl. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 9, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 1. Praha: SÚS, 1924.

²²⁹ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 3. část Slovensko a Podkarpatská Rus. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 22, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 4. Praha: SÚS, 1925; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 4. část Československá republika. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 23, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 5. Praha: SÚS, 1927; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 3. díl. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 37, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 6. Praha: SÚS, 1927; Sčítání bytů ve větších městech republiky Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 40, series XIII., statistika domů a bytů, workbook 1. Praha: SÚS, 1929.

²³⁰ Předběžné výsledky sčítání lidu..., Slovak municipalities from p. 35.

Thus, for each settlement, data on the area, number of houses, housing parties, present inhabitants and their structure according to gender, nationality, religion, and nationality were finally given. The parts of the settlements with the number of houses were also listed in the notes. Compared to the lexicons of previous censuses, data concerning administrative items such as public offices (post office, registry office, school office, parish office, court of justice, etc.) were thus absent. The Statistical Office considered that these data would be contained in the second volume of the lexicons, which would be prepared later in time. The lexicon for Bohemia, which was originally scheduled to be printed in the autumn of 1922, was published first. It had to be followed by lexicon for Moravia and Silesia, the manuscript of which was completed in the summer of 1922, and finally it was planned to complete the manuscript of the lexicon of Slovakia and Ruthenia in the spring of 1923.²³¹ However, there were time delays: the lexicon for Bohemia was published in 1923,²³² for Moravia and Silesia in 1924,²³³ but the lexicon of the municipalities of Slovakia was published as late as in 1927²³⁴ and a year later also for the settlements of Ruthenia.²³⁵

Separately published administrative lexicons to supplement the statistical lexicons were recommended by the Statistical Office at the end of 1922 to be postponed until the next census, which was originally scheduled by law for 1925 or 1926. It was mainly argued that the changes at the public administration were taking place in relation to the new county system adoption in Slovakia and also in Ruthenia.²³⁶ In 1925, a proposal was made that the administrative lexicon should be dealt with on a republic-wide basis and not only in parts, as was the case with the statistical lexicons. The reason was practicality, especially for the performance of public administration.²³⁷ This idea was finally implemented when a two-volume administrative lexicon was published in 1927 and 1928. The first volume dealt with Bohemia, the second one included Slovakia, included Moravia, Silesia, and also Ruthenia (Šprocha and Tišliar 2009a:32–36).²³⁸ In terms of statistical data, the administrative lexicon contained only information on the number of inhabitants present. Otherwise, the predominant ethnic character of the village was indicated for each settlement. Other information included the details of the nearest post office, telegraph office, railway station or stop, notary, folk school, parish office, gendarmerie and health district.

The census material from the territory of Slovakia has not been preserved in its entirety even in the case of this census. In fact, only samples of census sheets,

²³¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 62376/1922.

²³² *Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé I. Statistický lexikón obcí v Čechách*. Praha: SÚS, 1923.

²³³ *Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé II. Morava a Slezsko*. Praha: SÚS, 1924.

²³⁴ *Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé III. Slovensko*. Praha: SÚS, 1927.

²³⁵ *Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé IV. Podkarpatská Rus*. Praha: SÚS, 1928.

²³⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 249, signature No. 91813/1922.

²³⁷ *Ibidem*, signature No. 23683/1925.

²³⁸ *Administrativní lexikón obcí v republice Československé*. I. díl Čechy. Praha: SÚS, 1927; *Administrativní lexikón obcí v republice Československé*. II. díl. Morava, Slezsko, Slovensko, Podkarpatská Rus. Praha: SÚS, 1928.

surveys and summaries were preserved and they can be found in the Slovak archives.

Accordingly, it is clear that although the 1921 census was prepared and carried out in much better time than the 1919 census, in better conditions and undoubtedly with fewer methodological errors, there were also many problems associated with it. In addition to the vague and problematic definition of nationality, there were some other, mainly technical, errors.

Census 1930

Preparation of the 1930 census

Although there was talk in the early intercensal years of following a new 5-year cycle for the censuses, this intention did not work out. The original Census Act of 1920 modified the narrowness of the census period from a 10-year period to a 5-year period. Therefore, in 1924, people started talking and writing about planning a new census, which had to fall in 1925 or 1926.²³⁹ But the problem was the lack of finances (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:14–15). The previous census in 1921 cost the state about 10 million CZK, of which 2.7 million CZK were spent on the census. The rest was mainly for the remuneration and per diems of the participating people.²⁴⁰ The organizers had to reckon with approximately the same or even higher costs for the next census event.

Negotiations on a possible change of the census date and thus on a change of the census period methodology began between the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Statistical Office, particularly in July 1924. The position of the Statistical Office was virtually unchanged from the beginning, i.e., the Office advocated more frequent censuses as an advantage for the overall statistical practice, and described any changes in the census period as a mistake.²⁴¹

Parallel to this discussion and planning, the date of another type of census that should focus on the field of economic statistics and had been more or less planned for a long time, was also discussed. This census had to provide the detail data and an overview of agricultural, industrial and trade enterprises in Czechoslovakia, and the whole exercise had to be conducted under the auspices of the Statistical Office and the Ministry of Internal Affairs as the highest public administration body. There was a great deal of interest in the census of enterprises in Czechoslovak statistics, since the last available data in this area were outdated. They were from 1902 and only from the Czech Republic. The land ownership statistics from 1896 were also outdated. In Slovakia and Ruthenia there has been no census of land holdings since 1895 and no census of trade holdings at all.²⁴² Nobody doubted the need for such a census, so there was talk of a possible and logical combination of the two censuses and their joint implementation in 1925 or 1926. As an alternative, if it was necessary to choose only one census, there was clear talk of the preference for carrying out the 1926 census of enterprises, which was suggested on behalf of the Statistical Office (A. Boháč).²⁴³ These plans were opposed by the Ministry of Treasury, which expressed its opposition to the

²³⁹ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 45.334/1924.

²⁴⁰ Ibidem.

²⁴¹ Ibidem, signature No. 5840/II./1924.

²⁴² Ibidem, signature No. 1705/1 pres/1924.

²⁴³ Ibidem, signature No. 5840/II./1924.

holding of any census already in September 1923²⁴⁴ and reaffirmed its rejection in the autumn of 1924.²⁴⁵

Of course, in this situation it was necessary to amend at least the Census Act. Thus, at the end of October 1924, the Ministry of Internal Affairs informed the Statistical Office that it would begin drafting an amendment to the Census Act that would bring forward the official date to 1931, i.e. with a 10-year intercensal period.²⁴⁶ Nevertheless, they attempted to make a proposal to carry out both censuses, of the population and of enterprises, once more at the joint meeting of the Statistical Board and the Bureau of Statistics on November 05, 1924. They decided on the need to carry them out concurrently, preferably in 1926. Boháč suggested that in case of financial problems it was necessary to carry out at least the planned census of enterprises.²⁴⁷ However, even at the beginning of 1925, the Ministry of Treasury merely reiterated that there were no funds for the censuses. The joint census of the population, enterprises and land ownership, which was also in the Ministry of Agriculture interest, was estimated by the Ministry of Treasury at over 32.5 million CZK. At the same time, they stated that they would not support a separate census of enterprises and land ownership in 1926 because of the financial problems.²⁴⁸ In the course of January–March 1925, further discussions were held between the Ministries, which were finally terminated by the meeting of the Czechoslovak government. No provision was found in the 1925 state budget for the aforementioned censuses and on March 27, 1925 the Czechoslovak government agreed on the need to amend the Census Act to postpone the two censuses until 1930. Not only was the lack of finances not argued, but there was an equally strong criticism of the as yet unprocessed and unpublished data of the previous census of 1921.²⁴⁹ The resolution of the National Statistical Office dated June 25, 1925, in which the members were at least in favor of holding a census of enterprises in 1926, and the subsequent discussion of the highest administrative bodies did not help either. The resolution was also supported in August 1925 by the Presidium of the Statistical Office, which sent its own budget for the census at total cost of CZK 18.7 million to the Ministry of Treasury.²⁵⁰ At the same time, the Supreme Audit Office of the Czechoslovak Republic expressed its opinion as early as on August 28, 1925 that it would certainly be most effective to carry out the censuses together as a single action.²⁵¹ Thus, in terms of the statistical actions carried out, only the census of domestic animals as of December 31, 1925 was carried out in 1925/1926.²⁵²

²⁴⁴ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 9390/1924. Ministry of Finance Resolution dated September 21, 1923, No. 69254/9397/I/2b.

²⁴⁵ Ibidem, signature No. 91245/24-I./2b.

²⁴⁶ Ibidem, signature No. 64.538/1924.

²⁴⁷ Ibidem, signature No. 9018/1924.

²⁴⁸ Ibidem, signature No. 150089/24-I/2b.

²⁴⁹ Ibidem, signature No. 495/25 m.r.; Sčítání lidu v republice v roce 1930. In: *Právo lidu*, 8. apríla 1925, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2330.

²⁵⁰ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 3869 pres.

²⁵¹ Ibidem, signature No. 5806/1064-V-ai 1926.

²⁵² Sčítání domáceho zvierectva v republice Československé podíl stavu k 31. XII. 1925. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 45, series XII., zemědělství, workbook 7.. Praha: SÚS, 1928.

Efforts to meet the 5-year deadline were unsuccessful, so the Ministry of Internal Affairs began working on a draft amendment to the Census Act in 1925.²⁵³ This, according to its contents, seems to have become the basis for the new regulation. The National Statistical Office discussed the draft law on October 07, 1925 (Korčák 1934:9*), which, after further comments and modifications, was adopted at the beginning of 1927.²⁵⁴

The new version of the law set first of all the dates for the next census, determining the implementation of the second interwar Czechoslovak census in its introductory part by the end of 1931 at the latest.²⁵⁵ Thus, 10-year cycles of censuses were introduced again.²⁵⁶ Rather minor changes were made in other parts of the new regulation. Firstly, the role of the Statistical Office was specified by the law, which was mentioned as the body that processes the results of the census. With the approval of the government, possible ancillary censuses were also allowed²⁵⁷ and the law also specified the persons approached who were obliged to accept the position of census commissary and reviewer.

Eventually, both censuses were held in 1930, each of them separately, despite the fact that the Czechoslovak government had agreed to organize both censuses jointly in 1925. The census of enterprises was prepared and carried out as early as in May. Completely independently of it, the census was carried out half a year later.²⁵⁸

Letter/announcement of the Statistical Office dated June 12, 1928 was the first step towards the 1930 census, which addressed not only the central bodies of the Czechoslovak administration, but also scientific institutions and interest organizations, in order to obtain an overview of what all would be appropriate to survey by the census, and thus how to supplement the previous survey of 1921 (Korčák 1934:10*). The need for statistical survey of specific traits and characteristics that had to be the subject of the new census was voiced by institutions and organizations even before the official call by the Statistical Office in 1928. For example, at the end of May 1925, the Masaryk League against Tuberculosis asked the Statistical Office to include in the next census the data on the number of persons with tuberculosis or other serious diseases (the number of cripples, the blind, the deaf, the deaf-mute, the trachomatous, the syphilitic and the number of persons infected with leprosy...). However, the Statistical Office did not consider this entirely appropriate as a part of the census and suggested that

²⁵³ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 29691/1925.

²⁵⁴ Act No. 47/1927 Coll.

²⁵⁵ In the original bill, the Ministry of Internal Affairs proposed the end to the 1930s and the continuation of the 5-year censorship periods. NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 29691/1925.

²⁵⁶ Act No. 47/1927 Coll., § 1.

²⁵⁷ Already in 1926, under the authority of the district chairman in Bratislava and subsequently in the following years also under the Bratislava City Council, a special census in Bratislava for the purpose of administration began to be prepared. However, it was not implemented. It was considered impractical by both the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Statistical Office. NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1238, signature No. 23469/1928 and No. 70961/1928.

²⁵⁸ The census of enterprises was carried out on May 27, 1930 and its detailed results were successively published between 1932 and 1935 in the source work *Československá statistika*, vol. 87, 88, 91, 92.

a separate questionnaire campaign should rather be carried out to ascertain such cases.²⁵⁹ In early 1927, the Ministry of Education proposed to include information on deafness and blindness in the forthcoming census. These were characteristics that had already been surveyed as a part of the Austrian census of 1910.²⁶⁰ The Ministry of National Defense of the Czechoslovakia was also more actively involved in discussions about the forthcoming census. It proposed to survey the number of legionnaires and their character, by which it intended, above all, to indicate where the legionnaire had served, i.e. Russian, French, Serbian front, etc. Legionnaires had to present a certificate from the Ministry or the Office of Czechoslovak Legionnaires. The proposal of the Ministry of Defence came late, as the discussions of the Statistical Office in the methodological area had already been completed by this time, and at the same time the Statistical Office was opposed to the inclusion of these characteristics in the census.²⁶¹

The 1930 census eventually followed the established methodical rules. In general, it should be stated that it was based on the experience and methodology of 1921, although some changes were adopted. Therefore, checking and revision of house numbers in the villages began in the preparatory stage. On November 02, 1929, the Ministry of Internal Affairs issued a circular on the start of the revisions, which can thus also be regarded as the official commencement of the preparatory work for the census.²⁶² It was followed by an instruction regarding the compilation of the lists of towns (Korčák 1934:9*-10*).²⁶³ The starting point for these lists was the four-volume statistical lexicon of municipalities for individual parts of the Czechoslovak Republic, based on the results of the 1921 census. These lists were prepared by the district offices and in Slovakia they were prepared in most regions by February 15, 1930.²⁶⁴

In addition to the new law, which was enacted primarily to change the intervals between censuses, a detail special governmental decree was issued on June 26, 1930 specifying the content and implementation of the 1930 census.²⁶⁵ The regulation set the decisive moment of the census for midnight from December 01 to December 02, 1930 and the field data collection from December 02 to December 05, 1930.²⁶⁶

The 1930 census represented a continuation of the previous census. Therefore, the basis was again the attempt for obtaining primarily personal data, data on common housing, source of income, etc. The census sheet therefore enquired about the relationship or other relationship to the head of the household, stating

²⁵⁹ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 4086/1925.

²⁶⁰ Ibidem, signature No. 756/II. 1927.

²⁶¹ Ibidem, signature No. 1100/1930. The proposal was dated February 22, 1930.

²⁶² Circular No. 63.704-8/1929-8, Revize domovních čísel. In: *Věstník Ministerstva vnitra republiky Československé* (VMV), vol. XI. Praha: Rolnická tiskárna, 1929, p. 251.

²⁶³ Circular No. 72.538/1929-8, Sestavení seznamů míst. In: VMV, vol. XI, p. 284.

²⁶⁴ ŠAKE, f. Obvodný notářský úrad v Muráni (Municipal Notary Office in Muráň), 1908–1946 (f. ObvNÚ Muráň), administrative box 1929–1931, signature No. 137/1930 adm.; also ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notářský úrad v Rejdovej (Municipal Notary Office in Rejdová), 1917–1945 (ObvNÚ Rejdová), box No. 5, signature No. 1812/1930.

²⁶⁵ Government Decree 86/1930 Coll.

²⁶⁶ Ibidem, §§ 1 and 18.

directly whether the person was, for example, a wife, companion, daughter, son, father, grandson, possibly a maid or lodger. Personal details included gender, age with date of birth, marital status, but also birthplace, length of residence in the village, home and nationality. Recorded was also nationality, which will be discussed later, religion, and literacy in the form of reading and writing skills. In terms of source of income, the main occupation and position in that occupation, a more detailed designation and the location of the business (office) where the main occupation was carried out were given.

The main difference from the previous census of 1921 was that the sheets recorded not only those present but also those permanently resident. A separate part B of the census sheet was used to record temporarily absent persons. In case of women, the date of last marriage, widowhood, divorce, the number of children born in the last marriage and the number of deceased children were additionally entered. Recording of data on secondary occupations represented another difference. However, the indication of change of occupation was omitted.²⁶⁷ There was also an option to indicate unemployment. For children under 14 years of age, marital status was also ascertained if they were orphans or half-orphans. Internal population movements were more accurately captured by the previous residence. Some questions on mental and physical health (physical defects: blindness, deafness, missing limb, etc.) were also added.

In addition to the above-mentioned proposals, some other efforts were also made to the Statistical Office, aimed at expanding the census content. These included the reintroduction of some of previously surveyed information, such as language proficiency, school education, but also information that was not considered relevant by the Statistical Office, such as public insurance, health status, participation in public life, etc. (Korčák 1934:10*).

As in the first interwar census, the 1930 census also included an inventory of dwellings. However, the lower limit of the settlement's inhabitants' headcount for which the data in question were collected has changed. Whereas in the 1921 census the population reached 20 thsd., in 1930 the settlement limit was lowered to 10 thsd.²⁶⁸ In Slovakia, this category included, in addition to the most populous cities of Bratislava and Košice, also Banská Bystrica, Banská Štiavnica together with Banská Bela, Guta (Kolárovo), Handlová, Komárno, Levice, Lučenec, Michalovce, Nitra, Nové Zámky, Petržalka, Piešťany, Prešov, Ružomberok, Spišská Nová Ves, Trenčín, Trnava, Zvolen and Žilina.

The public administration again assumed responsibility for the census implementation. However, it underwent a significant change compared to 1921, which involved the abolition of the county system, which was replaced by the provincial system in 1928. It was headed by the Regional Office in Bratislava, and the lower territorial units changed to districts, in which the political/public administration was represented by district offices with their heads, the district chairmen. Thus, from 1923 onwards, they replaced the subordinate offices. Only

²⁶⁷ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, unsigned.

²⁶⁸ Government Decree 86/1930 Coll., § 3.

the public administration remained the same at the district level, which was divided into notary districts headed by notaries, and municipalities (Tišliar 2013).

In relation to the census, mainly district and notary offices were involved in Slovakia. The actual implementation was left to the appointed census commissaries and auditors, whose function remained practically unchanged from the previous census. This also applied to the division of the census districts. Although the governmental regulation differentiated between the census and census counting sheets as in 1921, only census counting sheets were again used in Slovakia. This meant that the census counting officer was a person who recorded the data on the basis of the information provided to him, primarily by the head of the household. The basic system of the census – one sheet per house, or one flat sheet per a flat – remained unchanged, while empty flats were also recorded. Unlike the census (conscription) sheet of the previous census, the new one was divided into two parts and not only the present population but also the aforementioned temporarily absent persons at the place of residence were entered.²⁶⁹

Penalties for deliberately misrepresenting data, but also for deliberately violating the census rules, were set out in more detail. It was possible to impose fines or imprisonment in case of violation.²⁷⁰

The procedure in the preparatory stage of the census and its implementation was regulated by a circular of the Ministry of the Interior.²⁷¹ Census commissaries and auditors were nominated by the district authorities. They were subsequently appointed by the provincial authorities. After taking the oath of office, each of them received a permit and instructions for the census commissary, as well as model forms describing the fulfillment of his/her duties. In Slovakia, the district notary had to organize an instruction meeting at which the commissaries and reviewers discussed the problematic parts of the instructions on how to fill in the census sheets.²⁷² The commissaries' briefing was to be completed by November 30, 1930. The commissaries had to be clearly advised of their assigned census area. The reviewers received the contact addresses of individual census commissaries whom they worked with after the data collection in order to review the census material. Each commissary was given a list of the house numbers in his or her precinct. These lists had to be field checked and corrected lists had to be submitted together with the census material. The lists of house numbers had later to serve as the basis for the compilation of a lexicon of settlements. In instructing the commissaries and reviewers, explanation of the census (conscription) sheet breakdown in relation to the division of counted in persons into present, temporarily present and absent was emphasised, as well as explanation of the family members concept, which was more narrowly defined as a member/s of the household. Servants were

²⁶⁹ Government Decree 86/1930 Coll., § 7.

²⁷⁰ Ibidem, Part II of the Ordinance Order and Penal Provisions.

²⁷¹ NACR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1236, signature No. 78281/1930. Ministry of Internal Affairs, Circular No. 67.537/1930, October 29, 1929.

²⁷² The census sheets were the basic census material in Slovakia also in 1930. The census by census sheets was ordered by the Regional Office in Bratislava by its Circular No. 14795/2-1930, Circular on the 1930 census by census sheets in the whole area of Slovakia, published under No. 301 in *Krajinský vestník pre Slovensko*, vol. III. 1930, p. 435.

also counted in this group. Information on the persons of individual households had to be obtained from the head of the household, the owner of the dwelling or an adult person. In the case of the census, an adult person was considered to be over 14 years of age. For individual data that could be documented, the census counting officer could ask for the submission of relevant documents. These included, in particular, proof of age, marital status, nationality and home nationality. The meeting had also to discuss the difference between divorce from table and bed and dissolution of marriage with the notaries, emphasizing the fact that separation and divorce were tied to a court decision. In practice, this fact also had to be documented. Marriage was dissolved only by judicial separation (Šprocha and Tišliar 2008a:21). Only Czechoslovak nationals could register their home nationality. Although the municipality could grant temporary home rule, unless a person also held Czechoslovak citizenship, he/she was still considered a foreigner.²⁷³ They were also warned on literacy enrolment, even for children aged 6 and over, including those who were taught to read and write from the new school year 1930/1931.

The census itself had to be carried out from dwelling to dwelling, and it was forbidden to invite and concentrate people, e.g., at the municipal office, where the census sheets would then be filled in. This was only allowed if the head of the household completed the information and was not present at home when the Commissary made his rounds, but another adult member of the household provided some information instead of the landlord. The census counting officer should have visited a dwelling in the first place to see whether all persons had been counted in. In order to avoid persons being absent from the dwellings, it was advisable to give at least 24 hours' notice of the day and at least the approximate time of arrival using the local municipal office. The commissary should therefore prepare a plan for the visit and also notify the relevant reviewer, notary and district office at least one day before the data collection commencement. Each commissary had to start the field counting immediately from December 02, 1930. Completion of the field rounds had to be completed no later than on December 05, or by December 07 if dwellings were also counted. Any prolongation of the data collection date by further 3 days was subject to permission from the relevant district office.

The revised census material had to be collected at the notary's offices and subsequently at the district offices where the district summaries were prepared. The district offices had to report on the census work completion to the Regional Office in Bratislava on December 18, 1930. Organizational preparations for technical implementation of the census were thus set.

There is no doubt that the biggest controversy and problems with this census were associated with nationality. After the wave of criticism, which was perhaps the loudest from the German milieu in the Czech Republic, (Rádl 1929; Boháč

²⁷³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1236, signature No. 78281/1930. Ministry of Internal Affairs Circular No. 67.537/1930, October 29, 1929.

1930; 1928; 1929)²⁷⁴ but also after the critical statements of some representatives of the Statistical Office, the discussions about the definition of nationality and its subjective or objective features were rekindled in the preparatory process of the new census. The controversy had been going on since 1929, after the meeting of the subcommittee on population statistics of the Statistical Office. (Boháč 1931:17) The subcommittee rejected a proposal to survey exclusively mother language, for which only 4 members voted.²⁷⁵ The differences of opinion among the members of the subcommittee continued and were very similar to those in 1920. Therefore, a narrower editorial circle was formed, which was assigned with the task of drawing up a definition of nationality (mother language). The result of the work of the drafting circle was a definition according to which “...nationality is recorded for each present inhabitant (of Czechoslovak and foreign nationality) according to the mother language.” Only one nationality could be registered, and the mother language was defined as the language spoken since childhood. In the case of Jewish nationality, which a counted in person could choose again, the mother language had to be Hebrew or so-called *yiddish*.²⁷⁶ The nationality of children under the age of 14 had to be entered according to the parents, or according to the mother in case of differences. Nationality had to be ascertained without coercion or cajoling (Boháč 1931:18).²⁷⁷ The aim was thus to objectify nationality, although in the circumstances it would have been probably easier if the new census had aimed directly at the linguistic characteristics of the population, or alternatively it could have worked with both attributes and had two statistics at the end of the day. This suggestion was also made in 1920, and the same proposal was also discussed in the drafting circle on November 29, 1929, but again the result was something of a compromise in the form of a not entirely clear-cut definition. In fact, there were voices in the subcommittee that pointed out that the proposed definition would actually make the census only trace the mother language but nationality and national statistics. The final compromise that the Subcommittee on Population Statistics finally arrived at was to omit the definition of mother language altogether and to generalize the possibility of recording Jewish nationality as well. The reminder that the definition of mother language had been omitted came from the Bratislava Chamber of Commerce and Industry, apparently formulated by Imrich Karvaš (Boháč 1931:19). The main reason for this was that the definition of mother language was important for Slovakia, especially since the Hungarian statistics had a different understanding of mother language and it was created purposely in order to be able to report more Hungarians. This comment and the ensuing discussion meant that although the Population Policy Sub-Committee approved the definition of nationality in January 1930, the issue was reopened. Thus another drafting circle was formed, which after deliberations recommended that only

²⁷⁴ More famous are the exchanges – between A. Boháč and E. Rádl, where two concepts of objective and subjective concepts of determining the national composition met. Rádl advocated subjective nationality and Boháč’s idea was the mother language. NÁČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2330.

²⁷⁵ The members were Auerhan, Boháč, Rauchberg and Schönbaum. NÁČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

²⁷⁶ Ibidem, signature No. A-699/24.

²⁷⁷ Ibidem, signature No. P-3541-1.

mother language should be surveyed, but again further objections were raised in the subcommittee. Eventually, a definition was adopted in which nationality had to be recorded according to the language that the counted in person had learned and spoke most often, which is, “*as a rule, the mother language*” (Boháč 1931:20).²⁷⁸

The Faculty of Philosophy of the Comenius University in Bratislava was also involved in the discussions on the nationality statistics from Slovakia, where the opinion was promoted that the mother language was the most objective and “best” sign of nationality, because it is not subject to coercion. The aforementioned Chamber of Commerce and Industry from Bratislava also directly opposed the formulation of nationality similar to that of the 1921 census, and also suggested that both nationality and language, or only one of these characteristics, should be ascertained in order to avoid confusion of the census commissaries. Finally, in a questionnaire on the preparation of the census, the well-known Slovak politician Emil Stodola also expressed his opinion and suggested to count in the Slovaks separately. “*As a member of the National Statistical Office, I feel obliged to draw your attention to a major shortage in the statistical census concerning Slovakia. I understand here the aggregation of Czechs and Slovaks under the single name of Czechoslovaks.*” E. Stodola justified his proposal: “*...not for political but for purely professional reasons I am compelled to take a decisive stand against this. Especially in the present transitional state, it is very serious to observe numerically in Slovakia: how many Slovaks have arrived, and have emigrated, how many children have arrived in Slovak schools, how many artisans, merchants, clerks, Slovak intellectuals, etc. have arrived.*”²⁷⁹ There were many politicians on the Slovak political scene who tried to politicize this agenda. For example, in an interpellation of the Minister of Internal Affairs to MP Andrej Hlinka in September 1930, just such a demand was made.²⁸⁰ In the 1921 census, it was possible to count in separately Czech and Slovak nationalities, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs was counting on this possibility for the upcoming 1930 census as well. However, the results of the 1921 census were published by the Statistical Office exclusively for the common Czechoslovak nationality.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs, which was working on its own proposal, also became involved in the nationality discussion. The one of May 20, 1930 came close to the 1921 definition: “*Nationality means a tribal affiliation, the main external feature of which is the mother language. A nationality other than that for which the mother language testifies may be counted in only if a person counted in does not speak the mother language either in his own family or in his own household and has full command of the language of that nationality. The Jews, however, may always admit the Jewish nationality.*” (Boháč 1931:20) Finally, the 1930 Government Decree on the census contained a modified version of the Ministry of Internal Affairs definition in the form, “*Nationality is entered, as a rule, according to the mother language. A nationality other than that for which the mother language testifies may be counted in if the person counted in does not speak the mother language either in his family or in the household and has full command of the language of that nationality. The Jews, however, may always*

²⁷⁸ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. P-3541-1.

²⁷⁹ Ibidem.

²⁸⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, signature No. 60767/1930.

admit the Jewish nationality."²⁸¹ In the event that a person was unable to declare his or her nationality, or he/she declared two nationalities, the mother language was decisive. After all, the Jewish nationality was not tied to any language, just as in 1921. We cannot answer directly today whether the approximation to the 1921 definition of nationality was also a consequence of the intervention of the Czechoslovak National Council, which in a lengthy elaboration addressed to the Prime Minister's Office pointed out the inappropriateness of the definition of nationality approved by the Statistical Office.²⁸² However, as is clear from the memorandum on the census, the committee of the Statistical Office defended the link between nationality and mother language from three points of view. First, it was for the prestigious reason "*...that the impression should not be raised that the State in 1921 was not proceeding correctly, and by changing the method that it was giving truth to unfavorable criticisms*". The second was a statistical consideration, and this was for the sake of statistical data continuity. The third reason was identified as the factual one, since nationality was identified with language in the Language Act dated in 1920. A. Boháč essentially rejected these reasons. In the first case, he considered wrong to repeat the mistakes of 1921 but right to admit the mistakes. The continuity of statistical data had already been broken by the 1921 census, and the last reason, which identified nationality and mother language, in his opinion, pointed to the correctness of the survey of mother language. He therefore proposed to survey both nationality and mother language.²⁸³

Thus, in 1930, the entry of nationality (mother language) on the census sheet remained unchanged, although the definition had moved towards a clear identification of the two attributes. At the same time, the immutability of the rubric designation in the 1930 census sheet was defended as continuity with the 1921 census (Boháč 1931:17).

The fact that the problem of nationality was perceived sensitively also by minorities in Slovakia is evidenced by the case of the district committee in Bardejov, which decided at the end of 1929 that due to the incorrectly recorded nationality of the population in the last census in 1921, when people were recorded as Slovaks, the district committee demanded that in the next census, the census sheets should be filled in two copies, and one copy should be left at the municipal office after the end of the census, for the sake of control...²⁸⁴

On the other hand, criticism of the 1921 census nationality statistics was also voiced by Slovak League of America. The latter criticised in particular the situation in the eastern Slovakia, where, in its opinion, many people who declared themselves Hungarians and Russians did not declare themselves Slovaks. The appeal of Ján Slabej, the chairman of the Slovak League, dated May 05, 1930, frequently referred to the identification of Eastern Orthodox Catholics with Ruthenians, and Calvinists with Hungarians.²⁸⁵

²⁸¹ Government Decree 86/1930 Coll., § 21.

²⁸² NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 3253/1930; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, unsigned.

²⁸³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, unsigned.

²⁸⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 15646/1930.

²⁸⁵ Ibidem, signature No. 914/1930.

Census forms and how to fill them in

The statistical and other census-related forms were in many respects identical to the previous census. The census and conscription sheet represented the basis thereof. The fact that, as in 1921, only the conscription sheet was used in Slovakia, which was filled in by the competent census commissary, was established by the Regional Office in Bratislava as early as in July 1930, and its decision was subsequently approved by the Ministry of Internal Affairs.²⁸⁶ The conscription sheet was intended for the whole house. It contained 24 columns and recorded all persons present in the dwelling and those who were temporarily absent. Sections of the sheet were reserved for both categories. The persons in the flat were entered in the following order: the head of the household (his possible relationship to the owner of the flat was also indicated), the wife or companion and, in turn, the children according to age, then other relatives, inmates, guests, subordinates, lodgers, and lodgers. The different households in the house were to be clearly separated.

Personal characteristics included: surname and first name, relationship to the head of the household, gender, date of birth, marital status (for children under 14 years of age, it was stated whether they were orphans, half-orphans of their father or mother). It was possible to rely on the documents provided to fill in these details. Selected data on conjugal fertility were collected separately for women. Women who were married gave the date of the last marriage, the date of widowhood, if any, or the date of divorce/separation, the number of children born in the last marriage, separately the live births and the number of children thereof who died. A live-born child was considered to be the one who showed signs of life after birth, although he/she died shortly after birth. Stillborn children were not recorded. Children born within 300 days of divorce/separation or death of the husband were also counted as children of the last marriage.

For all persons, the place of birth was given, in order of municipality, district and country. If the person did not live in the place of birth, he/she indicated the date of immigration and previous residence, again in the order of municipality, district and country. Seasonal work, imprisonment, military service, study in another place were not considered as interruptions of permanent residence. In the next columns, data on nationality and, in case of Czechoslovak citizens, municipality, district and country were entered.

Nationality (mother language) remained preprinted as in 1921. Similarly for religion, where the option of no religion could also be given. For nationality, the aforementioned principle of the defining character – “*as a rule, mother language*” – applied. The Jewish population had complete freedom to declare their nationality. A language other than the mother language was the evidence of nationality if the person did not use the mother language in the home environment and was fully conversant with the language of another nationality. Only one nationality could be recorded, e.g. Czechoslovak (Czech or Slovak), German, French, etc.²⁸⁷ If someone

²⁸⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 85371/1930; signature No. 417/1931 Decree of the Regional Office in Bratislava No. 111453/1930.

²⁸⁷ Ibidem, box No. 3055, signature No. 11641/1930.

professed two or none nationality/ies, he/she was counted in according to his/her mother language. Census takers over 14 years of age declared it by themselves, children under 14 years of age according to their parents. In the case of different nationalities of parents, the principle applied according to who cared for them, and if both, the father's nationality was entered, or mother's nationality in case of illegitimate children. The literacy of the population was measured by reading and writing skills. Religious denomination, as in 1921, also took into account the state-unrecognised churches. Changes of religion or withdrawal from a church could be recorded only after proper notification to the appropriate district office. In the census it was necessary to prove this act by an official certificate.

Major part of the census sheet dealt further with occupation. Here the counting officer indicated the type of occupation (main, secondary, or another one), the position in the occupation, again separately for main and secondary occupations, and a more detail indication of the establishment in which he/she was employed for the main job. The main occupation was that from which the main income was derived, i.e. including pension, annuity or gratuity, etc. Other income was derived from a secondary occupation. The type of occupation had to be concise and had to capture a specific area. It did not include generic designations such as clerk, labourer, but had to be specific activities, e.g. coal mining, weaving, mixed goods merchant, railway worker, doctor, dental technician, banker, pensioner, rentier, almsman, etc. The unemployed wrote down their last regular occupation, but in a note in the last column, the Commissary indicated that the counted in person was unemployed. Prisoners or soldiers, for example, also wrote down their previous employment. The type of occupation was not declared by housewives. The data was also not recorded for children, except for the youth in education (high school and university), and for people who had no income of their own and were dependent on others. For occupational status, a specific job position was given, e.g. storekeeper, miner, machinist, foreman, janitor, but also business owner, sole proprietor, journeyman, financial commissary, etc. Helping family members were also recorded. Unemployed people also listed their last occupational status here. This column was not completed for children and for persons who had no income from work and did not assist in gainful employment. Finally, in the last column of occupation, there was space to indicate the specific enterprise, factory, office, etc., where the person worked or last worked. Similarly, any secondary employment was entered. Again, there were no changes from the previous 1921 census.

The last columns of the census sheet were dedicated to information on whether the person lived in the village permanently or temporarily. If the person indicated that he/she was only temporarily living there, it was necessary to indicate his/her permanent residence. The Commissary filled in the column with "*permanently*" or "*temporarily*". The penultimate column recorded physical defects (blind, deaf, deaf-mute, or missing body part). Finally, the last column was for remarks. The sheet was accompanied by *Instructions for Completing the Columns*

of the *Census Sheet*,²⁸⁸ which was followed by the Census Officer. In addition to the census (conscription) sheets and related instructions, the instructions for the commissaries and reviewers, the guest census card, the list of house numbers and the house sheet were prepared in the preparatory process of the census. There were separate survey forms for census area, municipal, and county surveys. Two forms for “problematic” nationalities were also prepared separately for use by the census commissary or reviewer if they suspected that nationality was misreported.

The instructions for the Census Officer and the Reviewer consisted of two parts. The first one was dedicated to definition and explanation of the Census Commissary work. In 25 paragraphs, the Census Commissary learnt that the census in Slovakia was carried out using census conscription sheets and that it was the commissary who filled them in. His work was to be supervised by the reviewer and the competent district office. The data he obtained from individuals and subsequently filled in the sheets were officially confidential and their misuse was punishable by a fine of up to 10,000 CZK or up to two years’ imprisonment. The instruction exhaustively named all the basic forms and printed matter that the census counting officer had to receive from the district office. In addition to the instruction about the census sheets filling in method, these included the official permit, the list of house numbers of the census district, the census sheets, the dwelling sheets, the census guest cards according to the size of the census district for the census district summaries. Guest census cards had to be given to individual lodging establishments in advance, according to the instructions, no later than 5 days before December 01, 1930.

We have already mentioned that the Census Commissary was advised to become more familiar with the assigned census area before the data collecting in dwellings and households. This was particularly the case of those who were assigned an unknown zone from which they did not originate. The field data collection was thus scheduled to begin at 8 a.m. on December 02, 1930, and last until the evening of December 05, 1930. Housing census was also in progress for settlements, it was possible to enter them up to December 07 and in less accessible, e.g. mountainous conditions, it was up to December 08, 1930. It was recommended that persons without shelter and in movable dwellings such as boats, carts, wooden sheds, etc., be counted in as first, followed by lodging establishments, and then each house, apartment of the enumeration district. One conscription sheet was designated for each house, in which the commissary entered each housing party (dwelling) in turn. In the settlements in which a housing census was also held, it was necessary to fill in a housing sheet. Vacant flats or houses were also entered in the conscription sheets and vice versa. If the commissary found a house that was not numbered and included in the census area, he wrote it down and included it at the end of the list.

The conscription sheet, Part A, recorded all persons who stayed overnight in the house from December 01 to December 02, 1930. It also included those persons

²⁸⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Hucíne (Municipal Notary Office in Hucín), 1913–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Hucín), administrative box 1929–1932, unsigned, unorganised archive fund.

who lived in the house but were on duty or only temporarily for pleasure at the time, or traveling but did not stay overnight elsewhere. Persons who lived in the house but were temporarily away from the village at the time of the census were entered in Part B of the census sheet. The instructions characterised as temporarily absent a person who, for various reasons, was temporarily away from the village, including those who were away on seasonal work, or traveling for work to another settlement and staying overnight there, but returning home regularly. Persons who were permanently absent (due to employment, study, military service, inmates of institutions, prisoners) were not entered in the census sheet. The census also concerned the military and gendarmes. They were subject to the same recording conditions as other collective households, e.g. inmates of institutions, prisoners, etc. They were entered on the census sheets as members of a single household. Exceptions were persons who lived in private dwellings and were members of the army or were gendarmes.

Since the Census Act required the persons who were the subject of the census to respond according to the actual situation, the data should have been entered by the Commissary in accordance with the census findings, according to the information provided by the owner of the dwelling or an adult member of the family, or on the basis of documents and receipts. In disputed situations, the Commissary could require confirmation of the information claimed on the basis of some administrative document, e.g., baptismal and house certificates, passport, etc. Deliberate withholding of information or altering, modifying, etc. was deemed as violation of the law and census rules and the person concerned was subject to a fine or imprisonment, as in the previous census.

Sensitive nationalities were to be recorded independently, without coercion and as indicated by the head of the household. The latter stated it for himself, but also for immature members of his family under the age of 14. The elderly gave the nationality for themselves. Here again, as in the 1921 census, there was a remark about the possibility that if a person insisted on entering nationality which the Commissary did not consider to be realistic, he would submit the issue to the district office which was adjudicating on the matter for resolution. This procedure was further elaborated by the Home Office circulars which highlighted that disputed matters had to be resolved by the district office and also define the offences and criminal proceedings in more detail.²⁸⁹ For possible offences of a different nature during the data collection, the census counting officers were provided with a Form C, which they handed over to the competent district office, town notary or Town Hall, whose district they belonged to.²⁹⁰

The commissary's work was not finished until he had completed his rounds, registered all the houses, dwellings and persons. He checked by arranging the numbered conscription sheets according to house numbers. Afterwards, he could prepare a survey for the entire assigned census area. Therein he enlisted the name of the settlement(s), the street(s), the conscription number(s) of the houses, made

²⁸⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, signature No. 76675/1930 and 69.121/1930, dated November 07, and December 04, 1930.

²⁹⁰ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned, sample C.

a remark whether the house was occupied, then entered the name and surname of the owner of the house, the number of dwellings in the house and total number of the persons present. These summaries were drawn up for each census zone in duplicate insofar as the zone also represented the whole municipality. The instructions required from the Commissary to submit all the census material to the reviewer by December 08. In particular, he had to hand over the list of house numbers, the summary of the census zone and all the conscription sheets. He also had to hand in separately all blank, unfilled census sheets.

The second part of the instruction was dedicated to the work of the census reviewer, whose main task was not only to check the census material, but also to produce municipal summaries for each municipality of the reviewing district in duplicate in cases where the municipality was divided into several census districts. The reviewer not only had an inspection function, but also had the same powers as the census commissary. He could also carry out an inspection or verify the data in the households, for which purpose he also had a reviewer's licence. He was also bound by official confidentiality. He was officially given one week to review the census and any deficiencies on the census material were reported to the relevant district office.²⁹¹

Even before the census was held, the district and notary offices were notified on the recording of some of the more problematic data in the conscription sheets. It was mainly column 14, in which nationality was entered, and how to enter persons who were refugees or who could prove dual nationality. In case of refugees, the instruction recommended that the refugee's country of origin should be indicated, e.g. "*Russian, Ukrainian, Armenian refugee*". Where it was impossible to ascertain or prove nationality, the conscription sheet had to state "stateless". If someone had dual nationality, e.g. Czechoslovak-American, both had to be entered, with the census counting officer also adding the home municipality for Czechoslovak, and justification for entering the two nationalities in the remark column No. 24. For all "*suspicious cases*" it was recommended to require documentation of the Czechoslovak nationality and the home commune.²⁹² The addition to the column 23, in which data for deaf, dumb and deaf-mute persons had to be entered, also seemed problematic. Identifying them, the census counting officers should have distinguished between the groups. A deaf or deaf-mute person could not automatically be classified as deaf-aphrasic. A deaf-mute was defined as a person who had been deaf since birth or early childhood and had not learned to speak.²⁹³ In late November 1930, the census commissaries were still made aware of an error in the instructions for defining the census area survey data, where, for column 7,

²⁹¹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned, sample C; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Okresný úrad v Revúcej (District Office in Revúca), 1923–1945 (f. OÚ Revúca), box No. 80, signature No. 55/1930 adm.

²⁹² ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned. Instruction of the district chairman from Revúca, November 24, 1930, unorganised archive fund; f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Kameňanoch (Municipal Notary Office in Kameňany) (f. ObvNÚ Kameňany), administrative box 1930–1931, signature No. 1241/1930 adm.

²⁹³ Ibidem.

the number of inhabitants was incorrectly given instead of the aggregate number of housing pages.²⁹⁴

The course of the 1930 census

The 1930 census was carried out in Slovakia without any significant problems in terms of organization and technical aspects. More than 9 thsd. people participated thereon in Slovakia. Of these, 7,872 were paid bonuses or per diems at the end of the census.²⁹⁵ Most of them were census commissaries and auditors (8,313)²⁹⁶ and clerks from notary and district offices. The census organization was already more or less tested and, in a way, established from the previous census, and in our archival research we did not directly come across information or indications of more serious technical and organizational problems that still accompanied the census events in the previous period. From this point of view, everything was held within the deadlines and according to the organizers' intentions.

The information of the population was organised in a simple and clear way. Information about the forthcoming census was published in the daily press more and more frequently from the autumn of 1929, but especially throughout 1930.²⁹⁷ The articles, especially by the representatives of the Statistical Office, reflected the main topics related to the census, especially in the context of explaining what would be the subject of the census. In the municipalities of Slovakia, information about the census was announced practically throughout November 1930. Individual municipal boards of directors were obliged to publish the appeals to the population on the municipal notice boards by November 21 at the latest.²⁹⁸ In turn, the district authorities were obliged to publish the census decrees within 10 to 14 days before the start of the census, i.e. between November 18 and 22.²⁹⁹

The census material was distributed to the commissaries through the respective district and, in the extent, the notary offices. This related not only to census sheets, but also to district and municipal surveys, census cards for guests in lodgings, as well as to the forms for reporting the disputed cases of nationalities.³⁰⁰ They were also given these in advance so that they could react flexibly, if necessary. Field rounds began on December 02 as scheduled, and since the final work of data collection had to be officially completed no later than on December 08, 1930, a review inspection was required to begin as early as on December 09. District notary offices were required to notify the district offices of the completion of data collection no later than at 10 a.m. on December 11.³⁰¹

²⁹⁴ Circular No. 10.063/1930 of the District Office in Revúca.

²⁹⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Okresný úrad v Rožňave (District Office in Rožňava), 1923–1938 (f. OÚ Rožňava), box No. 16, signature No. 929/1930 prez.

²⁹⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 417/1931.

²⁹⁷ NAČR, f. MZV-VA, boxes No. 2330, 2331.

²⁹⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned, unorganised archive fund.

²⁹⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1236, signature No. 67537/1930.

³⁰⁰ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned, unorganised archive fund.

³⁰¹ Ibidem.

The census was relatively peaceful. In Slovakia, 74 cases of criminal proceedings were recorded, mostly related to slander, threatening the completeness of the census, improper national agitation, and influencing and abetting family members or persons outside the household. Fines were also levied for agitation by priests among the Eastern Orthodox Catholic faithful, for deliberate misleading with incorrect information, etc.³⁰² Thus, these were mostly minor offences, which were commonly encountered in practically all previous censuses. They were mostly fined with smaller amounts. The peaceful course is also documented by the reports from the various district offices.³⁰³ After the census was completed, the district offices submitted reports, which also captured any complaints concerning the recording of nationality data, with minor exceptions. The district of Kežmarok, where the district office had to deal with 196 complaints, reported the highest number of complaints in this respect. Thereof, only one complaint was made by a census counting officer, the others by census commissaries. Similarly high numbers of complaints were reported by Levoča surroundings. The district office received 222 complaints, with as many as 210 concerning the Russian nationality. Higher numbers of complaints were also reported in the Šaľa district, where 84 cases involving 289 persons were dealt with, and in Vrábľa surroundings, 141 complaints concerning the Hungarian nationality. Not a single complaint came from the persons counted, but all from the reviewers and commissaries, to whom the reported nationality of the counted in persons seemed suspicious. There were also more numerous cases in the district of Veľké Kapušany (58 complaints), which concerned total 141 persons, and in Levice, where there were 70 complaints concerning 165 persons of Hungarian nationality. In the Levice district, the census was conducted exclusively by commissaries of Czechoslovak nationality, although local members of the Hungarian Christian Social Party were allowed to submit suggestions for suitable persons – candidates for the office of commissary. According to the district chairman, they did not use this possibility. In Michalovce they had total 45 applications, 43 of which related to Russian and two related to Hungarian nationality. In Rimavská Sobota, out of total 44 cases, 17 were initiated by the census, 11 of which were of Gypsy (Roma) nationality against Hungarian nationality. Also, in Banská Bystrica, 33 complaints were lodged directly by the census commissaries about the process and they mostly related to incorrectly stated Hungarian nationality. In Revúca there were 35 complaints. It was not the case that most complaints were filed in ethnically mixed districts. For example, in the Komárno district only 11 complaints were filed and 6 of them ended up in favor of the persons counted. In the ethnically mixed district of Lučenec, 19 complaints were made by the census commissaries about what they considered to be incorrectly indicated Hungarian nationality. The district chairman added in his report that 16 commissaries and one reviewer were of Hungarian nationality, although the local members of Hungarian nationality did not specifically ask the district office to appoint their own commissaries. Dunajská Streda, with 11 submissions, was rather one of the below-average

³⁰² NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 417/1931.

³⁰³ *Ibidem*.

districts in terms of the number of submissions. The census commissaries here were predominantly of Hungarian nationality. In the Rožňava district there were 10 cases, all from Kunova Teplica, and one census commissary made a complaint about incorrectly stated Hungarian nationality. In the neighboring Tornaľa district there were 8 cases filed by commissaries on Hungarian nationality. There were not many cases in the Nitra district either; only 4 complaints were filed there on Hungarian nationality, 3 complaints in Parkáň (Štúrovo) and no complaint in the district of Šamorín. The situation in the north-east of Slovakia was similar in many respects. In Stará Ľubovňa, where there was a large Ruthenian community, only two complaints were filed, and these were about the German nationality. In Sabinov, there were 4 complaints, filed by the commissaries about Hungarian nationality. The same was in Medzilaborce, but both cases concerned Russian (Ruthenian) nationality. In Spišská Sobota, the census commissaries and the reviewer filed 9 complaints to investigate 4 German and 5 Hungarian nationalities, and in Spišská Stará Ves there were no complaints at all.

In the eastern-Slovak Košice-vicinity district, 21 petitions for investigation of nationality were filed, and 10 ended in favor of the persons counted. Directly for the town Košice, the town notary reported 36 complaints concerning the Hungarian nationality entries. Similar number of complaints were filed with the Notary's Office in Bratislava. Specifically, there were 39 complaints, 18 of which concerned German nationality. Thus, in total, slightly more than 1,400 complaints were filed during the 1930 census. Since the progress reports were mostly dated January 5–6, 1931, in many cases these proceedings had not yet been concluded. What is surprising from the above reports, however, is the relatively low number of submissions in more ethnically mixed districts, and at the same time from the census takers. Thus, in the vast majority of cases, the district offices dealt with submissions from census commissaries or reviewers, which were held in the presence of the counted persons. The district offices thus summoned them and dealt with the submissions in turn. A number of district offices also gave sketchy information in their reports on the appointment of commissaries and reviewers, where in many cases reviewers of opposite nationalities were appointed, as recommended by the regional authorities in the preparatory process of the census. From the above reports, we can thus conclude that the census implementation was essentially smooth and the 1930 census was organised and technically well managed.

On one hand, there was the organizational and technical aspect of the census, while on the other hand there was the political aspect, which in the case of this second interwar Czechoslovak census was again manifested in connection with the nationality question. We have already mentioned the discussions and the formation of the definition of nationality. Also in 1930, various representatives of national minorities expressed their dissenting opinions. Even before the census, there were agitation campaigns of various kinds, organised mainly in an attempt to obtain the highest possible number of members of this or that nationality. This was also of practical importance, as the language law allowed for the minority language to be used in those districts where the minority had reached at least a

20% share, and it was also related to minority education. The fact that this was a sensitive issue and every even minor mistake meant a stirring of passions is evidenced by the example of the violation of the language law at the end of 1930 in the district of Kežmarok. The problem with the reply to the Spiš German party, which the authorities had taken the liberty of sending in Slovak, was highlighted by an interpellation from Andor Nitsch, a member of the National Assembly, which was signed not only by German but also by Hungarian deputies.³⁰⁴ The investigation highlighted a problem at the district office, as not all the officials there spoke German.

National agitation in Slovakia was held in the case of all three of the more numerous minorities: the German, Hungarian and Ruthenian (Russian). In the case of the last group, the problem was more complex since the Ruthenian population was statistically incorporated back into the broadly constructed Russian nationality.

Interestingly, some Slovak politicians were not satisfied with the census either. On January 23, 1930, Andrej Hlinka submitted an interpellation to the Czechoslovak government in which he pointed out that the results of the previous census in 1921 had not been published separately for the Slovaks, but only jointly for the Czechoslovak nationality.³⁰⁵ A. Hlinka stated that the Statistical Office did not include in the published results the information on headcount of persons in Bohemia, Moravia and Ruthenia that declared themselves as Slovaks and of those in Slovakia that declared themselves as Czechs. He described the absence of the data as anti-Slovak and as violation of the applicable census legislation, which *"...offends us as Slovaks all the more, because even the Hungarians in the former Hungary reported Slovak nationality in the official census statistics."*³⁰⁶ In the interwar censuses, however, it was possible to record Czech, Slovak, and even Czechoslovak nationality. This was also the answer of the Czechoslovak government to the Hlinka's interpellation.³⁰⁷ A. Boháč stated in this relation that very few people, in both Slovakia and the Czech Republic, had their Czechoslovak nationality directly written down in the censuses.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 12015/1931 pres. Interpellation dated December 03, 1930, No. 851/VI.

³⁰⁵ Ludoví posl. proti veľkovýrobe Českoslovákov. In: *Slovák*, January 24, 1930, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2330.

³⁰⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3055, signature No. 44100/1934.

³⁰⁷ Vláška o sčítání ľudu. Odpověď Hlinkovi. In: *Lidove noviny*, March 19, 1930, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2330.

³⁰⁸ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3055, signature No. 7512/1930. The data from the 1930 census for Slovak nationality were published in 1932 in selected issues of the Reports of the SÚS, but they were absent in the main source work *Československá statistika. Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XIII, 1932, No. 150 (tab. 1. Slovak nationality since 1921); *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XIII, 1932, No. 179 (tab. 1. nationality in Moravia and Silesia since 1880, data for Slovak nationality since 1921 and tab. 2. district overviews 1930); *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XIV, 1933, No. 170 (tab. 1 - overview of national development in Ruthenia, Slovak nationality since 1921, tab. 3. district overview); *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XIV, 1933, No. 195 (tab. 6. nationality development since 1880, separately data for Czech nationality since 1921; tab. 7. nationality in Slovakia at the district level and number of persons of Czech nationality 1930).

The campaigns for people to declare themselves to different nationalities were conducted in different ways; whether these were covert or official forms, or attempts to seek official approval from the public administration. Thus, in November 1930, Ladislav Aixinger from Bratislava applied to the regional authority for permission to distribute leaflets encouraging the public to declare their German nationality. However, the regional authority did not grant permission, warning that this was violation of the 1930 Government Decree on the census and describing the leaflets as nationalistically hateful.³⁰⁹ On the contrary, on November 26, 1930, a consent decree was issued by the regional authority to the Czechoslovak United Jewish Committee to distribute leaflets throughout Slovakia, in which the population of the Jewish confession was invited to declare their Jewish nationality.³¹⁰ So it seems that whatever was politically convenient was allowed. In Slovakia, too, they were fully aware that Jewish nationality has statistically reduced the Hungarian population in particular, but also the German population. This was already clearly shown in the previous census.

In northeastern Slovakia, the idea of identifying nationality with religion was revived again. On November 10, 1930, a lengthy article was published in the Prešov newspaper *Narodnaja gazeta*, calling on the Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Eastern Orthodox population to declare their Russian nationality.³¹¹ The author of the article was the acting chairman of the Russian National Party in Slovakia, Ivan Zhidovskiy. The article contained selected statistical data from the 1921 census on the number of persons of Russian nationality compared to the number of Eastern Orthodox Catholics in the northeastern Slovak districts and their comparison with the results of the 1890 Hungarian census. The author tried to prove direct relationship between religion and nationality, although nationality in the 1930 census shouldn't correlate with religion but to mother language. Agitations in this vein were also organised in churches.

Complaints and prides that have survived and directly relate to the census implementation or its incorrect results almost always speak of a problem with nationality. The aforementioned deputy A. Nitsch interpellated the Minister of Internal Affairs because of the "over-gatherings" and "tormented" in the German language islands in Slovakia during the census.³¹² Several specific cases of officially investigated nationalities in the districts of Kežmarok, Stará Ľubovňa, Prievidza and Martin were thus investigated. A. Nitsch objected to the alleged pressures on several persons, e.g. also on the Jewish population, which was allegedly forced by the census commissaries to declare only their Jewish nationality, and to the persecution of several Germans by the gendarmes. At the end of the interpellation, the deputy stated that the possibility of the German population freely declaring their nationality was not guaranteed in Slovakia. The interpellation was also signed by Hungarian MPs. Cooperation between Hungarian and German

³⁰⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Hucín, administrative box 1929–1932, 1934–1938, unsigned. Regional Office in Bratislava No. 189.439/9/1930 of November 28, 1930, unorganised archive fund.

³¹⁰ Ibidem, Regional Office in Bratislava No. 190.802/9, section 190.802/9, 1930.

³¹¹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, signature No. 75404/1930.

³¹² Ibidem, box 3056, signature No. 24850/1931. Interpellation dated January 25, 1931 No. 917/XI.

minority deputies was extremely frequent on the census-related issues. The result of the investigation conducted by the regional authority did not reveal any irregularities.

Complaints about the census process were also registered, concerning unfair practices of the census commissaries, or outright abuse of their authority and recording of incorrect nationality.³¹³ An interpellation to that effect was also tabled by Jozef Tököly MEP. He mentioned the failure to count 60 Hungarian families as Hungarian, but also referred to the existence of a 'secret decree' which was intended to encourage the public administration to enroll in favor of the Czechoslovak nationality. Finally, he also commented negatively on the use of conscription instead of census sheets.³¹⁴ The objection of Dr Alapy, a member of the Provincial Committee, may also be mentioned, who pointed in particular to the incorrect appointment of the census commissaries. These issues were in many ways similar to those in 1921, when the complaint was mainly directed at the appointment of census commissaries who did not speak the minority language and therefore could not 'describe' people correctly. The Regional Office in Bratislava, to which most of these complaints were referred, gradually examined the circumstances of the commissaries appointment, but did not find any direct fault in this respect either. The appointed commissaries in the mixed areas mostly spoke or understood Hungarian.³¹⁵

J. Tököly has been active in the Chamber of Deputies for a long time. Already in 1929 and then in the beginning of 1930, he submitted his own bill on the census to the Parliament, which was signed by other Hungarian and German deputies as well.³¹⁶ Tököly included in the draft those demands that resonated mostly in the Hungarian but also in the German political camp. He proposed a census with census sheets and with the handwritten signature of the owner of the flat. The proposal provided for an exception only in the case of the flat owner illiteracy. Only then the census commissary was allowed to fill in the sheet. It also required the commissary to be accompanied on rounds by two trustees with a controlling function, to be determined by the representative body of the municipality concerned. J. Tököly proposed that nationality should be recorded exclusively according to the will of the counting officer, children primarily according to their father. The mother language had to serve as an indication of nationality if the counting officer could not decide on or identify one nationality at all. The bill was rather reminiscent in conception of the government's later enacted census regulations. However, the initiative of minority representatives continued and did not slacken even after the census was completed.

³¹³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, *Prághi Magyar Hírlap* of November and December 1930; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 6417/1931; signature No. 4825/1931, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, boxes No. 2330, 2331.

³¹⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1237, signature No. 81714/1930. *Lidové noviny, Slovák, Slovenská politika, Národní politika, České slovo, Reforma, Československá republika*, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2331.

³¹⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1234, signature No. 66475/1930 pres.

³¹⁶ *Ibidem*, box No. 3056, signature 2282/1930; signature No. 8473/1932.

The Hungarian national newspaper *Prágai Magyar Hírlap* published several articles and reports criticizing overall methodology and conduct of the 1930 census. The abuse of official power was mentioned therein, saying that persons of the Jewish confession had to compulsorily declare their Jewish nationality, persons of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic confession, and Hungarians had to declare their Russian nationality. In some places, it was said that the nationality was not filled in at all, so that it could be added later; in other places, the nationality was decided only by the census commissaries, which was unacceptable.³¹⁷ It is not our aim to mention all the cases. However, we will deal with the most serious problems in the next section.

Amongst them we could mention the submission of a petition by Hungarian and German deputies to the Council of the League of Nations on 18 November 1930, headed by Gejza Szüllö.³¹⁸ It criticised both the government decree on the new census, but also some other steps related to the preparation and implementation of the 1930 census, such as the use of census sheets throughout the territory of Slovakia, which was ordered by the regional authority. The deputies argued that this violated the respect for the freedom and free development of national minorities declared in the Saint-Germain Peace Agreement dated September 10, 1919.³¹⁹ They were not only critical of the selection and appointment of census commissaries, but also of the census rules, which did not provide for the possibility of checking the commissary's work when entering data in the census sheets, or of appealing against his work. They also criticised the fact that an individual was not free to determine his/her nationality (mother language), and to officially change the nationality at the district office. They cited as inappropriate and unjustifiable the use of census sheets throughout Slovakia, regardless the literacy/illiteracy of the population, while in most regions of the western part of the Czechoslovakia census sheets were used, which they described as considerably less influential or abuse-prone.³²⁰ The petition of the Hungarian minority from Czechoslovakia regarding the census was even discussed in the British Parliament. The daily press carried information that on December 11, 1930, in the House of Commons, Robert Gower was asked by the Foreign Secretary whether he had received information about the petition submitted to the League of Nations.³²¹

The reaction of the Czechoslovak government to the MPs' petition was a rather lengthy statement, which argued and referred in the case of the census sheets to the Austrian statistical tradition and in particular to the opinion of the Bratislava Regional Office, which was in favor of the use of the census sheets, even though the majority of the Slovak population was literate. The Regional

³¹⁷ NAČR, f. MV-SR, signature No. 81714/1930, *Prágai Magyar Hírlap*, No. 281, December 10, 1930.

³¹⁸ It is also described in more detail in Kadlec et al. 2016:160–162; NAČR, f. MV-SR, box 3056, signature No. 85371/1930; *Maďari a sčítání lidu : Szüllö ohlašuje stížnost ke Společnosti národů*. In: *Lidové noviny*, December 31, 1930, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2331.

³¹⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 2282/1931.

³²⁰ *Ibidem*, signature No. 85371/1930.

³²¹ *Dotaz v anglickém parlamentě o sčítání lidu v Československu*. In: *Národní listy*, December 18, 1930, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2331.

Office chose this alternative mainly so as the incorrectly filled in sheets would not delay the census commissaries by additional corrections. In particular, they referred to the experience of the census of land and business holdings carried out in May 1930 and the problems that had arisen in connection with the incorrect filling in the census material. The Ministry of Internal Affairs refused to link the census conscription sheets only to the efforts to change/adjust the ethnic composition of the population. It also argued that the census sheets were also used in some regions of the Czech Republic (almost 23% of the municipalities in Bohemia, more than 42% of the municipalities in Moravia and Silesia), including the districts with predominantly Czech population. This decision also resulted from the experience with the enterprise census. Moreover, the conscription sheets were not restricted to the use with the illiterate population and were understood to be entirely consistent with the census sheets.

In response, they defended a system of recording nationality whereby the census counting officer had to accept the reported nationality by a counted person, without any coercion, even though he might not agree with it or find it untrue. He should subsequently respond to this by lodging a complaint with the relevant political (district) authority and not to act spontaneously. Census takers could appeal/complain to the reviewer or to the district office, with the option of appealing to the provincial office and then to the Ministry of Internal Affairs if they disagreed with the figures recorded. The rules allowed them to ascertain the nationality that the census counting officer had entered for them.³²² Additional changes could not be made without the census taker's knowledge and consent. Finally, the argument was used that the census methodology, including the sensitive issue of the entry of nationality, was proposed by the Statistical Office, on which two representatives of the German minority were also represented.

The absence of signatures on the conscription sheets represented another suggestion in the petition. The Ministry of Internal Affairs stated in this regard that no one had made such a request or suggestion in the preparatory process, although there was room for it. It was also argued that the same was not the case with the signing of the personal registration sheets in the earlier Hungarian censuses.³²³

Consideration of the petition before the United Nations Council fell to the Council's Minority Committee, comprised of representatives of the United Kingdom, Ireland and Peru. The Committee additionally requested data on the numbers of census commissaries and reviewers in Slovakia and Ruthenia, as well as information on the possibilities for various interest organizations to participate in discussions on the census methodology.³²⁴ These were mainly associated in the reply with membership of district and provincial councils, in which it was possible to reflect on particular parts of the methodology.³²⁵ The question on the number of census commissaries and the lower representation

³²² Even before the official start of the census, the Ministry of Internal Affairs issued Decree No. 758521 on November 24, 1930, which also dealt with checking the enrolment accuracy.

³²³ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 8473/1932.

³²⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 84362/1931.

³²⁵ Ibidem, signature No. 49259/1931.

of minority commissaries and reviewers was cited as a result of unfamiliarity with the national language.³²⁶ A person should have been invited to be a Census Commissary who provided a guarantee that he/she would carry out the census work correctly and accurately and has a command of the state language. In ethnic regions, it was recommended that consideration should also be given to selecting persons who had the confidence of the local population because of their “national justice and tolerance” without distinction of nationality and also with knowledge of the local minority. In Slovakia, 92.9% of total 8,313 commissaries and reviewers, 92.9% were of Czechoslovak nationality, 4.9% of them were of Hungarian nationality (407), 1.3% of them were of German nationality (109) and 0.8% of them were of Ruthenian nationality (66), (Kadlec et al. 2016: 78)³²⁷ which was logically a significant disproportion to the actual national composition of the population. On the other hand, however, as many as 5,294 commissaries (63.7%) spoke Hungarian and 1,835 spoke German in addition to the state language.³²⁸ The reply to the petition also argued that there were only 935 petitions by census commissaries to examine Hungarian and 200 petitions to examine German nationality in Slovakia after the census was completed, of which 306 were decided in favor of Hungarian and 122 in favor of German nationality.³²⁹ These figures were described by the Ministry of Internal Affairs as overall low and as testimony “...for the correct approach of both the census and other authorities.”

As a result of the United Nations Minority Committee’s proceedings, it was concluded that there was no need to discuss the Members’ petition in the Council of the League of Nations.³³⁰ The Committee’s report was published in the Official Journal of the United Nations and it was in favor of Czechoslovak statistics.³³¹ The reaction to these results apparently triggered the preparation of a new petition in 1933 and 1934, which was even initiated by the Hungarian government. The new petition was to be resubmitted to the League of Nations, and its contents were equally intended to demonstrate the excesses of the 1930 Czechoslovak census in relation to minorities in Slovakia. According to information from the Czechoslovak embassy, it had to be a more extensive piece of material prepared by several persons whom the Czechoslovak Ministry of Internal Affairs described as “known to the irredentist movement”. In cooperation with the Hungarian Statistical Office, the new petition had apparently to include a retrospective overview of the censuses results since 1890.³³² However, this effort remained unrealised.

The criticism of the Czechoslovak census thus had direct support in the neighbouring Hungary, not only in the relationship between the Hungarian government and the Hungarian minority in Slovakia, but also among the Hungarian Jews (the Association of Hungarian Jews from Budapest), who in their resolution were equally critical of the Czechoslovak census and the agitation

³²⁶ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 62606/1933.

³²⁷ Ibidem, box No. 3056, signature No. 8473/1932; signature No. 417/1931.

³²⁸ Ibidem, box No. 2995, signature No. 62606/1933; box No. 3056, signature No. 417/1931.

³²⁹ Ibidem, box No. 3056, signature No. 8473/1932.

³³⁰ Ibidem, signature No. 8473/1932; also box No. 2995, signature No. 62606/1933.

³³¹ Ibidem, box No. 3056, signature No. 8473/1932.

³³² Ibidem, box No. 2995, signature No. 78641/1933.

against recording of the Hungarian nationality of the Jewish population.³³³ In early 1931, an interpellation was submitted in the Hungarian Parliament by the deputy József Pakots, pointing out the shortcomings and falsifications of the Czechoslovak census in an attempt to minimize the proportion of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia.³³⁴ J. Pakots also mentioned the petition to the League of Nations, but also the criticism of the Czechoslovak census in the British Parliament. He argued that there were several cases of coercion and the registration of persons with Czechoslovak surnames as persons of Czechoslovak nationality. He accused the Czechoslovak government of counting only 746,000 Hungarians in the 1921 census results instead of one million living in Czechoslovakia, and of enrolling Hungarians who did not speak Slovak as Czechoslovak nationalities. He criticised the use of census sheets, but also the filling of the post of census commissaries. He described the methodology of the census as a deliberate system of falsification by the Czechoslovak government and also mentioned the existence of a “*secret instruction*”, which was supposed to have originated from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, dated October 16, 1930, addressed to the Bratislava Regional Office. The public administration had to be instructed therein to take such measures that would safeguard the “*national political interests*”. Reaction of the Hungarian Prime Minister Stefan Bethlen was also interesting, who, in response to J. Pakots, mentioned the right of the Hungarian government to oppose the violation of the minority rules agreed at the Paris peace negotiations and the right of the Hungarian government to react on these grounds also before the League of Nations.³³⁵

Another unpleasant complaint that the Czechoslovak statistics faced was another accusation of an incorrectly conducted census, addressed on December 12, 1930 by Béla Földes, an honorary member of the International Statistical Institute. He published it as an open letter in the daily *Pester Lloyd*.³³⁶ J. Auerhan, as a President of the Statistical Office, together with A. Boháč addressed the same open letter to Albert Delatour, President of the International Statistical Institute, and to Henry Wilhelm Methorst, Secretary General, whom they invited to Prague to make sure that the census was carried out within the intentions of the accepted rules.³³⁷ At the same time, the representatives of Czechoslovak statistics refuted the claims that the methodology of the nationality survey was incorrectly

³³³ Troufalost maďarských židů naproti Československu. In: *Lidové noviny*, December 24, 1930; Hloupost maďarsko-židovská. In: *České slovo*, December 24, 1930; Maďarští židé štvou proti Československu. In: *Právo lidu*, December 25, 1930 and others, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2331.

³³⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 6411/1931.

³³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³³⁶ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 172/1930; also NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 26634/1933.

³³⁷ Obrana proti maďarským útokům na sčítání lidu. Prezident Mezinárodního Statistického Institutu pozván do Prahy k prohlédnutí sčítacího materiálu. In: *Reforma*, December 26, 1930; Obrana proti maďarským útokům na čsl. sčítání lidu. Otevřený list presidiu Mezinárodního ústavu statistického. In: *Československá republika*, December 25, 1930, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2331.

or purposely set. This was not the first criticism of B. Földes. He had already criticised the first Czechoslovak census in a similar vein.³³⁸

The German side also complained. A complaint was lodged with the Ministry of Internal Affairs about misplaced German publicity in the Prievidza district, where two local teachers, with the help of other German activists, were distributing leaflets claiming that the state had appointed only Slovak commissaries to the upcoming census.³³⁹

Errors in national statistics

A very serious problem with the results of the 1930 census arose in the processing of nationality data in Slovakia. It concerned two nationalities, the Hungarian and the Russian (Ruthenian), when the Statistical Office found a high decline of both nationalities compared to the results of the previous census of 1921. In the case of the Hungarian population, after a detailed processing of the results in autumn 1931, it turned out that their number had fallen by as many as 79,080 persons.³⁴⁰ A part of this decline was explained by the Statistical Office by the fact that 38,843 fewer persons of foreign nationality were found in Slovakia. This more significant decline in processing was considered suspicious by the Statistical Office. They asked for a revision and it was allowed by the governmental regulation on the census. The new investigation of nationality, which had to be carried out *"confidentially and completely unobtrusively at the request of the Statistical Office, so that the whole exercise remained completely unknown to the public"*, related to 23,737 persons living in 195 municipalities in southern Slovakia. The reaction of the Statistical Office was mainly rooted in the fear of another possible "Hungarian attack" on the Czechoslovak statistics, since such a high loss of persons of Hungarian nationality would be difficult to justify. However, the revision ordered, which covered the districts of Stará Ďala (Hurbanovo), Parkáň (Štúrovo), Želiezovce and Levice, only brought about a partial adjustment. The Regional Office in Bratislava, as well as other public administration bodies, denied their wrongdoing and the results were assessed at the Regional Office as a *"return to Slovak nationality"*.³⁴¹ The Statistical Office, however, attributed the significant changes in the results of the Hungarian/Slovak population ratio to the overzealousness of the census commissaries in Slovakia and described the results as *"artificial re-slovakization"*.³⁴² Thus, it questioned them, which can be considered a rather significant moment of the 1930 census, as the Statistical Office admitted significant errors. He went on to argue and justify that the decline in Czechoslovak members of the Hungarian nationality compared with the 1921 census was so significant that it could not be explained by the return of the "hungarianised" Slovaks to their original nationality, nor by the addition of 19,000 Roma who had previously declared their Hungarian nationality, nor by the addition of foreigners and persons of unclear nationality, which was caused

³³⁸ Sčítání lidu a Maďaři. In: *Národní listy*, August 16, 1923, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

³³⁹ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 1234, unsigned. Letter dated December 02, 1930.

³⁴⁰ Ibidem, box No. 2995, signature No. 59145/1931.

³⁴¹ Ibidem, signature No. 686/1932.

³⁴² Ibidem, signature No. 26634/1933.

by the clarification of home nationality in the 1930 census.³⁴³ The loss of persons of Hungarian nationality, according to the established results, not only meant the loss of the entire natural increase in the intercensal period, reduced by emigration (approximately 63,000 persons), but also further loss of more than 46,000 persons. This was the reason why the Statistical Office asked for revision of almost 24 thsd. persons mentioned above. It resulted in the change in 10,220 cases, in which the Statistical Office described as insufficient to justify the results. Accordingly, total loss, including natural increase, amounted to approximately 100,000 Hungarians, which could not be explained by relocation or natural assimilation. The results for specific municipalities were particularly vulnerable, which showed an unexplained loss of Hungarians. Hence, the Statistical Office requested further revision in 1933, which initially covered 1,396 census sheets from 58 municipalities and covered 6,143 persons from the districts of Šamorín, Galanta, Šaľa, Parkáň (Štúrovo), Želiezovce, Levice, Feledince (Jesenské), Moldava nad Bodvou, Košice, Kráľovský Chlmec and Kapušany. Subsequently, the material for the revision was supplemented by 1,526 census sheets with 6,955 persons living in 40 villages in the districts of Dunajská Streda, Komárno, Stará Ďala (Hurbanovo). Thus, total number of persons revised exceeded 13 thsd. However, the change of nationality to Hungarian occurred only in 2,870 cases. On the other hand, however, the change from Hungarian to Slovak occurred in further 2013 cases. The change of nationality in favor of the Hungarian nationality was thus finally made in less than 800 cases.³⁴⁴ On the occasion of the second revision, the Regional Office in Bratislava took the liberty of polemicising with the Statistical Office by questioning the “zealous work” of the census commissaries. It is clear from the statement that the questioning of the accuracy of the results was hardly borne by the representatives of the Slovak public administration. It was also argued that the inaccurate results of the 1921 census, when the time and circumstances were ‘more favorable for the Hungarian nationality’ in connection with the recent occupation of Slovakia by the soldiers of the Hungarian Republic of the Councils (1919), agitations and the spreading of news about the possible reoccupation of Slovakia by Hungary, which, according to the regional authority, in turn distorted the results in favor of the Hungarian nationality in some southern regions. At the same time, the Regional Office compared the results of the last Czechoslovak and Hungarian census for the Statistical Office, which was also carried out in 1930. According to the Regional Office, the “cleaned” decrease of 46,000 persons of Hungarian nationality in Slovakia meant a decrease of 7.81% compared to the 1921 census. In Hungary, according to the 1930 census, the Slovak minority had declined by 26.1% since 1920, the Serbian minority by 59.0%, the Romanian

³⁴³ The Regional Office in Bratislava, in a report sent to the Ministry of Internal Affairs on October 23, 1931, described the home affiliation established in 1921 as incorrect. It argued that the Hungarian legislation was different and referred to the Supreme Administrative Court’s ruling No 16455/1923, which had led to the abolition of a part of the home jurisdiction. The Ministry of Internal Affairs opposed this claim and argued that the 1930 census apparently registered more Czechoslovak nationals than foreigners by mistake. NACR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 72136/1931.

³⁴⁴ Ibidem, signature No. 62606/1933.

minority by 31.5%, and the German minority by 13.2%, which in absolute numbers meant a decline by more than 37 thsd. Slovaks, ignoring the natural increase. Thus, if the total decrease was calculated by the Czechoslovak Statistical Office per 100,000 persons, including natural increase, it would represent a decrease by approximately 15% “...i.e. a figure which will be very easy to defend to the public, especially when compared with the decrease in the number of Slovaks in Hungary. ...If the scientific experience of statistical science admits a decrease by up to 26.1% in the number of Slovaks in Hungary, it cannot be contrary to this experience that the number of Hungarians in Slovakia will decrease by only 15%; on the contrary, it will be a very good testimony to the objectivity of our census.”³⁴⁵

From the above, it is apparent that the Hungarian criticism of the preparations, but especially of the census implementation in terms of shortcomings and oversights had some real basis, admittedly not as exaggerated and pronounced as they claimed in their contributions, interpellations and comments, in which many things were not only exaggerated, but especially more often argued with fabricated and untrue information as well. But this revision of the results was not the only one that occurred.

In November 1932, the Statistical Office found a special national structure in the Snina district. According to the results of previous censuses, the majority of people in this area has been of Ruthenian nationality/language, or Russian nationality group for a long time.

In the 1930 census, however, the results differed diametrically.³⁴⁶ This was a region that was already on the radar of the Slovak regional authorities at the turn of 1930/1931, as the Ruthenian politician Ivan Kurt'ák, supported by Hungarian and German MPs, spoke in Parliament with an interpellation.³⁴⁷ Therein, he drew attention to the problems with the census throughout the eastern Slovakia, including the Snina district.³⁴⁸ In the interpellation, he described the 1930 census as an effort to turn Russians into Slovaks. He accused the regional authorities of appointing almost exclusively Slovaks, Czechs and Jews as census commissaries, but only a few Russians. I. Kurt'ák also published several articles in which he pointed out that the census in the whole eastern Slovakia had not been carried out correctly and that the rules had also been breached. A comprehensive report from the beginning of April 1931, which was the result of the case investigation by the Regional Office in Bratislava and the relevant district offices in Stará Ľubovňa, Bardejov, Trebišov, Medzilaborce, Sabinov, Sobrance, Stropkov, Michalovce, and Humenné, indicates that the census was formally carried out in the aforementioned districts of eastern Slovakia without any conflicts, complaints, or protests.³⁴⁹ Local teachers were mainly appointed as commissaries, and appointments of the commissaries of Russian (Ruthenian) nationality were also taken into account. In its report, the Regional Office for several regions criticised in particular the

³⁴⁵ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 2995, signature No. 26634/1933 and signature No. 62606/1933.

³⁴⁶ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 4302/II/1932.

³⁴⁷ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 17740/1931. Interpellation of January 27, 1931.

³⁴⁸ Ibidem, signature No. 33845/1931.

³⁴⁹ Ibidem, signature No. 2282/1931.

agitation of Eastern Orthodox Catholic priests, but also the distribution of the magazine *Russkii Vestnik*.³⁵⁰

Although the outcome of the investigation in the Snina district was in a similar vein, we will pay special attention thereto for several reasons. I. Kurt'ák stated in his interpellation that in the "Russian villages" in the Snina district 50% of the inhabitants were registered as Slovaks, and all but the teacher were registered as Slovaks in the village of Ruská Bystrá. The results of 1930, which will be discussed later, did indeed bring about a significant change in the nationality structure in this region, which was later noticed by the Statistical Office when processing them.

In response to a suggestion by MEP I. Kurt'ák, the District Office in Snina began to investigate the issue in more detail. The gendarmerie commander questioned the individual mayors of the municipalities, but the conclusions did not confirm any direct misconduct. However, in its report to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Regional Office stated that there was some suspicion of incorrect nationality results.³⁵¹ In fact, the notary from Ubla stated that the result for nationality "...does not seem to correspond to actual data since all inhabitants of Ruská Bystrá were registered as Slovaks except the teacher, because approx. 50-60% of the population declared themselves to be Russians." An investigation was therefore held, in which the district authority stated that "...the people in the district of Snina speak mostly the 'Šariš' dialect, thus a significant part of the Eastern Orthodox-Catholics also claim Slovak nationality ...the population of the district of Snina speaks neither Russian nor Ukrainian, only a minor part of the Eastern Orthodox Catholics has a special dialect which is mixed with Slovak, Polish, Russian and Ukrainian, and this part of the population declares itself 'Russian' in the census."³⁵² The report was signed as explanatory material for the interpellation by the regional president, Jozef Országh, who also stated that the census in the Snina district was carried out correctly and in compliance with the regulations and that "...the complaints of deputy Kurtjak... are based on wrong information ... on the fact that he (Deputy Kurt'ák) did not take into account that the population, already in the second decade of the existence of the Republic, is thinking and enjoying those rights which were secured to it by the Freedom." In June 1931, the Statistical Office hastily examined the census sheets and specified that 224 persons, i.e. almost 70% of the population, were registered as Russian in Ruská Bystrá.³⁵³

The interpellation also mentioned some problems in the village of Dúbrava in the Snina district, where the census commissary was allegedly expelled for improper access. It was Manó Laufer who was summoned by the district office for questioning. M. Laufer said that on the first day he recorded the nationality exactly as people reported to him without any problems. He further mentioned that on the second day of the rounds he was approached by a local group of people asking him to show them the census material, which he refused and continued with the census work. According to him, he wrote down only the data that people reported to him. He reportedly counted around 85% of Ruthenians in the village.

³⁵⁰ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 16362/1931 pres.; signature No. 25100/1931.

³⁵¹ Ibidem, signature No. 17578/1931 pres.

³⁵² Ibidem, signature No. 25559/1931. Report of April 14, 1931.

³⁵³ Ibidem.

The Statistical Office numerically clarified his testimony. There were 221 persons of Russian nationality in Dúbrava, which was more than 60%.³⁵⁴ Laufer's testimony was confirmed by the local mayor, as well as by deputy director and, finally, by the report of the gendarmerie commander. They unanimously considered the work of the census counting officer to be conscientious and duly carried out. No one of the village inhabitants complained directly.³⁵⁵

The district office also summoned other census commissaries and interviewed them in turn about the census process in the district. All 12 commissaries confirmed that they took the census to their best ability and recorded the nationality as reported to them by the people and nothing strange happened during their rounds in the census zones.³⁵⁶ Thus, the district office, the mayors, the gendarmerie, the census commissaries and, on the basis of their reports, statements and minutes, the Regional Office confirmed the census legitimacy, without complications and without any direct complaints from the district inhabitants.

However, the results for the whole Snina district were noticed by the Statistical Office in 1932 and they seemed very suspicious.³⁵⁷ While the ratio of the Czechoslovak and Russian population in previous censuses was approximately 1:3 in favor of the Russian population, and in 1921 29.4% were Czechoslovak and 64.8% Russian, in 1930 the results were quite the opposite. Total 70.1% Czechoslovak nationality and 27.9% Russian nationality of the district's population was reported. The overall results for the municipalities also sounded suspicious. In 1921 there were as many as 36 Russian villages in the district, but only 3 villages where the Russian (Ruthenian) population was predominant in 1930. The head of the Second Department of the Statistical Office A. Boháč pointed out that on a simple field inspection the situation looked different, and the Russian population was predominant. The problem was therefore addressed at a meeting at the Regional Office in Bratislava on October 14, 1932. It was attended by the representatives of the Statistical Office, as well as the Slovak Regional President Jozef Országh and other employees of the Regional Office. Since this was a serious problem, which greatly affected the very quality of the 1930 census as a source and similar to the problem of the Hungarian population decline reflected above, we will dedicate more space to this case.

According to the minutes of the meeting, the President of the Statistical Office, J. Auerhan *"Our national statistics have very many enemies at home and abroad, and if we were to leave the data on the nationality of the Snina district population as they appear in the census sheets, we would be giving these enemies a very effective weapon in their hands, which would undermine the confidence in national statistics in Slovakia in general. We emphasize... that national statistics must be taken in the whole country from one point of view. This point of view was determined by the National Statistical Office. Nationality should be recorded according to the mother language."* Regional President Országh responded to this remark by describing the Government Decree on the census as not very beneficial for Slovakia, which *"...distorts the real situation."*

³⁵⁴ NAČR, f. MV-SR, box No. 3056, signature No. 25559/1931.

³⁵⁵ Ibidem.

³⁵⁶ Ibidem, signature No. 17578/1931.

³⁵⁷ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 4302/II/1932.

He mentioned that the Hungarian population in the south of Slovakia was also not as firm in its nationality as was generally thought: *"...he was very surprised to observe that many Hungarian peasants – even on Žitný ostrov – today sincerely declare their Slovak nationality."* This was undoubtedly a response to the problem of the Hungarian nationality loss described above, and an indication that it was not the commissaries or the public administration that had made a mistake, but the will of those interviewed.

Jaromír Korčák, who was another representative of the Statistical Office, then explained to the attendees the nationality borders on the 1921 maps of eastern Slovakia, as well as the linguistic borders drawn up in 1906 by Samuel Czambel, an eminent Slovak philologist and translator (Czambel 1906). In 1907 it was adopted by L. Niederle in his ethnographic map of Slovaks. J. Korčák also argued for a linguistic borders according to the ethnographer Jan Húsek in 1925 and stated that all these sources agree significantly, while the results from 1930 are different for the Snina district. In the Snina district, only 3 small villages remained Russian, although the surrounding regions remained essentially unchanged since 1921. According to the minutes, the regional president acknowledged the arguments put forward about the Slovak-Russian nationality border, but nevertheless: *"However, they hold a political position against them; when the population of that district declares themselves Slovaks, we cannot prevent them from doing so; it would be inhuman even if they wanted to do something better. And it is a matter of great political importance, for from statistical data political claims could be derived."* Leaving aside the inappropriate and undue "caste" of nationalities, it is clear that this problem has taken a very wrong turn. Since the discovery of the strange and totally inconsistent data in 1932, the Statistical Office has chosen to defend the position of further adjustment of the data. On the other hand, according to the minutes of the Statistical Office, the regional president saw this as a political problem and an opportunity to increase the nationality in favor of the Slovaks (Czechoslovaks). J. Auerhan responded by emphasizing the mother language, which governed the 1930 census much more than the previous one, and *"...national consciousness can certainly be different than its mother language..."* Another interesting fact emerged from the minutes. Regional President J. Országh referred to the report of Dr. Liška from the Regional Office, whom he sent to the Snina district in the summer of 1931 (sic!) to find out whether the regulations for recording nationality in the 1930 census had been breached. According to his report, *"...he became convinced by his own examination that no pressure was exerted on the local population in the terms of nationality during the census, that they were indeed by a large majority declaring themselves to be Slovaks, and that the great growth of Orthodoxy could not at all be regarded there as a rise of Russian national consciousness."* J. Auerhan acknowledged that on the basis of Liška's report the statistical office had reconsidered its opinion regarding the rapid growth of Orthodoxy in eastern Slovakia, but at the same time questioned his report precisely in the nationality field. The report does not state how the local population speaks at home in the family, in the household, but: *"The report, on the contrary, tries to prove that the local population largely speaks Slovak ... In many places in the report of Dr. Liška it is admitted that the population*

of the district of Snina is actually Russian." Országh's argument was that it was incorrect to call the local population Russian. According to him, Ruthenian would be more appropriate. *"The population there does not understand the Great Russian language at all; its dialect is much more similar to Slovak than to Russian."* J. Országh was thus referring to the artificially created group of Russian nationality, which included persons of Great Russian, Ukrainian and Ruthenian nationality. This was finally acknowledged by J. Auerhan, although he claimed that linguistically the Ruthenian dialect belonged among the Russian languages.

As Dr. Liška was also present at the meeting, he was able to personally defend his report and the results of the mission. His task was to find out whether the census was carried out in compliance with the regulations and whether the commissaries tried to artificially increase the number of Slovaks in the region.

We have not been able to trace the Fox's report. We can therefore only assume that it probably argued for the investigation of February to April 1931, i.e. in response to the above-mentioned interpellation of deputy I. Kurt'ák, which was not mentioned in the minutes of the Statistical Office. Dr. Liška stated that he was convinced *"...that the census was formally correct."* He acknowledged, however, that these results could not be scientifically substantiated by the Statistical Office. He walked through 15 villages and became convinced that the local population, *"...not only declares itself to be Slovak, but also actually speaks Slovak. He notes to the question: 'Are you Slovak or Russian', only in perhaps one case did he receive an answer from the village people in favor of the Russian nationality. It is true that the people speak their native dialect at home, but it is impossible to find out in a census what their mother language actually is."*

J. Korčák responded to this information, stating that it was inappropriate to ask such a question because he had personally seen that, with few exceptions, local residents usually answered direct questions in the terms of the questioner. In his opinion, *"The linguistic character of the village is easily ascertained by indirect questioning and also by talking to the women, because they do not go to work outside the village and do not try to speak in the language of the ladies, i.e. Slovak."*

According to the minutes, the regional president J. Országh finally got the impression that the population of the Snina district was after all Ruthenian, under the pressure of arguments. However, he was of the opinion that the nationality was to remain at the will of the census taker and was not governed by the mother language. He expressed concern that the results should not become one of the arguments for reducing the territory of Slovakia in favor of Ruthenia. After the publication of the first 1921 census results, the governor of Ruthenia, Grigory Žatkovič, had already expressed the opinion that some districts of north-eastern Slovakia should be annexed to Ruthenia, as there lived predominantly Ruthenian population there.³⁵⁸ At the same time, Országh said that he had *"...heard from many Slovaks that 'the Czechs supposedly wanted more Ruthenians to expand the area for the recruitment of their next civil subordinates'."*³⁵⁹

³⁵⁸ Sčítání lidu v šaryšské župě. In: *Lidove noviny*, May 10, 1921, NAČR, f. MZV-VA, box No. 2329.

³⁵⁹ NAČR, f. SÚS, box No. 45, signature No. 4302/II/1932.

The meeting concluded with a direct proposal from the Statistical Office on how to solve the problem. *“Dr. Korčák communicated the proposal of the head of the Population Department, Dr. Boháč: in the municipalities that lie close to the 1921 linguistic border, the 1930 data will be left mostly unchanged, whereas in the inner territory the Russian nationality will be marked for those inhabitants of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic religion who come from purely Russian municipalities of the Snina district.”* According to the minutes, J. Országh finally agreed to this proposal and expressed the hope that *“...it will proceed with caution and will not harm Slovak interests too much.”* At the same time, he advocated that in the next census the nationality should be ascertained according to the will of the individual.

Thus, the data were adjusted and the main reason thereof was the concern that the results should not be interpreted against the census action and Czechoslovak statistics. The two cases of data adjustments mentioned above are, after all, of a different nature. While in the case of the Hungarian minority the statistical office used the possibility of revision and subsequent adjustments were made on the basis of the results, in the case of the Russian minority in the district of Snina only adjustments were made without a revision survey, i.e. from the table, with a pencil in hand. A. Boháč's proposal for adjustment, which relied on the association of nationality with the Eastern Orthodox Catholic population, which in other circumstances was strongly criticised by the Statistical Office throughout the interwar period, since there were clearly Slovaks among the Eastern Orthodox Catholics. The criticised idea of directly linking religion and nationality was therefore no longer a problem in this particular case. Thus, in the official final data, the aforementioned municipality of Dúbrava had 335 persons of Russian (Ruthenian) nationality (94.4%) and Ruská Bystrá had 313 Russians (Ruthenians, 95.4%).³⁶⁰

It is clear from the above cases that the results of national statistics in Slovakia can be understood and used rather tentatively. In these cases, it is apparent that certain mistakes had already been made during the census exercise, which were de facto pointed out by the Statistical Office itself by requesting revisions, thus actually calling the results into question. At the same time, the changes and adjustments that were made at the initiative of the Statistical Office may not have captured all the problems, not to mention the adjustment of the Russian (Ruthenian) data from the 1930 census on the basis of the previous census of 1921 results and with the help of the religious structure. In case of the Snina region, one should clearly see that the definition of nationality was certainly not even clearly formulated, and certainly not ideal. If the commissaries had only written down the data reported by the census takers, there would always have been room for a possible recession.

Processing and publication of results

The statistical material obtained was processed by the Statistical Office in a relatively short period of time. Preliminary results were published in the same

³⁶⁰ *Lexikón obcí v krajine Slovenskej : Úradný soznam miest podľa zákona zo 14. apríla 1920, Čís. 266 Sb. zák. a nar.* Praha: Orbis, 1936, pp. 89–90.

way as after the 1921 census from the district surveys.³⁶¹ They included not only the district results for the present population, housing parties and number of houses, but also settlements with more than 2 thsd. inhabitants were included in the preliminary results. The Bureau of Statistics published these results in 1931 as a part of their reports. They were supplemented by total population growth in the intercensal period 1921–1930 and by data on removals.³⁶²

Unlike the previous interwar census, the processing of the census material was done not only by machine, but also partly by hand. J. Korčák justified this by the needs of the state administration, which primarily required data on church affiliation in order to determine the additional salary of clergy (*congrui*) (Korčák 1934:24*). Thus, manual sorting was used to obtain preliminary results of religion, nationality, number of unemployed, especially with regard to agriculture and building trades. Finally, the data from manual processing were published only for unemployment. Others were only partially published as a part of other surveys, comparisons or incompletely published only by parts (countries) of Czechoslovakia.³⁶³ Detail machine censuses were complicated by the collection of data on marital fertility, which was not surveyed in the 1921 census. The processing was thus based not only on individuals, but, given the statistics on married couples, families, and households, it was necessary to process these social groups as well. The machine processing was therefore divided into two parts: individual, the results of which represented general statistics, and group, that is, statistics on families and households, which were purged of persons not living in a married couple or in a joint household. The method of processing was similar to that of the 1921 census, except that minor changes were made, mainly in the reworking of the aids for marking and categorizing occupations, which were adapted to the 1930 census of land and business holdings (Korčák 1934:25*).

In addition to the marking, the completeness of the entries in the census (conscription) sheets was also checked. This was also carried out separately in the manual pre-processing for nationality. Errors and incompleteness detected were gradually eliminated on the basis of the 1930 Government Census Ordinance.³⁶⁴ This concerned, in particular, the birthplace, occupation and the aforementioned nationality and citizenship, to which special attention was paid. According to J. Korčák, it was in Slovakia and Ruthenia that several thousand inhabitants lacked home and nationality, as the census commissaries listed these data as unknown in the census conscription sheets (Korčák 1934:25*). In addition, as many as 134,350 cases of unclear and undetermined nationalities were additionally investigated throughout the Czechoslovakia, of which over 36,500 were in Slovakia. Therefore,

³⁶¹ They were already available as of March 11, 1931. MVSR – State Archive in Žilina with headquarters in Bytča, branch in Čadca (ŠABY, p. Čadca), f. Okresný úrad v Kysuckom Novom Meste (District Office in Kysucke Nové Mesto), 1923–1945 (f. OÚ KNM), box No. 152, signature No. 2107/1931 adm.

³⁶² *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XII., 1931, No. 41, pp. 5–9.

³⁶³ *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XII., 1931, No. 109 and *Statistický obzor*, vol. XII–XIV, 1931–1934.

³⁶⁴ Government Decree 86/1930 Coll., § 29.

an extensive revision action was carried out, which also had the effect of prolonging of the census results processing.

Although some of the results were published successively in statistical reports for the whole country, or in selected data parts, the final data were published only in the source work *Československá statistika* (Czechoslovak Statistics). The first detail data were published by the Statistical Office in 1934 and covered the basic features and characteristics of the present population in a regional perspective.³⁶⁵ These included, in particular, the territorial aspects (number of villages and settlements, houses, housing sites/apartments, size of villages); population present and resident; gender, growth/loss and population density; nationality of the population present, especially Czechoslovak nationals; number of foreigners (by nationality and nationality); religion; age and marital status. The data were compared to the results of the 1921 census. As early as in 1934, the first detail data were also published, especially on the occupation of the population.³⁶⁶

In 1936, the Statistical Office began publishing important data on the population fertility, making *Československá statistika* (Czechoslovak statistics) among the most advanced in the world in the field of surveying data on the demographic reproduction.³⁶⁷ Data on internal migration, literacy and disability were not published until 1937.³⁶⁸

The population literacy was based on the literacy skills of persons aged 6 years and above. It was particularly significant in relation to the eastern parts of Czechoslovakia, where illiteracy was still higher in the interwar period (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012b:67–84). The questions on reading and writing skills were identical in the 1930 census, i.e. directly comparable to the 1921 census. On

³⁶⁵ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl I. Růst, koncentrace a hustota obyvatelstva, pohlaví, věkové rozvrstvení, rodinný stav, státní příslušnost, národnost, náboženské vyznání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 98, Series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 7. Praha: SÚS, 1934.

³⁶⁶ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část I. Druhy, skupiny a třídy hlavního povolání, poměr k povolání a sociální příslušnost, třídy vedlejšího povolání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 104, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 8. Praha: SÚS, 1934; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část II. Povolání podle věku a rodinného stavu, povolání podle velikosti místa pobytu, objektivní povolání, veřejní zaměstnanci, vedlejší povolání, nezaměstnanost. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 113, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 9. Praha: SÚS, 1935; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část III. Povolání a sociální rozvrstvení obyvatelstva podle národnosti (také cizinců) a podle náboženského vyznání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 116, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 10. Praha: SÚS, 1935.

³⁶⁷ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část I. Počet dětí živě narozených v posledním manželství. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 126, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 12. Praha: SÚS, 1936; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část 2. Domácnosti a rodiny. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 151, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 13. Praha: SÚS, 1938; Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část 3. Plodnost manželství. Konkubináty. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 153, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 14. Praha: SÚS, 1938.

³⁶⁸ Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl III. Ostatní data demografická (vnitřní stěhování, tělesné vady, znalost čtení a psaní, cizinci). In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 146, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 11. Praha: SÚS, 1937.

the contrary, the survey of physical disabilities (blindness, deafness, deafness-aphrasia, loss of limbs) was absent in the 1921 census, although it was initially considered, even as a special statistical survey outside the regular census (1924), but until 1930 Czechoslovak statistics did not have data of this nature available.

As already mentioned, in addition to the census, a housing census was also carried out in 1930 in selected settlements. These were settlements with more than 10 thsd. inhabitants. The results were published in 1935.³⁶⁹

Special mention should also be made of the lexicon of municipalities, which was compiled from the new results, just as after the 1921 census. The lexicon of municipalities for the territory of Slovakia was published in 1936³⁷⁰ and contained the basic data on the number of houses, area, number of inhabitants present, their nationality and religion at the municipal level. Information on the post office, telegraph and railway was also added, and in the local history section a conscription of the settlements was included, with information on the population present. On the other hand, compared to the previous village lexicon, data for gender and residential parties/housing were missing. In addition, the number of inhabitants present in the settlements was added, which was not published in the 1927 village lexicon. The Statistical Office did not plan to publish a separate administrative lexicon.

In addition to the source work *Československá statistika* (Czechoslovak Statistics), which in this way brought detailed selected results of the 1930 census in the years 1934–1938, the data were also published in other publications of the Statistical Office. These were in particular the “reports” of the Statistical Office,³⁷¹ preliminary and extraordinary reports of the Statistical Office,³⁷² statistical yearbooks, which started to be published gradually from 1934,³⁷³ or the Statistical Review.³⁷⁴ As far as possible and compatible, these results were published each time in comparison with the previous census results. Currently, the complete census material for the territory of Slovakia is available for research purposes at the Slovak National Archives in Bratislava.³⁷⁵ A digital copy has also been created.

Selected results of the Czechoslovak censuses of 1921 and 1930

The results of both interwar censuses are presented in detail in the statistical editions. We have already dedicated dozens of publications to them, in which we successively analysed most of the demographic data concerning the population of Slovakia. Perhaps the most comprehensive in the case of population structures is the publication *Demografický obraz Slovenska v sčítaniach ľudu 1919–1940*

³⁶⁹ Sčítání bytů ve větších městech republiky Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 107, series XIII., statistika domů a bytů, workbook 2. Praha: SÚS, 1935.

³⁷⁰ *Lexikon obcí v krajině slovenskej: Úradný soznam miest podľa zákona zo 14. apríla 1920, čís. 266 Sb. zák. a nar.* Praha: SÚS, 1936.

³⁷¹ *Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. XII., 1931.

³⁷² *Mimořádné zprávy Státního úřadu statistického*, vol. I., 1931. Praha: SÚS, 1931; *Předběžné zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé*, vol. I., 1931. Praha: SÚS, 1931.

³⁷³ *Statistická ročenka republiky Československé 1934*. Praha: SÚS, 1934.

³⁷⁴ *Statistický přehled o Československé republice 1936. Rozbor stavu a vývoje*. Praha: SÚS, 1936.

³⁷⁵ <<https://www.minv.sk/?scitacie-harky>> [online, 13.4.2023].

(Demographic picture of Slovakia in the censuses 1919–1940) (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a) and in the case of fertility it was the monograph *Transformácia plodnosti žien Slovenska v 20. a na začiatku 21. storočia* (Transformation of fertility of Slovak women in the 20th and early 21st century) (Šprocha and Tišliar 2016a). Thus, we will only briefly mention the basic results of national statistics here, to which we have so far dedicated the most space.

The results of the first Czechoslovak census of 1921 showed 2,998,244 inhabitants present in Slovakia. Compared to the results of the 1919 census, when 2,923,214 were counted, the number increased by more than 75 thsd. At the end of 1930, 3,329,793 inhabitants were counted. The population of Slovakia accounted for approximately 22% of the total population of Czechoslovakia. In the intercensal period 1921–1930, the natural increase reached more than 15%. Nevertheless, the population of Slovakia has been losing population to migration for a long time. However, the interwar period did not see a repeat of the situation at the end of the 19th century and the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, characterised by high emigration, motivated primarily by the search for employment opportunities abroad. The total increase in Slovakia, after taking into account migration movements, was approximately 11% between 1921 and 1930 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:29–31).

The ethnic structure of the population of Slovakia was relatively stable between 1919 and 1930. The results of the 1921 census practically confirmed the previous extraordinary census, when the most significant changes compared to the Hungarian censuses showed mainly movements between Hungarian and Czechoslovak (Slovak) nationalities. Not only migration movements, the dislocation of military garrisons (most of those serving in Slovakia came from the western part of the Czechoslovakia), but also the possibility of declaring Jewish nationality, which was already allowed by the 1919 census, played a role here.

Table 3: Population development and its share on the total population of Czechoslovakia in the individual countries of Czechoslovakia as of December 01, 1930 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:30)

Country/region	1880	1890	1900	1910	1921	1930
<i>Population</i>						
Slovakia	2.465,247	2.583,213	2.790,234	2.925,251	2.998,244	3.329,793
Bohemia	5.568,964	5.852,127	6.329,530	6.781,997	6.670,610	7.109,376
Moravia and Silesia	2.653,049	2.813,294	3.042,684	3.296,640	3.338,977	3.565,010
Ruthenia	395,692	456,097	526,686	595,598	604,593	725,357
<i>Percentage of the total population in the Czechoslovak Republic</i>						
Slovakia	22.2	22.1	22.0	21.5	22.0	22.6
Bohemia	50.2	50.0	49.9	49.9	49.0	48.3
Moravia and Silesia	23.9	24.0	24.0	24.2	24.5	24.2
Ruthenia	3.6	3.9	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.9

Table 4: Population development of individual countries of Czechoslovakia* by natural change and migration since 1911 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:31)

Country/region	Population increase (+) or decrease (-)					
	overall		natural currency		by downloading	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
<i>Period 1911–1920</i>						
Slovakia	74,046	2.5	171,320	5.9	-97,274	-3.3
Ruthenia	9,506	1.6	40,925	6.9	-31,419	-5.3
Bohemia	-109,863	1.6	58,658	0.9	-168,521	-2.5
Moravia and Silesia	45,381	1.4	117,107	3.6	-71,726	-2.2
<i>Period 1921–1930</i>						
Slovakia	331,549	11.1	453,492	15.1	-121,943	-4.1
Ruthenia	120,764	20.0	136,043	22.5	-15,279	-2.5
Bohemia	438,766	6.6	407,196	6.1	31,570	0.5
Moravia and Silesia	226,033	6.8	319,043	9.6	-93,010	-2.8

*Between 1901 and 1920 Bohemia without Vitoraz, Moravia without Valtice, Slovakia and Ruthenia regardless of later border changes, Silesia in 1901–1910 without Hlučín.

Table 5: Overview of population size and composition by mother language/nationality in Slovakia until 1930 (Šprocha and Tišliar 2012a:155)

Year*	Population	Mother language/nationality				
		Slovak (Czechoslovak)	Hungarian	German	Ruthenian	Other
1880	2.455,928	1.498,808	549,059	225,059	78,941	104,061
1890	2.587,485	1.600,676	642,484	232,788	84,787	26,750
1900	2.792,569	1.700,842	759,173	214,302	84,906	33,346
1910	2.926,833	1.685,653	896,338	196,948	97,014	50,880
1919	2.923,214	1.954,446	689,565	143,466	81,332	54,405
1921	2.955,998	2.013,675	634,827	139,880	85,628	81,987
1930	3.254,189	2.345,909	571,988	147,501	91,079	97,712
%						
1880	100	61.0	22.4	9.2	3.2	4.2
1890	100	61.9	24.8	9.0	3.3	1.0
1900	100	60.9	27.2	7.7	3.0	1.2
1910	100	57.6	30.6	6.7	3.3	1.7
1919	100	66.9	23.6	4.9	2.8	1.9
1921	100	68.1	21.5	4.7	2.9	2.8
1930	100	72.1	17.6	4.5	2.8	3.0

* Data from the years 1880–1919 for the present population, in the years 1921–1930 only for Czechoslovak (Slovak) nationals; in 1921 not Ruthenian, but Great Russian, Ukrainian and Carpatho-Russian nationality, in 1930 Russian and Malorussian.

Table 5 shows the results of censuses since 1800, when mother language was first surveyed in modern censuses in Hungary. It can be seen that until 1910 the proportion of Hungarian-speaking persons gradually increased, while the proportion of persons with Slovak as their mother language stagnated. This was due both to increased migration, which in the last quarter of the 19th century was mainly confined to the territory of current Slovakia, but also to the gradual Hungarianisation pressure. Finally, as we have already mentioned, the definition of the mother language, which, according to the 1910 methodology, a child could learn at school, also played a role in the statistical survey. After the Czechoslovakia foundation, the situation was reversed and the once majority Hungarian nation in Hungary was the largest minority in Slovakia. By 1930, the proportion of persons belonging to the Hungarian minority had fallen from 30.6% in 1910 to 17.6%. The official explanation of this state of affairs, published by the Statistical Office in the analytical parts of the edition *Czechoslovak Statistics*, was given above (Boháč 1924; Korčák 1934). The clarification of home affiliation, the return of many persons to their original Slovak ethnicity (increase in Slovak awareness) was emphasised, but also the southern districts, where the number of persons of Roma (officially Gypsy) and Jewish nationality increased in the interwar period, were analysed. From both of these population groups, in the previous censuses, persons mainly declared Hungarian mother language. Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality was also increasing with the arrival of a larger “official element” coming from the western part of Czechoslovakia. They came with their families and gradually their number increased to almost 121 thsd. in the interwar period. (Tišliar and Šprocha 2017a:90–91). They were more concentrated in urban areas, but also in southern Slovakia in connection with land reform and the establishment of colonies.

The more significant numerical decline of the Ruthenian population was explained by official statistics as a correction of the results from 1910, when the more significant merging of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic religion with the Ruthenians also played a role. Ruthenians were subject to assimilation in the Slovak, but also in the Hungarian environment (south-eastern Slovakia) for a longer period of time. In the censuses of 1921 and 1930, the Ruthenians were included in the more broadly understood group of the Russian population. The German minority, whose roots in Slovakia can be traced back to the Middle Ages, was gradually losing its share. The assimilation process gradually affected also the areas with higher German population concentration. Of course, the possibility to declare Jewish nationality also affected the share of this minority.

Overall, it can be concluded that no census results certainly offer completely accurate results of the population ethnic structure. This is because there were different circumstances (mainly political) under which the census was conducted, conditions, different understandings and explanations of the terms, recession and various compromises.

The path to the 1938 Provincial Population Census

In 1938, the second extraordinary census of the interwar period was carried out in Slovakia. It was extraordinary in several respects. It took place only on a part of the territory of present-day Slovakia, as several significant territorial changes had taken place just before it. It was also an untypical, rapid census, with virtually no preparation and no information to the population about the census. It was not organised by the Statistical Office, but, as in 1919, by the highest administrative authority in Slovakia.

Czechoslovakia went through a rather difficult period in the 1930s. Not only there was the economic crisis, which caused considerable damage to the Czechoslovak economy and increased unemployment, a major problem, but the country's international political position also began to become complicated. This had a negative impact on the domestic political scene and eventually led to a number of significant changes in the state legislation.

The economic and political crises that plagued the interwar Germany gave rise to power of extremists. They were represented above all by Adolf Hitler and his German National Socialist Workers' Party, whose aggressive foreign policy tended to seek post-war revisions until it eventually led to another world conflict.

The foreign policy position of Czechoslovakia began to deteriorate significantly in the second half of the 1930s, as the neighboring Germany escalated tensions and became more and more aggressive about the German minority, its position and rights in Czechoslovakia. This policy resulted in the claiming of territories inhabited by the German population. As the former victorious powers of the First World War, France and the United Kingdom, maintained a conciliatory attitude and a policy of appeasement towards Germany, Hitler gradually succeeded in advancing his power plans and building the Third Reich. Without much difficulty, Germany annexed Austria, and the policy of appeasement continued right up to the Munich Conference of the Great Powers at the end of September 1938. At this meeting, the fate of the Czechoslovak borderlands was seal doomed, especially in the western part of Czechoslovakia, with Germany gaining the Sudetenland, where a large German minority lived. Apart from the fact that Czechoslovakia was not represented at the Munich negotiations, it eventually submitted to its results. Munich was significant not only in terms of the direct territorial enfranchisement of Czechoslovakia and the way in which these territorial changes were achieved from the point of view of international law, but, understandably, the Munich dictate was also fully manifested on the domestic political scene. The Czechoslovak government resigned and was replaced by the government of Gen. Jan Syrový.

In Slovakia, the situation became radicalised, not only in relation to the fact that Slovakia lost the cult and memorial site of Devín and the suburb of Bratislava,

Petržalka, to Munich (Janas 2004:121–128),³⁷⁶ but the right-wing radical political forces, concentrated mainly in the *Hlinkova slovenská ľudová strana* (Hlinka Slovak People's Party /HSLŠ/), took advantage of the internal political crisis to advance their long-term agenda. With signing the Žilina Agreement in early October 1938, they proclaimed the autonomy of Slovakia.

The former Slovak People's Party, which in 1925 was symbolically renamed after its most prominent representative Andrej Hlinka to Hlinka's Party, was closely monitored by the Ministry of Internal Affairs as early as in 1919, mainly because of its political demands and the form of agitation among the population. Its political program of autonomy and dualism with the Czech lands, which very early on belonged to the permanent agenda of the aforementioned political party, was still in 1919 evaluated mainly from the point of view of the protection of religious rights for Slovakia.³⁷⁷ Later, however, other political themes were added, and the party was perceived in interwar Czechoslovakia mainly as a clerical-nationalist one, which repeatedly sought autonomy also by tabling motions in parliament. With signing the Žilina Agreement in October 1938, in which other Slovak political parties also participated, and the declaration of Slovak autonomy, the Slovak autonomous government was established, chaired by the main representative of the HSLŠ, Jozef Tiso.

Already at the Munich Conference of the Great Powers there were talks about settling the mutual demands of Hungary and Poland and their possible claims, which were to become a part of special negotiations between Czechoslovakia and its neighbors. Supplementary declarations were adopted on the Polish and Hungarian minorities, which were to be mutually settled within three months with the Czechoslovak Government. After the declaration of Slovak autonomy, the Czechoslovak government accepted the forming Slovak autonomous government when Jozef Tiso was first appointed for Minister of the Czechoslovak Republic with full powers for the administration of Slovakia (Tišliar 2013:107). Although the law on Slovak autonomy was not enacted until November 1938,³⁷⁸ the ongoing problems in Slovakia were already left to the new Czechoslovak government of Gen. Syrový to essentially Slovak politics (Deák 1998:20). Thus the Komárno negotiations with neighbouring Hungary, for years dissatisfied with the Trianon Peace Treaty of 1920, began as early as October 1938 (Deák 1998:7, 23). Encouraged by Germany success in Munich, Hungary asked for a "neighbourly settlement" with Czechoslovakia. Negotiations, in which a delegation headed by Deputy Minister J. Tiso took part on the Czechoslovak side, were not successful, however, and an arbitration agreement was subsequently reached to resolve the whole problem (Deák 1998:31). The result was the so-called Vienna Arbitration, with Germany and Italy as arbitrators in the dispute, who on November 02, 1938 decided to cede large parts of southern Slovakia to Hungary, more or less accepting the earlier results of the ethnic structure according to the Hungarian census of 1910. Thus, Czechoslovakia had to cede to Hungary the territory south

³⁷⁶ SNA, f. Ministerstvo vnútra Slovenskej republiky (Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic), 1939–1945 (f. MVSR), box No. 14, signature No. 1831/39 prez.

³⁷⁷ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3335, signature No. 348/1919.

³⁷⁸ Act No. 299/1938 Coll.

of the line: Štvrtok na Ostrove, Bernolákovo, Galanta, Šurany, Komjatice, Vrábce, Levice, Lučenec, Rimavská Sobota, Rožňava and Košice inclusive (Deák 1998:34). The territory of Slovakia was thus reduced by more than 10 thsd. km². Seven districts and the seats of 21 other districts of southern Slovakia, including Košice, were completely ceded.³⁷⁹ In total, there were 779 settlements, where more than 854 thsd. inhabitants lived according to the 1930 census data. The population comprised more than 855 inhabitants. Moreover, Hungary regarded the new state border line as only provisional (Deák 1998:35–37), which later became clear just after the division of Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1939.

Neighbouring Poland already formulated its conditions during the Munich Conference and demanded, in particular, the withdrawal of the long-disputed Tešín region. In Slovakia they were interested in some state border areas (Kamenec 1992:9).³⁸⁰ On the basis of the agreement dated December 1938, Poland acquired some territories of Kysuce, Orava and Spiš (Tišliarová and Tišliar 2013:35–75; Janas 2004:93–103).³⁸¹ The above-mentioned significant territorial changes disrupted both state and administrative borders and it was necessary to consider not only temporary adjustments in public administration, but also a new reform.

In connection with the adoption of the Autonomy Act, apart from the change of the Czech-Slovak Republic name, it is necessary to mention in particular the establishment of the Slovak Autonomous Congress and the autonomous government chaired by Jozef Tiso. As the political agenda of the HSLS played a major role in Slovakia, this was soon manifested by the efforts to apply long-standing views, for example on the presence of Czech officialdom and intelligentsia in Slovakia. It was often said from within this political camp that the Czech intelligentsia was “*taking jobs away from the Slovaks.*” They were bothered by Czech instead of Slovak bureaucracy, and the aforementioned idea of a Czechoslovak nation was also a thorn in their side. They found support at home in various state organizations and associations,³⁸² but also abroad, e.g. in the Slovak League. Support of the Slovak language promotion as an official and teaching language at schools was expressed in the protest “*In Slovakia in Slovak!*” Canadian Slovak League, which on January 17–18, 1938 spoke out in favor of the political and linguistic self-government of Slovakia.³⁸³ It called for the departure of Czech officials, as well as teachers, from Slovakia and their replacement by

³⁷⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 37, signature No. 150/1939 pres.

³⁸⁰ ŠABY, p. Čadca, f. Okresný úrad v Čadci (District Office in Čadca), 1923–1945, box No. 66, signature No. 49/1939 pres. Circular No. 74.588/1938 prez. of the Presidium of the Regional Office; also ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Okresný úrad v Dobšinej (District Office in Dobšiná), 1938–1945 (f. OÚ Dobšiná), box No. 1, signature No. 161/1938 pres., also e.g. KAMENEC, 1992:9.

³⁸¹ The inhabitants of Spišská Javorina also lodged an official protest against the withdrawal to Poland, SNA, f. Úrad predsedníctva vlády Slovenskej republiky (Office of the Presidency of the Government of the Slovak Republic), 1939–1945 (f. ÚPVSR), box No. 1, signature No. 419/1938. The delimitation work with Poland lasted until November 30, 1938, and by December 01, Poland had occupied the ceded territory, SNA, f. ÚPVSR, box No. 1, signature No. 535/1938.

³⁸² For example, the Memorandum of the Union of Slovak Academic State Associations, addressed to Prime Minister Milan Hodža and aimed at the employment of Slovaks in the domestic environment. NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 23443/1938.

³⁸³ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 746/1936.

Slovak intelligentsia (Chorvát 2018:87). Therefore, it began to dismiss or force the departure of these people from Slovakia. On October 31, 1938, information was sent from the office of the President of the Republic to the Prime Minister that some Czech professors at the University of Bratislava were forced to sign a declaration on October 27, 1938 that they were willing to leave the Comenius University. They were therefore placed at Czech universities.³⁸⁴ On the basis of a mutual agreement with the Czech-Slovak government, a government decree was passed in December 1938, resulting in the departure of 9,000 Czech officials to the western part of Czecho-Slovakia.³⁸⁵

It is thus clear from the above that the territorial changes and changes in the number and structure of the population in Slovakia at the end of 1938 were extremely significant, not to mention the migration of the population, which affected not only the territory occupied by Hungary, Poland and Germany, but also internal migration in relation to the departure of a part of the Czech population. The changes concerned mostly ethnically mixed territories. This was the first important moment why the autonomous government began to consider the need to carry out a new census.

The second was related to the national situation in Slovakia. The Hungarian minority, which had clearly dominated among the minorities during the interwar period, became only the fourth minority in Slovakia after the above-mentioned changes (Šprocha and Tišliar 2016b:139). The German remained the most numerous minorities in Slovakia, which was practically untouched by the territorial changes. This was primarily due to the fact that, unlike in the Czech lands, the German population in Slovakia did not live in the state border areas.

According to the interwar census, there were fewer than 150 thsd. Germans in Slovakia. They were mainly concentrated in three distinct linguistic islands whose roots can be traced back to the medieval settlement of Slovakia (Tišliar 2008b: 89–118). In the west, they were more numerous mainly in Bratislava, also in the Lesser Carpathian area and in the western part of Žitný ostrov. The more important German area was so-called *Hauerland*, located in the Upper Nitra region and the Lower Turiec. Spiš was the last German bastion where there were several settlements with German predominance. Thus, the German language islands resisted to assimilation processes for a long time, although from the second half of the 19th century onwards a gradual retreat towards Slovak, but also partly towards Hungarian, can be traced.

German ideology and aggressive campaign proclaiming German supremacy and the right to a living space, coupled with the spread of German culture, was also met with a stronger response in Slovakia. With the advent of Germany aggressive foreign policy, the German minority gained a significant ally, which was manifested in various social and cultural spheres. It was the desire to gain a special legal and cultural status in Slovakia (Schvarc et al. 2008:460-461), which resonated increasingly strongly from the German political environment, that became one of the significant political motives for the Slovak regional government

³⁸⁴ NAČR, f. PMR, box No. 3336, signature No. 746/1936.

³⁸⁵ Government Decree 382/1938 Coll.

to implement the new census, especially quietly and 'quickly'. The main goal of this census action was thus shifting more and more to the level of national or political-national statistics, to the creation of a so-called national cadastre,³⁸⁶ which would clearly delineate and define the new ethnic boundaries. Therefore, in addition to the total population, the focus of the census was on ascertaining the nationality of the population.

A peculiarity, however, which underlined the objectives of the census, concerned the census of the permanently settled population only.³⁸⁷ This census was prepared and carried out by the Regional Office in Bratislava in cooperation with the autonomous Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Lands, which gradually, from its inception, began to take over all important agendas from the Regional Office and to prepare itself for the role of supreme administrative authority.

The country census, as it was more often referred to at the time, was prepared secretly behind closed doors, practically until the decisive day, i.e. the start of field data collection. This was mainly due to the fear of ethnic campaigns, which were one of the typical features of census operations. In this way, an attempt was made to prevent pressures on the population, i.e. to make the survey of the national structure as objective as possible, which would not be influenced by political-nationalist agitations. However, this also had its adverse aspects. Certainly, the most significant was the complete absence of an information campaign towards the population and even, at certain moments, towards the subordinate public administration offices that were supposed to participate in the census campaign as organizers.

The decisive day was set for December 31, 1930, and on this day the informative decrees were to be published in the municipalities for the population and, in addition, the census was to be taken on this day.³⁸⁸ The provincial census surveyed only some selected characteristics that related to its main objectives, i.e. the number of permanently settled persons, their nationality, religion, and age.³⁸⁹

Conscription sheet and forms of the 1938 provincial census

Traditionally, the conscription sheet represented the basic form of the provincial inventory. It was a very simple form, which contained the name of the district, the municipality, the street and the house number in the header. The tabular part contained only 8 fields: common number, surname, first name, date of birth, nationality, in which Slovakia, Czechia, Moravia and Ruthenia were

³⁸⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938 pres.

³⁸⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Rejdová, box No. 11, signature No. 1727/1938 adm.

³⁸⁸ Ibidem; also ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Roštári (Municipal Notary Office in Roštár), 1922–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Roštár), signature No. 1500/38 adm., unorganised fund; also ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad vo Veľkej Polome (Municipal Notary Office in Veľká Poloma), 1865–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Veľká Poloma), signature No. 161/38 adm., unorganised fund.

³⁸⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938 prez., circular No. 396-001/2a-1938 of the Regional Office No. 396-001/2a-1938 determined that the number of inhabitants of the Slovak lands, nationality, religion and citizenship had to be ascertained.

separately preprinted. Among other countries, Germany, Hungary and Poland were preprinted as neighboring countries, and the item "Other" where any other nationality was entered. Nationality had 8 most common groups preprinted, Slovak, Czech, Ruthenian, German, Hungarian, Polish, Jewish and Gypsy. In the case of other nationality, it could be indicated verbally in the other nationality column. Religion was listed verbally. The last column was used for eventual remarks. As it was a conscription sheet, the census counting officer entered the individual data therein.

Only one overview, summary form was prepared for all the summaries. It was therefore also referred to as the district-municipal-district summary and was completed in the same way by the census commissary in the case of a census district, by the reviewer for the municipality, and the district summary was prepared by the appropriate district office. The survey form contained the name of the settlement-municipality, the number of houses, the number of residential parties (households), and the number of persons enrolled. The number of nationals (provincial) and the number of persons by ethnic group were further sorted according to the same headings as the aforementioned census sheet. Seven columns were set aside for religion, which, when summarised, were superscripted consecutively from the most numerous religions in the village.

An instruction manual was also prepared and compiled by the Regional Office. It was clearly based on the experience of the preceding interwar censuses, therefore, in terms of the prepared event methodology, there were no significant changes compared to the interwar censuses.³⁹⁰ The commissary and the reviewers were therefore appointed by the district office. The same duties remained with them.

The instructions stipulated to start the field rounds at 8:00 a.m. and, as in previous censuses, the data recording was to be carried out first with persons who did not have a residence or lived in mobile homes (e.g. the nomadic Roma population). Also, during this census, it was forbidden to summon the population at one place, e.g. at school, at municipal office, for the purpose of a sequential counting. In the case of businesses, institutions, but also in hotels, inns, etc., only the owner and the persons who permanently resided in these establishments had to be registered. Guests had not to be counted at all. This also applied to sick people in hospitals who were treated there temporarily. Persons who were temporarily absent had to be registered at the place of permanent residence. Therefore, the census counting officer had to ascertain in each household whether such household members were absent in order to enter them on the census sheet. Soldiers in attendance were also considered to be temporarily absent. Similarly, prisoners had to be counted at the place of instead of prison. Only life convicts, who were counted in prisons, had the prison as their place of residence.

Even before the beginning of the field data collection, the Regional Office in Bratislava sent an explanatory circular, in which it specified in particular the problematic points of the whole census action, such as the enrolment of the

³⁹⁰ ŠAKE, f. ObvNÚ Rejdová, box No. 11, signature No. 1727/1938; f. ObvNÚ Roštár, box Administrative 1937-1939, signature No. 1500/1938.

soldiers of the present duty, including those who came from the Czech lands, but also the way of counting the persons who had the right of domicile in the occupied territory,³⁹¹ since many persons fled from the occupied territories towards Slovakia. Due to the validity of the permanent residence principle, the census also covered soldiers on active duty, but not soldiers originating from the Czech Republic. These had not to be counted by the commissars. Persons who were of Slovak nationality but resided in the occupied parts of Slovakia what to be counted as nationals of Slovakia, since according to the instruction they were considered to be nationals of the country of Slovakia. However, if they were of a different nationality, they had to be registered as nationals of the country from which they came. This also applied to persons of Czech nationality, for example.

In addition to life prisoners, the instructions to the census commissaries regarded emigrants in particular as permanently distant persons.³⁹² As the entire census had to be carried out on a single day, it was also possible that the census counting officer could not find anyone in the house/apartment who could provide the data to fill in the census sheet. In this case, the instructions required the Commissary to ascertain at least the name of the absent head of the household. This was undoubtedly one of the most problematic points of the 1938 county census and a consequence of the unannounced census action.

The data were recorded by the Census Counting Officer on the basis of information provided by the landlord, who also provided data on minors under 14 years of age. Other persons self-reported their data. As in previous inter-war censuses, the census commissary had the right to ask for supporting documents for the individual data recorded.

The head of the household was counted as first, followed by his wife, companion, children according to age, and other relatives and subordinates. If the dwelling had several households, they were counted consecutively, with the households separated in the conscription sheet by a distinctive line. Personal data were recorded according to the personal documents and papers submitted. For married women, the maiden's name was also recorded. The nationality (country) was entered by a single comma in the box. In order to verify the nationality, it was necessary to check the home certificate, citizenship certificate or passport. If a counted person did not have the possibility to prove the nationality, the instructions allowed that it could be entered also according to the person's direct declaration and thus without direct checking. This was equally to the detriment of the quality of the results and related to the public's lack of information about the census event. Only those who had the right of domicile in Slovakia could be counted as Slovak citizens.

The nationality of the population was declared. The head of the household declared it for himself and the immature children up to 14 years of age, the others declared their nationality separately. According to the instruction, the nationality could be only one and had to be entered, as a rule, according to the

³⁹¹ Circular No. 396.001/2a-1938 of the Regional Office. ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Rejdová, box No. 11, signature No. 1127/1938.

³⁹² Ibidem, signature No. 1727/1938.

mother language. Thus, the definition from the last census was adopted. Another nationality could only be entered if the person did not speak the mother language either in his or her family or household and was fully proficient in and used the language of another nationality." *The Jews could always admit the Jewish nationality. Gypsies have the Gypsy nationality.*" If someone reported two nationalities or none, they were counted according to their mother language. The instruction also took over the possible appeals process for stating a nationality that the census commissary considered incorrect. In the event of a problem with the nationality, the matter was referred to the appropriate district office, which, after hearing the counting officer, decided on the nationality to be entered. However, there was no appeal against this decision.

The religious denomination was written with the appropriate abbreviation, and it could be a state-recognised or non-recognised church.

After canvassing the assigned census area, which had to be counted in one day, the census counting officer filled out a census area summary. If the area was identical to a municipality, the municipal summary was sent directly to the municipality. On the next day, it had to be handed over, together with the census material, to the reviewer, who, according to the instructions, was already a competent notary.

The instructions to the reviewer focused primarily on inspection activities, which covered not only the census material handed in and its completeness, but also the inspection of rounds and the proper performance of the Census Commissary duties. For that purpose, he also had the same rights as the census counting officer, including the possibility of making enquiries of the population, where he presented his identity card. He had to have 3 days after the census material was handed in to carry out the revision work, and his task was to compile municipal surveys on the basis of the zone surveys. The compiled summaries and the checked census material were handed over by the reviewers to the respective district offices. There, in turn, the district surveys were compiled and submitted to the Regional Office by January 08, 1939. The census material had to be retained by the district chairmen at the district offices and secured by them.

Implementation and results of the provincial inventory

The whole census event bore the marks of improvisation. In fact, only a few days before the start of data collection, active preparations began at the regional level. However, this was not officially communicated publicly but carefully concealed. The circulars that were sent from the Regional Office or the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the district offices, and from there on to the notariats, were headed "*strictly confidential or urgently – confidential*".

The Regional Office in Bratislava, on behalf of the Slovak Government, announced the census by its circular of December 23, 1938. It was addressed to the district offices and the notary office in Bratislava.³⁹³ The circular contained a note that the circular could only be officially recorded on December 30, 1938. As the main objective of this provincial census, it stated the establishment of a cadastre of

³⁹³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938.

nationalities, as a result of which it was necessary to ascertain the exact number of inhabitants of the Slovak lands, its structure according to nationality and religion, and its state-civic characteristics. The district offices had to bear the entire burden of the census action. The census action confidentiality was so important that even the census material was printed secretly in the *Unia* and *Novina* printing houses. The census material was distributed to the district offices practically only in the last week of December, to each of them in two special packages, marked with “...the conspicuous word ‘Elections’...”. If any district did not receive the packages by December 28, they had to report it immediately by telephone to the county office.

Upon arrival, the census material had to be immediately sorted for each municipality and sent to the notary offices along with the notices, which had to remain sealed so that the day of the census preparation remained secret. Practically from that moment on, the initiative was taken by the individual district offices, which continued to organize the census work at the lowest level.

How was the country inventory prepared in a classified mode? We will use several examples, especially from the territorially affected southern regions of Slovakia, from the Revúca district and the newly created Dobšiná district, which was created from the northern part of the former Rožňava district (Tišliar 2008a:139–148; 2008c:75–87). The southern part of the region with the district town was occupied by Hungary after the Vienna Arbitration. The district chairman in Dobšiná with his notary office ensured the preparation and implementation of the census action only in the last week of December. In a circular dated December 27, 1938, he addressed basic instructions on preparations and organizational work to the notaries.³⁹⁴ In the neighbouring Revúca district, preparations began in a similar way, but here the district chairman also issued an order to the notaries to revise the house numbers. He asked them on December 23, 1938 without mentioning any census. The notaries had to provide complete lists of the houses of each village, which the district office simply needed. “*The matter is very serious, you must indeed sacrifice your Christmas rest, but I am convinced that you will gratefully do so for your Slovak nation. The purpose of making these lists is confidential, and it will be communicated to you subsequently.*”³⁹⁵ The selection of the census commissaries was left entirely in the hands of the notaries by the district chairman of Dobšiná. The census had to be carried out by “...local reliable Slovak intellectuals who know the local conditions and the language of the local population.”³⁹⁶ In the circular, the Regional Office mentioned the possibility of using local teachers, officials, and academics in particular.³⁹⁷ Thus, no lists of census commissaries were prepared even 4 days before the planned census implementation. The census commissaries had to take an official oath to carry out

³⁹⁴ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Betliari (Municipal Notary Office in Betliar) (f. ObvNÚ Betliar), box No. 11, signature No. 2430/1938 adm.; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Rožňavskom Bystrom (Municipal Notary Office in Rožňavské Bystré), 1903–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Rožňavské Bystré), administrative box 1938–1939, signature No. 2108/1938.

³⁹⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938.

³⁹⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Roštár, administrative box 1937–1939, signature No. 1500/1938.

³⁹⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938.

the census duly and conscientiously. The District Chairman further demanded that the counting districts be so formed that they could be bypassed in one day, since the census had to be taken only on December 31, 1938. The revisors were, by virtue of their office, notaries public, whom the District Chairman actually appointed by this circular. The forms (ordinances, municipal summaries and official permits) were still being prepared by the District Office and the notaries were asked to add the names of the commissaries to the permits and to hand them over to them when they took the oath of office. Other forms, instructions and conscription sheets had been issued to the notaries earlier, but “...keep these ordinances until December 30, so that the census date may not be disclosed in advance.”³⁹⁸ The notaries had to summon the mayors of the villages in the afternoon on December 30, to instruct them about the whole action and hand them the decrees, which they were then to post in the village on the morning of December 31, and “drum up” their contents. The mayors were in charge to assist the census commissaries if necessary. Until December 30, the notaries had not been allowed to instruct the individual commissaries on the forthcoming provincial census and to hand them all the forms. At the same time, it was their duty as reviewers to send the checked census material to the District Office by January 03, 1939.

As soon as the census was completed, the district authorities had to report to the regional authorities by January 02, 1939 whether the census had been properly conducted and to report on its progress. The audited and processed district summaries had to be submitted by January 08, 1939, in particular with the following summary data listed exhaustively: number of households, number of inhabitants, number of persons belonging to each state (country), number of persons of each nationality and number of persons belonging to churches.³⁹⁹

Despite the fact that no major incident occurred during the actual course of the event, the census results were published only in general terms and, in particular, incompletely. As the census material remained with the district offices and was not gathered for special processing, its fate was more or less sealed. At present, only a torso of the census material can be found in the branches of the state archives. As the census sheets and summaries were no longer handled, some of them have been lost over the years, and later only selected parts of the census sheets were left in the archives for display.⁴⁰⁰

In terms of results, only aggregate data for districts were published in 1939. The primary purpose of compiling a national cadastre was thus not fulfilled, primarily for political reasons. This was mainly due to the reaction of the political leaders of the Deutsche Partei, led by Franz Karmasin, who objected to the results and did not acknowledge them (Schvarc et al. 2008:547–550). Therefore, in order to avoid conflict, the data remained only in the form of district summaries and were published as a part of the lexicon of the ceded settlements of Slovakia in 1939.⁴⁰¹ The results were never completed at the municipal level. Only a list of

³⁹⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Roštár, administrative box 1937–1939, signature No. 1500/1938.

³⁹⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938.

⁴⁰⁰ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. f. OÚ Dobšiná, boxes No. 2 and 3.

⁴⁰¹ *Územie a obyvateľstvo Slovenskej republiky a prehľad obcí odstúpených Nemecku, Maďarsku a Poľsku*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1939, pp. 8–17.

villages with more than 20% minorities was compiled.⁴⁰² However, it was not published and served only for the needs of Slovak ministries.

The state borders between Czechoslovakia (Slovakia) and Hungary were not definitively established by the arbitration in Vienna. From the end of 1938, the border demarcation works were carried out slowly and later, with the end of the Czechoslovak Republic, when a short military conflict between Slovakia and Hungary broke out (the so-called *Small War*), the state borders were again significantly changed. The changes affected a number of municipalities or their cadastres, which is why, as early as in April 1939, the Regional Office in Bratislava asked selected border districts to prepare a supplement to the 1938 regional census. At first, it was probably considered to properly supplement the data with new rounds in the municipalities concerned, but in the end the Regional Office only asked the districts to supplement the nationality cadastre on the basis of the 1930 census results by nationality and religion.⁴⁰³

In 1939 and 1940, the 1938 national census was only ever positively evaluated by the central authorities, and the national results compared to the 1930 census were always seen as realistic.⁴⁰⁴ The decline of the German minority compared to the 1930 census, which was also criticised by F. Karmasin, was mainly due to the fact that the 1930 census also included serving soldiers from the western part of Czechoslovakia, among whom were also members of the German minority. However, the results were not in favor of the Ruthenian population either. Already on January 28, 1939, the Ruthenian (Russian) National Council from Prešov sent an official protest to the autonomous Slovak government, in which they described the results of this census as not only surprising, but certainly incorrect. *“Although we did not consider the statistics of 1930 to be fair, according to which the number of Ruthenians in Slovakia reached 95,000, nevertheless we had not considered the fact that the census of December 31, 1938 would reduce the number even further to 79,000.”* Thus they protested with the usual argumentation that this was mainly the result of the deployment of Slovak commissaries in the Russian villages, some of them allegedly did not even ask about the nationality, but entered it directly on the sheets, or persuaded people to declare their Slovak nationality, etc. *“As a result of such work, there are 79,000 Ruthenians in Slovakia, although there are 200,000 Eastern Orthodox Catholics and Orthodox church affiliates together in Slovakia.”* The complaint was therefore investigated in the affected mixed districts of north-eastern and eastern Slovakia. Direct pressure in the districts was refused. In their reports, the district chairmen were more inclined to the Ruthenian unawareness, which might have caused the registration of a different nationality somewhere. They deployed census commissaries mostly of Slovak or Ruthenian (Russian) nationality. The district chairman in Sobrance stated that he did not entrust local parish priests and teachers of Ruthenian nationality with the function of census commissaries, but foreign persons who were *“politically and nationally impartial”*. He justified the numerous agitations, when it was from these people that the identification

⁴⁰² SNA, f. ÚPVSR, box No. 110, signature No. 361/1939.

⁴⁰³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938.

⁴⁰⁴ SNA, f. ÚPVSR, box No. 110, signature No. 361/1939.

of nationality and religion was frequent. Possible issues were admitted by the district chairmen in Bardejov, Medzilaborce and Prešov, where some inhabitants could also confuse the census commissaries. The Prešov district chairman stated that some Eastern Orthodox Catholics said they were "Slovaks", which could also have confused the commissaries, who entered Slovak nationality. In all districts, however, they rejected the direct conflation of Eastern Orthodox Catholics and Ruthenians as a false claim, which, although circulated among the population, especially from the church environment, was not actually true. From the district reports, the case of the Spišská Stara Ves district appears to be more troublesome. In the local village of Osturňa, the census counted 1,348 inhabitants in 1930, thereof 1,270 were Eastern Orthodox Catholics and 51 Ruthenians. In 1938, however, the results were different. Out of a total of 1,537 persons, 1,453 were Eastern Orthodox Catholics and 299 Ruthenians. In 1921 and 1930, the majority of the population declared Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality. The district chairman stated in his report that the population spoke the native Goral dialect. According to the census commissaries testimony, persons were self-confessing their Slovak nationality until their children returned from school. Subsequently, people began to declare Ruthenian nationality, and some of them even asked to correct their already registered nationality to Ruthenian in the afternoon on the same day. According to the report, the Eastern Orthodox Catholic parish priest Petrašovič is said to have sent the children home with a message for the parents to declare Ruthenian nationality. Thus, in the afternoon, several persons demanded redress, but the commissaries refused to do it since they understood the situation. After the end of the census, the aforementioned priest also complained to the district office. This example also shows that various forms of agitation and influence peddling could not be completely eliminated. However, these were probably rather isolated cases.

In the Stará Ľubovňa district, it was necessary to explain to the inhabitants what nationality was, as they often reported the "Rusňacke" (Ruthenian) religion. The district chairman therefore stated in his report that a number of inhabitants perceived nationality as synonymous with religion. After explaining that some people spoke Slovak, others Ruthenian, they began to list so-and-so nationality. The district chairman from Stropkov also complained about the ignorance of the nationality meaning and expression, "*...they declared Slovak nationality concurrently with the Ruthenian, finally they do not know that the census commissary should enter, based on his decision*". He therefore did not exclude possible related shortcomings. However, he mentioned that the local population had been "*intensively instructed*" by the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church that every Eastern Orthodox Catholic was a Ruthenian.

Although we do not have data for all municipalities, at least a list of those that showed more than 20% representation of persons belonging to national minorities has been preserved. The list was probably prepared for the needs of the language law and officialdom. We have purposely and in detail analysed the data for the Snina district, with which the problems were already solved in the 1930 census (A. Boháč) by rewriting the data without revision. In his report, the

district chairman hinted at the problems when he linked the declaration of Slovak nationality with the situation in Ruthenia. The latter had been largely occupied by Hungary in the same way by the Vienna Arbitration. However, the change of name to Carpathian Ukraine and the accession of Augustin Voloshin also changed the attitude of the local population of Snina towards the possible whole region annexation to Carpathian Ukraine. According to the district chairman, *"...the census commissaries cleverly made it clear to the population that the purpose of the census was unknown to them, but it was possible that this had to serve as the basis for some kind of plebiscite. The population of the Ruthenian nationality, especially at the eastern borders of the district, out of fear of perhaps falling into Ruthenia, where the Ukrainian direction ruled at that time, preferred to declare themselves Slovaks in order to document that the district was Slovak and that they did not want to fall into Ruthenia, where the Ukrainian direction, which they hated, reigned."* From the above, it is clear that neither completely independent nor correct action was taken, and the population was at least partly misled and deliberately disoriented. According to this statement, 38.03% of the persons were of Ruthenian nationality in the Snina district in 1938, while according to the census sheets, less than 30% were Ruthenian in 1930. Based on the census sheets, these results are thus rather close to the data from 1930. For the sake of completeness, the list with a higher representation of minorities also mentioned the municipality of Dúbrava, where, according to the new results, 188 persons of Ruthenian nationality (46%) and 217 of Slovak nationality (53%) resided permanently.⁴⁰⁵ However, the source did not provide data for Ruská Bystrá, as it apparently did not even statistically show a minority population share above 20% (!) in 1938. After the cession of several municipalities from the Snina district to Hungary in spring 1939, which also meant a decrease in the population by more than half (from 36,474 to 14,976 persons), the share of the Ruthenian population in this region decreased to less than 24%.⁴⁰⁶

It results from the above that even the attempt to completely prevent national agitation and thus to determine selected characteristics of the population on the basis of a "sudden" census was not perfect and had its negatives. Firstly, by not announcing the census in time, a part of the population was probably not included at all, despite the New Year's Eve day which the data collection fell on. Inadequate briefing of the commissaries and their quick selection certainly also had a negative impact on the results. While some district chairmen also selected with the existence of minorities in mind, others went their own way and selected 'impartial' people who did not seem to know the local community at all. In some places the selection was left entirely to individual notaries, who by virtue of their office were straightforwardly reviewers. In any case, however, the public administration certainly demonstrated its readiness even for a properly planned census, which had already begun to be discussed in the course of 1939, all the more so as the state-law situation in Slovakia had also changed after the dissolution of the Czechoslovak Republic.

⁴⁰⁵ SNA, f. ÚPVSR, box No. 110, signature No. 361/1939.

⁴⁰⁶ Územie a obyvateľstvo Slovenskej republiky..., p. 10-11.

Census 1940

Slovakia, which had been territorially sourced by significant territorial losses at the end of 1938, underwent further significant changes in the following period. Undoubtedly the most significant was the break-up of Czecho-Slovakia, which took place in March 1939. The new state formation enacted a constitution in July 1939 and officially came to be known as the Slovak Republic. From its beginnings, this state formation was built primarily on the authoritarian basis. Jozef Tiso became a President and the HSLŠ was the main and basic political platform.

A few days after the proclamation of the Slovak state, neighbouring Hungary also occupied the rest of the Carpathian Ukraine and in a minor conflict with Slovakia (the so-called *Small War*), which took place on March 23–24, 1939, Hungary also occupied some parts of eastern and north-eastern Slovakia with 1,670 km², where approximately 40 thsd. people lived. The population of the region comprised approx. 40,000 inhabitants. The armistice was officially declared in April 1939 (Cséfalvay 2007:241–250; Mičianik 2007:251–267; Tulkisová et al. 2007:124–156). Foreign policy-wise, the new state formation existed only as a German satellite, completely dependent and subordinate to Germany in several crucial areas on the basis of the treaty of protection (Baka 2018:36).

Domestic politics became progressively more radical in many respects, and some of its elements were directly reflected in the next census, which took place in 1940. Although the country census was successfully carried out at the end of 1938, as early as 1939 voices began to be heard asking whether Slovakia should not prepare for a new and more detail census. This should at least try to supplement the recently obtained data from 1938 and update some of them. There were several arguments at once, and all of them were certainly important. First of all, there was the data incompleteness from the provincial census, which specifically monitored nationality. Important statistical data for the economic, population and social policy of the new state were completely absent.⁴⁰⁷ At the same time, a new public administration reform was being prepared, which was necessary in view of the extensive territorial changes. On that occasion, the idea of reform did not remain only on the adjustment of administrative boundaries, but also touched the administrative system (Tišliar 2013:107). The new county structure had to come in force on January 01, 1940.

The performance of the statistical service⁴⁰⁸ necessary for the new state operation was taken over by the National Statistical Office in Bratislava, which

⁴⁰⁷ Do konca roka má byť prvé sčítanie ľudu. In: *Slovenská pravda*, October 05, 1940, p. 3; also in detail SNA, f. Kancelária prezidenta Slovenskej republiky (Office of the President of the Slovak Republic), 1939–1945 (f. KPR), box No. 23, signature No. 9303/40. Explanatory report to the governmental draft law on the 1940 census.

⁴⁰⁸ The statistical service and its scope were defined by Act No. 330/1940 Coll. which was commented on during 1940. SNA, f. KPR, box No. 23, signature No. 10024/1940.

was established on April 12, 1939.⁴⁰⁹ It took over all the tasks of the interwar Prague Statistical Office, including the planning and organization of subsequent statistical actions. Therefore, the idea of a new census was already developing and maturing in this office, which eventually prepared and organised it in cooperation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The creation of the Slovak Statistical Office wasn't the only more important prerequisite for the new census, but also the effort to legally anchor the nationality of the population, based on the Constitutional Law of 1939. These ideas, which had already emerged in the second half of the 1930s, gradually began to crystallize into the new preparation of the national cadastre. Although the nationality cadastre did not ultimately materialize, there is no doubt that some of its components influenced the forthcoming 1940 census, especially the understanding of nationality.

Draft national cadastre

The concept of nationality, which was being prepared for the next census, was particularly peculiar in its attempt at legal anchoring, which had been directly contemplated practically since the end of 1938 already in direct connection with the provincial census. This idea did not disappear, but moved on to the next stage of its development. The national cadastre became active in 1939 and 1940, which directly related to the adoption of the new constitution. A part thereof was also dedicated to national groups, and the principle of their registration was adopted. Although the term "nationality register" was initially proposed, the designation nationality cadastre was eventually adopted. The Constitution allowed the population to freely declare the nationality.⁴¹⁰ The nationality cadastre had to be established to register nationalities and the constitutional law referred its implementation to the enactment of a special law.⁴¹¹ Therefore, intensive work was done on the outline of this law during 1939, as well as in the first half of 1940, which would put the nationality cadastre in question into practical life.⁴¹² However, it was ultimately not implemented (Brandes et al. 1999:88). However, it did somehow stimulate the interest in selected parts of the new census, since it was this census that had to provide the necessary data to form the basis of the national cadastre.

The Prime Minister Office, which became more deeply involved in the discussion of the nature of the nationality cadastre in the early 1940s, defined the cadastre objectives as "*...that there should be legal certainty about nationality, that the status of nationality should be ascertained and fixed and applied to all consequences wherever the exercise of the rights and duties of citizens is dependent on their nationality.*"⁴¹³ Meanwhile, the Prime Minister Office did not link the objective of the cadastre to

⁴⁰⁹ Government Decree 58/1939 Sl. z.

⁴¹⁰ Slovak Parliament, 1st term, 1st session, Parliamentary Press 20 [online, March 29, 2023] <<https://www.nrsr.sk/dl/Browser/Document?documentId=21>>

⁴¹¹ Act No. 185/1939 Sl. z., §§ 91–95.

⁴¹² SNA, f. KPR, box No. 15, signature No. 735/1940.

⁴¹³ Ibidem, signature No. 543/6a-1940.

residence, but proposed to link the ascertainment of nationalities in the cadastre to the periodic population censuses in perpetuity.

The basis for the discussions was the governmental draft law on the nationality cadastre and on the protection of the Slovak citizens' nationality, which has been revised, supplemented and commented on among the ministries several times. There were up to 5 versions of the draft law and three inter-departmental comments were made. Census definition of nationality and the use of language is of particular interest from the perspective of the 1940 Census, as it was practically reflected in the basic methodology of the census. The draft was based on a constitutional law and allowed a citizen to freely declare his nationality. However, this was generally to be tied to the mother language and could only exceptionally correspond to the community language. The vernacular language was the language commonly used by a person in his or her home environment and did not have to correspond to his or her mother language. However, the draft bill limited the communicative language to a minimum of three years of use in the family environment and perfect knowledge of it. Nationality was thus linked to the mother language as a matter of priority. The Jewish population was an exception to these criteria, as the draft law explicitly stated, with reference to the Governmental Decree 63/1939 Coll. which defined "the term Jew", that Jews could only declare their Jewish nationality. In any case, this was a significant shift from the interwar understanding of Jewish nationality. In previous censuses, Jews had the option, but not the obligation, to declare Jewish nationality. This was undoubtedly a consequence of many foreign policy changes, which were also more pronounced in the internal politics of Slovakia. It was mainly the influence of Nazi, but also fascist propaganda, which was gaining ground here. They also resulted in the gradual persecution of the Jewish and Roma population. The Jews were gradually deprived of their rights, property and dignity by the adoption of various legislative regulations, culminating in the later adoption and application of the racial principle.

Another exception to the 1940 censorship rules was the Roma population that could only claim Gypsy nationality. In doing so, a person was considered a "Gypsy" if both parents were "*members of the Gypsy race*" who also lived in a nomadic or settled manner but "*avoided work*".⁴¹⁴ This rather ambiguous definition was later criticised by the Statistical Office as non-functional.

The forthcoming national cadastre had to be governed by fairly clear rules. The nationality of children under 18 was determined by their parents, the illegitimate by their mother, different by their father. However, the draft law also allowed nationality to be determined by the mother if the father agreed with it. On separation, nationality had to be determined according to the acknowledgement of custody. This was to be checked by the Census Commissary on the basis of the documents submitted. Changes of nationality could take place after the death of one of the spouses, when the other one was of a different nationality and requested the change for his children, as in the case of separation and acknowledgement of upbringing. A person who reached the age of 18 could change his or her

⁴¹⁴ SNA, f. KPR, box No. 15, signature No. 13200/1940-8.

nationality as registered in the nationality cadastre, but could do so through the District Office, and only once in a lifetime.

Originally, civil registry offices were proposed as liaison points of the national cadastre, which was subsequently changed in a further proposal to county offices. Initially, it was considered that nationality would become directly a part of the civil registry. In further course of time, District Offices were again discussed, until finally the Statistical Office appeared. In particular, the Prime Minister Office advocated the use of civil registry records in which nationality would be entered directly after a child birth.

In terms of the realistic form, one of the last proposals stated that the cadastre should be made up of a card file of the of living state citizens nationality certificates and the registered nationality should have a universally binding character. The census had to be used to establish the nationality of the citizens. Particular idea was that on the decisive date, the district authorities, with the help of the census commissaries, would collect the necessary data from the population at the same time as the census was being carried out. The first such survey had to be linked to the 1940 census.

As a part of the census rounds, the census counting officers were apparently supposed to fill in the nationality sheets in addition to filling in the census sheets. These had to contain the basic details of the counted person, name and surname, date of birth, place of birth, municipality, district of residence and house number, religion, mother language and nationality. This meant that both characteristics were to be separately ascertained, which was undoubtedly a neck forward. In the case of a person over the age of 18, the nationality certificate had also to contain his or her signature. If it was a younger person, the form was signed by his or her legal representative. Here, too, if suspicions arose that an incorrect nationality has been entered, the district office had to have the competence to deal with them.

After the census was completed, an entry in the national cadastre of a newborn children was up to the registry offices. They had to issue nationality certificates continuously, simultaneously with the registration of the birth in the civil registry. The state registrar had to fill in the nationality sheet at the same time as the census birth certificate and submit both to the Statistical Office. The nationality had to be certified in this way by the Statistical Office with a certificate of nationality. If the registrar was in doubt about the nationality recorded, he could contact the District Office in the same way as the census counting officer during the census. The bill also contained a penalty section for breaching of the rules, deliberate misrepresentation, etc.

The second part of the proposed law dealt with the protection of nationalities. Any purposeful recognition of another nationality and its misuse for political, economic and cultural purposes was considered an offence. It was considered an offence in order to persuade or abet the misuse of a nationality.⁴¹⁵

The basic principles of defining nationality, on which the draft law was based, were translated directly into the methodology of the forthcoming 1940 census. The preparation of the law wording on the nationality cadastre was thus in a

⁴¹⁵ SNA, f. KPR, box No. 15, signature No. 22335/Ic-1940.

way a precursor to the 1940 census, which it also directly mentioned. As late as in September 1940, the circulars for the creation of the national cadastre mentioned the nationality lists as a part of the census and awaited the approval of the law.⁴¹⁶

Preparation of the 1940 census

Direct preparations for a new census in Slovakia began in the spring of 1939 with revisions of the house lists.⁴¹⁷ The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic even envisaged that a detail census would probably take place during 1939. The reason for this was seen mainly in the extensive territorial changes, as others had also occurred in the spring of 1939.⁴¹⁸ In the end, this did not happen and the census was postponed until 1940, in an attempt to coordinate it first with the creation of the aforementioned national cadastre. New revisions of house numbers in the notary districts therefore also started in the summer months of 1940.⁴¹⁹

In the preparatory process, the legislative framework of the census was first and foremost addressed. A new law on the census was adopted by the Slovak Parliament in October 1940.⁴²⁰ It confirmed the 10-year periods of subsequent census actions and abolished the validity of the previous legislation in this area.⁴²¹ Nevertheless, the continuity of the inter-war censuses was deliberately preserved, as evidenced by the explanatory memorandum to the Census Act.⁴²² This was also confirmed by the Presidium of the Slovak Supreme Court in the inter-departmental annotation procedure.⁴²³ The Statistical Office, which organised the census, was the main player in the census, carrying it out with the help of the public administration and processing its results. The law also mentioned the

⁴¹⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Lubeníku (Municipal Notary Office in Lubeník), 1914–1944 (ObvNÚ Lubeník), administrative box 1940, unsigned, unorganised archive fund; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Slavošovciach (Municipal Notary Office in Slavošovce), 1914–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce), box No. 17, signature No. 4508/1940; f. OÚ Dobšiná, box No. 65, signature No. D-1732/1944.

⁴¹⁷ Ibidem; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1939–1940, unsigned, unorganised archive fund. House numbers were revised for the first time in February and March 1939 on the basis of Ministry of Internal Affairs circular No. 2388/IV/7-1939 dated February 25, 1939.

⁴¹⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Revúcej (Municipal Notary Office in Revúca), 1937–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Revúca), Presidential box 1939–1945, signature No. 48/1939 pres., unorganised archive fund.

⁴¹⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Sirku (Municipal Notary Office in Sirk), 1907–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Sirk), administrative box 1934, 1940, 1946–1947, signature No. 1712/1940.

⁴²⁰ SNA, f. KPR, box No. 23, signature No. 9304/1940; SNA, f. Ministerstvo zahraničných vecí Slovenskej republiky (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic), 1939–1945 (f. MZV), box No. 13, signature No. 7664/40. Initially, it was only envisaged to adopt the act that would cover the upcoming census terms as well. Therefore, the original draft included the decisive moment of midnight from December 01 to December 02, 1940, which again can also be described as a direct continuation of the 1930 census.

⁴²¹ § 1 of Act No. 265/1940 Coll.; Snem schválil zákon o sčítaní ľudu : Sčítanie ľudu bude každých 10 rokov – Prvé sa prevedie do konca roku 1940. In: *Slovenská pravda*, October 10, 1940, p. 2.

⁴²² SNA, f. KPR, box No. 23, signature No. 9303/40.

⁴²³ Ibidem, signature No. Pres 1020/40.

functions of census commissaries and auditors. The State was responsible for financing the census. Already in the budget approved at the end of 1939, special appropriation of 800 thsd. Slovak crowns (SKK) was made as a part of the funds allocated to the Ministry of Internal Affairs for the census.⁴²⁴ This was though insufficient funding. In fact, the Statistical Office required more than 1.8 million SKK for this event, with additional funds for the printing of forms, census sheets and logistics.⁴²⁵ As there were not enough additional funds in the 1940 budget, the census financial settlement stretched far into 1941, and many debts had to be covered from their budgets not only by the District Offices, but also, to a large extent, by the municipalities.⁴²⁶ The municipalities were obliged by the Census Act to cooperate gratuitously and to make their premises and officials available for this purpose.⁴²⁷

The law was followed by a Government Decree that specified the date or the decisive moment of the census. It was set at midnight from December 14 to December 15, 1940. The regulation also specified the role of the census commissaries and auditors.⁴²⁸ The continuity and inspiration of the inter-war censuses can also be seen in the preparation of the census of houses and dwellings, which had to be carried out at the same time as the population census.⁴²⁹

The continuity of the census action is also confirmed by the implementation of the census, which was mainly linked to the work of the district and notary offices. The latter were responsible for the creation of census districts, the list of candidates for census commissaries and reviewers, as well as their instruction.⁴³⁰ A new element in the census was the involvement of the county offices, which were responsible for appointing the county auditors involved in the auditing activity. The revision activity was rounded off by the Auditor General, who was assigned to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and cooperated with the Statistical Office (Tišliar 2015:4).

Traditionally, census commissaries were selected mainly from among officials and teachers aware of the local conditions. They were appointed by the district chairmen and, as in previous censuses, took the oath of office.⁴³¹ On appointment, they were given an appointment decree and an official permit.⁴³² It was recommended that census commissaries be deployed in the census districts, taking into account linguistic proficiency, as a direct interpreter was forbidden.⁴³³

⁴²⁴ Act No. 343/1939 Sl. z. Annex A, Group I.

⁴²⁵ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1880, signature No. 1359/41; box No. 1885, signature No. 55590/41.

⁴²⁶ § 4 of Act No. 265/1940 Coll.; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, unsigned, unorganised fund; SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1882, signature No. 18469/41; box No. 1882, signature No. 19608/41, box No. 1885, signature No. 59650/41.

⁴²⁷ § 4 of Act No. 265/1940 Coll.

⁴²⁸ § 4 Government Decree 270/1940 Coll.

⁴²⁹ *Ibidem*, § 3. Initially, December 01, 1940 was considered, and here we can see a continuity with the previous census of 1930, which took place on December 01. SNA, f. MZV, box No. 13, signature No. 7664/40.

⁴³⁰ Government Decree No. 270/1940 Coll.

⁴³¹ *Ibidem*, § 4.

⁴³² *Ibidem*, § 8.

⁴³³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, unsigned, unorganised fund.

Census districts were set smaller than in the interwar censuses. A zone had generally to consist of about 70 houses in which about 350 people lived. The limit for the maximum zone was 100 houses and the minimum was 40 per a census counting officer.⁴³⁴ It was assumed that in small zones of about 50 houses and 200–250 inhabitants, the census counting officer's rounds should take approx. 3 days, or 4 days per 70 houses. For larger numbers of houses the number of days was increased, namely: 5 days for 90 houses and 6 days for more than 90 houses. The number of days, as well as the nature of the census zone, was then used to allocate the census commissary pay.⁴³⁵

The counting was done by conscription sheets, i.e. the same as in previous censuses. The census counting officer entered the data in the sheets. Unlike the interwar censuses, the 1940 census also required the signature of the head of the household on each census sheet. If he was illiterate, he substituted his fingerprint for his signature.⁴³⁶

The auditors, who were mainly responsible for checking the sheets and drawing up the municipal reports, were mainly teachers, but in some places also notaries.⁴³⁷

Since the 1940 census followed the interwar census and declared mostly continuity, the features and characteristics that formed the basis of the census were largely identical to the 1930 census. Thus, the main personal data were collected: name and surname, date of birth, marital status, nationality, nationality, religion, occupation, literacy, place of birth, and permanent or temporary residence. The relationship to the head of the household was also indicated in the conscription sheets.⁴³⁸ Omitted were data on marital and illegitimate fertility, as well as physical defects and data on possible relocation. The Bureau of Statistics planned to include fertility data again only in the 1950 census. This is indicated in the explanatory memorandum to the Census Act, where it was stated that data from 1930 were still sufficient for statistical purposes. These, as we have mentioned, were not published until the late 1930s. We assume that the omission of fertility was also due to the technical and time-consuming nature of the results processing, since the data had to be processed in groups, purged of persons who were not married or cohabiting. The Statistical Office planned to obtain fertility information by combining data from the 1930 census with data obtained by the Statistical Service on the natural change of the population. For information on physical defects, the organizers argued for a layman's approach and a lack of expert judgement. Finally, omitted data for migration were identified as minor, not differing much from birthplace.

The only problematic item in the census was, virtually again, nationality. As the Nationality Registration Act failed to be passed, the 1940 census ultimately

⁴³⁴ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40; SNA, f. Sčítanie ľudu 1940 (f. SL 1940); ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Dobšiná, box No. 65, signature No. D-1732/1944.

⁴³⁵ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1880, signature No. 1359/41.

⁴³⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, unsigned, unorganised fund.

⁴³⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Revúca, box No. 34, signature No. 1671/1938 pres.; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Muráň, administrative box 1940–1941, signature No. 3802/1940.

⁴³⁸ SNA, f. MZV, box No. 13, signature No. 7664/40.

failed to prepare and use the nationality lists. On the other hand, however, the principle of considering nationality in conjunction with mother language was adopted. Under certain conditions, the vernacular language, i.e. the language used in normal daily contact, was eventually acceptable. In principle, this was a continuation of the approach of the 1938 provincial census. What was different, however, was the segregation of the two population groups, Jewish and Roma. The principle of compulsory registration was taken from the forthcoming draft law on the national cadastre. The explanatory memorandum explained the measure against the Jewish population by saying that in the past it wasn't possible to obtain: "...a satisfactory overview of the number of Jews and the social stratification of the Jewish population. It is therefore expedient, in view of the regulations on Jews, to adjust their registration obligation."⁴³⁹ Thus, Jewish nationality had to be registered by every person who was of the Jewish faith, as well as by all those who converted to another faith. Persons who had at least one parent of the Jewish faith, as well as those who had married or cohabited with a person of the Jewish faith and their descendants, were also required to register their Jewish nationality.⁴⁴⁰ Similarly, there was an effort to compulsorily register the Gypsy nationality. A vague definition of the Gypsy nationality was used, which figured in the nationality cadastre but also became an official wording of the decree of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.⁴⁴¹ As it was an ambiguous definition, practically unusable, the Statistical Office abandoned this part of the census methodology just before the census was carried out.⁴⁴²

The nationality of children up to the age of 18 was recorded according to their parents and in accordance with the principles on which the aforementioned national cadastre had to be based.⁴⁴³

Census counting officers and reviewers should rely on detail work instructions. These contained not only the full text of the law and Government Decrees on the census, but especially more detail instructions on what to include when filling in the sheets.⁴⁴⁴ In many respects, these instructions were identical to those of the last interwar census. Commissaries and reviewers were protected by law during

⁴³⁹ SNA, f. KPR, box No. 23, signature No. 9304/1940, explanatory memorandum to § 4 of the government proposal.

⁴⁴⁰ § 1 Government Decree 63/1939 Coll. on the definition of the concept of a Jew and guidelines for the headcount of the Jews in certain liberal professions.

⁴⁴¹ Decree of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic No. 18.635-Ic/1940, implementing § 9 of the Regulation with the force of Act No. 130/1940 Coll. dated May 29, 1940 on the temporary regulation of the labour obligations of Jews and Gypsies.

⁴⁴² Staráme sa, aby sčítanie ľudu bolo čo najdokonalejšie : Práva a povinnosti majiteľa bytu – Národnosť Cigánov. In *Slovenská pravda*, December 15, 1940, p. 3: "...The term Gypsy as defined in the Ministry of Internal Affairs dated June 18, 1940, No. 18635-Ic/1940, quoted on page 21 of the Instruction according to the local authority's circular No. 1230/I-40 dated November 30, 1940, does not apply to the census..."; the districts received this information at the end of November 1940. ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, unsigned, unorganised fund, circular No. 1223/40-I dated November 30, 1940 of the State Statistical Office in Bratislava.

⁴⁴³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1940, unsigned unorganised archive fund.

⁴⁴⁴ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1940, unsigned unorganised archive fund.

fulfilment of their duties, had to maintain confidentiality and to protect the census material.

The sheets and instructions were given to the Commissaries in advance from the notary offices together with a template sheet.⁴⁴⁵ In addition to the template, the census counting officer received the conscription and house sheets, instructions, a list of house numbers and an overview of the census district. In addition, census guest slips were prepared and addressed by the District Offices to the respective owners, lessees or managers of hotels, inns, etc., between December 8 and 12. They filled these by themselves. The census counting officer then filled in a census sheet on the basis of these tickets.

Commissaries were advised to walk their assigned census zone prior to the counting, noting mobile and distressed dwellings, and those not listed on the house list. They had also to check the registration of hotels. The sequence of the count, with the homeless, those in mobile home had to start going round the houses and followed according to the instructions. When they encountered an empty flat/house, they had to at least enter the names and surnames of the persons who were not temporarily staying in them on the conscription sheet and, if necessary, find out where they were during the counting. These were so-called temporarily absent persons for whom Section II of the census sheet was defined. However, overnight address of these persons should have been entered in Section I of the census sheet. People who were temporarily absent were mainly counted among those who were travelling for work, even seasonal work. Persons abroad who intended to return were also to be entered in the second section. So, there was a shift from the previous census. It also concerned, for example, the assessment of prisoners who were recorded as permanently absent, that is, those who were not recorded on the sheet at their place of residence but in the prison. Soldiers on army duty were registered at their respective garrisons. This also applied to gendarmes (former gendarmes). If they were on duty at the decisive moment, they were counted in the garrisons. If they were on a leave or living away from the garrison, they were counted wherever they were. Only the population present at the decisive moment was recorded on the sheets in the first section. Thus, the pattern of previous scheduled censuses was continued instead of the 1938 provincial census, which recorded only the resident population. Exempted from the census were the members of the German Reich Defense Forces in the protection zone in Záhorie, where, according to the treaty on the protection ratio, German soldiers had been stationed since the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. These, although present, were not counted, even outside the perimeter of the protection zone. However, this did not apply to their family members.⁴⁴⁶

It was forbidden to write abbreviations of gender, nationality, nationality, occupation and position in the profession.

⁴⁴⁵ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1940, unsigned unorganised archive fund.

⁴⁴⁶ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Kameňany, administrative box 1939-1940, signature No. 3388/1940.

The census had to run from December 15 to December 21, and, where justified, until Christmas.⁴⁴⁷ After the commissaries had handed over the census sheets to the reviewers, which was scheduled for December 28, 1940 at the latest, the inspection and compilation of the surveys began. As a rule, the district commissary for his district, the municipal revisor, prepared the district returns, checking not only the contents of the census and house sheets but all the census material handed in, including the permit handing in. The revisor had the same powers and duties as in previous censuses. The revision had to take no more than a week and the municipal returns had to be completed and handed in no later than on January 04, 1941 to the designated office. As a rule, these were municipal or district notaries.

1940 Census Forms

The census and house sheets represented the basic census material. The census sheet, which was also in German, was filled in per a household/apartment. In the first section, persons were recorded starting with the head of the household, through the spouse and children according to age. Subsequently, any other members of the household, including subordinates, were entered. If more than one family lived in the dwelling, they were not separated, but the new family started again with its head. The hierarchy of possible multiple households in one dwelling was also established in more detail. The household of the owner of the flat had to be counted first, then the households of his children, other relatives and finally the households in subletting. They were separated by horizontal lines. Relationship of the landlord to each person counted was given.

In other columns, personal data, gender, date of birth, and marital status were recorded. If the date of birth was unknown, the age in completed years was given and a note was made to this effect.

In the following sections, contained in the conscription sheet, the place of birth was recorded, which not only indicated the municipality, but also required the district or state if the person was a foreigner. Because commas were prohibited and various abbreviations were considered problematic, the census counting officer indicated "yes" or "no" verbally to some questions on the form. This also applied to permanent residence in the municipality concerned. In the case of immigration, the year in which the person moved to the municipality was given.

Nationality was associated, as in previous censuses, mainly with home affiliation. Therefore, all persons who had a home nationality before the Slovak State foundation (March 14, 1939) and applied for citizenship before April 17, 1940, even if they had not had the decision yet, should have been enrolled with Slovak nationality. Regarding the members of German nationality who were of Czechoslovak nationality before the division of the Czechoslovak Republic and had not acquired the Slovak citizenship by March 21, 1940, they should have acquired it provided that they had been domiciled in the territory of the Slovak Republic until October 10, 1938 or since March 14, 1939.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁷ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Muráň, box Administrative 1940–1941, signature No. 3802/1940.

⁴⁴⁸ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40.

Nationality was the following question on the conscription sheet, which we have already discussed. Religion remained in its previous form, where it was permitted to use the established abbreviations. However, the case of writing without denomination has dropped out of the instructions. The literacy of the population, filled in with the words 'reads and writes', 'reads only', 'does not read and write', remained unchanged. It was surveyed in the same way from the age of 6.

The census also collected data on the occupation of the population. It was divided into major and minor. The main occupation was defined as the main occupation from which the means of subsistence were derived. Occupation was added in the form of occupational status (e.g. worker, self-employed, etc.), with an indication of the employer and the specific industry. The occupation was not to be confused with the enterprise. For the unemployed, the last occupation was given. Here again, the inspiration of the 1930 census is apparent, and it also covered the more problematic groups of pensioners, rentiers, i.e. persons who were not gainfully employed but received some kind of income. For housewives, the column on occupation was left blank as they were dependent on their husband earnings. The same procedure was followed for children. In addition to the main occupation, secondary occupations were also declared on the census sheets.⁴⁴⁹ Only one secondary occupation could be listed, according to the amount of income. In the case of a secondary occupation, the name and location of the establishment were also entered, where, for example, in the case of students, the name of the school was entered. The branch of occupation specified the activity of the enterprise, e.g. furniture manufacture, iron ore mining, etc.

The house sheet represented the second basic form, which had to be filled out by the census counting officer for every house, even if it was unoccupied. The house sheet was simple in form and was a kind of cover for the conscription sheets representing the individual flats/apartments within the house. The conscription sheets were inserted into the house sheet after the counting was completed. The header provided basic details of the dwelling, the number of the counted house and the number of sheets inserted. Inside, the census counting officer filled in the details of the owner of the house, his occupation, share of ownership of the house (going in order from the largest owner), and the owner's residence. In addition to these details, basic information about the house was given, the number of dwellings, occupied, vacant, house building date (an approximation was sufficient), basic building material, roof material, and information about any remodeling after 1920. On the right inner part of the house sheet, the owners of the flats, or tenants, were recorded, with information on whether the flat was occupied, unoccupied or vacant. It also included an indication of the number of people present, specifically how many of them were Jews, and the last column was used for remarks.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40.

⁴⁵⁰ SNA, f. SL 1940, census and house sheets, box No. 373, Town Dobšiná; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1940, unsigned, unorganised archive fund.

The summaries began with an overview of the census zone/municipality. The only difference between them was the preprint of the name and the difference in the header, where the Commissary signed for the zone and the reviewer for the municipality. These summaries included the name of the settlement, the house nomenclature number, or the name of the street, the type of dwelling, the name and surname of the owner of the house, the house occupancy, the number of dwellings in the house, the number of persons present, how many of them were Jews, and remarks.

In addition to these main forms, instructions for census commissaries and reviewers were printed, which included the legal standards that governed the census. We have already mentioned the permits which were given to the census commissaries and reviewers for the census period.

The course of the 1940 census

The census implementation was practically in the hands of the District Offices. On December 12–14, 1940, the latter had the census officially announced (drummed up) through the notary offices, and at the same time proclamations were posted in the villages.⁴⁵¹ The population was not only notified by means of the proclamations, but the press also dealt with the forthcoming census throughout more or less the whole of the second half of 1940. Technically and administratively, we have no information about the emergence of a major problem. Recording of nationalities presented the expected complications, with occasional complaints about census commissaries regarding their inability to speak the minority language. But the opposite was also the case. Census commissaries also lodged complaints with the district authorities on suspicion of giving false information.⁴⁵² This was mainly due to ignorance of the language of the nationality to which the person claimed to belong. A number of complaints was preserved, received by the Ministry of Internal Affairs as a part of appeals and additional investigations. Some of them had an international impact, so we will deal with them at least briefly.

A larger number of complaints had to be dealt with by the District Office in Malacky. This was a district located in the Záhorie region, in the German protection zone. This is probably why the local national issues attracted more attention. Eighteen persons lodged a complaint in Malacky. In four cases, however, a bigger problem arose when, as a part of its investigations, the district authority found that the persons who declared German nationality did not speak German. Thus, according to the census rules, these persons could not be of German nationality. By special measures, the District Office decided on their Slovak nationality, since they could only speak Slovak. It did not take long, however, for the German embassy to object to this decision and to submit a verbal note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic, in which it strongly demanded the whole matter to be investigated. The investigation did not reveal any wrongdoing on the part of the District Office. On the contrary, the correct procedure was followed and so

⁴⁵¹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ, Kameňany, administrative box 1939–1940, signature No. 3388/1940.

⁴⁵² SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1883, signature No. 23891/41.

was the result. However, the pressure from the German side still persisted. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs eventually asked the Ministry of Internal Affairs to make the change. *“The District Office in Malacky did not realize that racial affiliation to a certain nation is not dependent on knowledge of its language. The racial affiliation of the complainers is undoubted, since they are all descend of German fathers, as their undisputed German names indicate. The instructions issued for the census provide for complete freedom for each counted person to declare his nationality, which is in no way dependent on the language narrated by the person concerned. The District Office has based its reasoning on spurious praemis, and it has therefore happened that it has taken ‘mother language’ as the basis for determining nationalities, a concept which in no way satisfies the ‘völkish’ (folk) principle.”* There was thus a change in the registration of nationality, and the aforementioned complainers, who, although they did not speak German, were recognised as members of the German nationality.⁴⁵³

The complaint of Ján Progner from Nižný Medzev in eastern Slovakia represented another case. He demanded that not only he, but also other inhabitants of Medzev should be registered as Hungarians. The region of Medzev and Štós was one of the ethnically diverse areas. There was a large German minority, the so-called Mantaks, but the Hungarian and Slovak population was also more numerous. After the Vienna Arbitration, which affected this region as well, Nižný Medzev was practically on the new Slovak-Hungarian border. As it was a more ethnically problematic region, the Ministry of Internal Affairs had already begun to take an active interest in the local and cultural situation before the census. According to the report drawn up by the local commander of the *Hlinkova garda* (Hlinka Guard)⁴⁵⁴, in 1930 2,072 people declared German nationality, 240 of Hungarian nationality and 245 of Slovak nationality in Nižný Medzev. The rest of the inhabitants belonged to other nationalities. At the time of the regional census at the end of 1938, however, only 480 persons were counted as German, but as many as 1,900 persons as Hungarian and 220 persons as Slovak. According to the local commander of the Hlinka Guard, this was directly related to the changes in the Slovak-Hungarian borders and the population mood.⁴⁵⁵ Although this turnover was certainly one of the more significant in Slovakia, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Regional Office did not include the village of Nižný Medzev among the settlements with more than 20% minority at all after the 1938 census.⁴⁵⁶

When J. Progner’s complaint was dealt with by the District Office in Gelnica, it confirmed his German nationality, since according to the results of the investigation, German and also his mother language were his most frequently used languages. The district chief stated that *“everyone spoke Manx (Mantak) at home”*, i.e. German.⁴⁵⁷ However, Progner appealed and also complained to

⁴⁵³ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1883, signature No. 23891/41. Letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Ministry of Internal Affairs dated March 27, 1941.

⁴⁵⁴ Hliková garda (Hlinka guard) was the militia maintained by the Slovak People’s Party in the period from 1938 to 1945.

⁴⁵⁵ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 701, signature No. 3593/1940.

⁴⁵⁶ SNA, f. MZV, box No. 163, signature No. 51509/40.

⁴⁵⁷ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1882, signature No. 18880/1941.

President Tisza. He complained that he had performed as a chairman of the local Hungarian Party in Medzev for 12 years, which had up to 800 other members. So the investigation continued and the district chairman from Gelnica confirmed that there were about 200 people actively involved in the activities of the local Hungarian Party in Nižný Medzev.⁴⁵⁸ However, he described the others as Mantaks, i.e. Germans. His report also suggests a probable reason for the change of nationality, which was related to propaganda. This was spread among the population and supposedly encouraged people to declare their Hungarian nationality, which could eventually lead to the whole region being annexed to Hungary. In that connection, the district chairman mentioned that some 200 people had left for Hungary in the course of 1939. The results of the 1940 census once again confirmed the dominance of the German population, with 1,835 people in Nižný Medzev registering their German nationality. The Hungarian minority was represented by 216 census takers (Tišliar 2011c:76). J. Prognér was finally granted Hungarian nationality by the decision of the County Office in Ružomberok.⁴⁵⁹

Changes in the ethnic structure of the population in the region probably had a political background. The disagreement of the local Manty population with the policies of the Deutsche Partei probably played a role. This manifested itself, among other things, in the pro-Hungarian orientation of the population, but also in the attempted assassination of the party's chairman, Franz Karmasin (Schvarc 2007:42-50). Effectively targeted Hungarian propaganda also contributed to the pro-Hungarian sentiment, the basic idea of which was the annexation of southern Spiš to Hungary (Hetényi 2011:51).⁴⁶⁰

János Esterházy, the chairman of the Hungarian Party in Slovakia, also complained to the chairman of the Slovak government, Vojtech Tuka, in May 1941. According to his claims, as many as 1147 persons were not granted Hungarian nationality in the census. The district authorities supposedly established their Slovak or German nationality (Hetényi 2007:106-107). However, we do not know how this complaint turned out.

In spite of the above cases, it can be stated that the overall course of the 1940 censorship was peaceful and without any major disturbances.

At the beginning of 1941 there was an additional, supplementary census, which lasted until January 20, 1941. The aim was to register also those persons who were in Slovakia on December 15, 1940, but for various reasons they were not included in the census sheets.⁴⁶¹ The census did not use census and house sheets, but a simple form containing all the census questions was prepared. The only practical difference was that the completed form was signed by the district/

⁴⁵⁸ SNA, f. MVSR, box No. 1882, signature No. 18880/1941, Report of the District Chairman, March 22, 1941.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibidem, signature No. 18880/1941.

⁴⁶⁰ It was the area of Štós and Medzev. "Pro-Hungarian" Germans also lived in the vicinity of Smolník.

⁴⁶¹ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. OÚ Dobšiná, box No. 65, signature No. D-1732/1944; Predbežné výsledky sčítania ľudu : Slovenská republika má okolo 2,653.564 obyvateľov - V Bratislave žije 138.000 ľudí - Slovenské mestá podľa veľkosti. In: *Slovenská pravda*, March 23, 1941, p. 1.

municipal notary along with the counting officer. It was the notary's offices that were entrusted with the additional census from January 02, 1941.⁴⁶² They had until January 31, 1941 to send the records of the additional census to the relevant District Offices, which in turn had to send the census material to the Statistical Office until February 10, 1941.⁴⁶³ The collected census material was gradually collected from the districts for further detailed evaluation and processing at the Statistical Office.

Results of the 1940 census and its comparison with the results of census 1938

The census material has been preserved in good condition. It is stored in the Slovak National Archives and is available for researchers. It has been digitised in the same way as the previous census of 1930.⁴⁶⁴

However, the 1940 census has not yet been comprehensively processed. At first, preliminary results were published, which were released by the Statistical Office in March 1941.⁴⁶⁵ They did not take into account the persons from the supplementary census. The preliminary results contained only a few basic data, the numbers of inhabitants, houses and dwellings present and the number of persons of Jewish nationality. During World War II, some results for municipalities were still published in the form of a lexicon of settlements. However, the latter contained only the population headcount from the census.⁴⁶⁶ However, it was designed as an administrative lexicon, to which, in addition to the population figures from the 1910, 1930 and 1940 censuses, data on the area and number of houses were added. These data were supplemented at the municipal level with administrative information: the affiliation to the notary's office, the post, telegraph and telephone offices, the railway station (stop) and its distance from the municipality in kilometres, the parish office, the gendarmerie station, and the health district.

By the end of the war, no further data had been published. It can be assumed that, as in 1939 with the results of the provincial census, the reason for the delay of some of the results was the fear of the German political leadership response in Slovakia (Schvarc 2009:65), as well as the fear of the publication of sensitive and detail statistical information in the economic, social, etc. field.

At present, we have the results of the 1940 census available in the form of statistical files, but these are only selected characteristics, whether at the municipal or regional level, and some more comprehensive only for the whole

⁴⁶² ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce, box No. 17, signature No. 4508/40.

⁴⁶³ ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Lubeník, administrative box 1939–1940, unsigned, unorganised archive fund; ŠAKE, p. Rožňava, f. ObvNÚ Muráň, box administrative, signature No. 3802/1940.

⁴⁶⁴ SNA, f. SĽ 1940, [online, 13.6.2023] <<https://www.minv.sk/?scitacie-harky>>.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibidem; also in more detail in *Štatistické zprávy*, No. 6, vol. II/1941, Series A, 1.; *Predbežné výsledky sčítania ľudu...*, p. 1.

⁴⁶⁶ *Lexikón obcí Slovenskej republiky*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1942.

of the then Slovak Republic.⁴⁶⁷ After the end of World War II, more detail data on the occupation of the population were published, which were not published by the Statistical Office until 1948.⁴⁶⁸ In 1947, the age and gender structure and summary data for the economic activity of the population were published. It is likely, therefore, that the data were gradually compiled by the Statistical Office but deliberately not published. Indeed, it is apparent from the preserved sets of census sheets that basic statistical methods were used to comprehensively process the results of the 1940 census on the basis of the agreed rules.⁴⁶⁹

Further census results can thus probably only be obtained by working with census sheets, preserved municipal surveys and further archival research. Thus, data from the ethnic structure of the population have been published in detail tables and statistical cartograms at the municipal level. (Tišliar 2011c; Čéplö et al. 2016)

The results of the 1938 and 1940 censuses are significantly different from the interwar Czechoslovak censuses. We have already mentioned that these censuses were organised on a considerably reduced territory of current Slovakia. The 1938/1939 territorial changes meant the withdrawal of the predominantly ethnically diverse parts of Slovakia, which was reflected not only in the overall change in the population, but also, and most visibly, in the completely different proportions of various nationalities. In particular, the proportion of persons of Hungarian, but also of Ruthenian nationality, decreased significantly. On the contrary, the proportion of Jewish and Gypsy nationalities increased. While the Jewish nationality was the result of an obligation, the compulsory recording of the Gypsy nationality was abolished on the eve of the 1940 census, but in many regions the census commissaries tried to observe it. The higher difference between the 1938 and 1940 censuses was also mainly due to territorial changes, when Hungary occupied not only other villages in the south of Slovakia in the spring of 1939, but also the eastern border belt, where approximately 39,000 Gypsies lived. The population of the border region reached 39 thsd. inhabitants.

⁴⁶⁷ *Zprávy Štátneho plánovacieho a štatistického úradu 1946*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1946; *Štatistická príručka Slovenska 1947*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1947; *Štatistická príručka Slovenska 1948*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1948; SNA, f. Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1945–1951 (1952), box No. 1, unsigned.

⁴⁶⁸ *Sčítanie ľudu na Slovensku zo dňa 15. XII. 1940: príslušnosť prítomného obyvateľstva k povolaniu podľa okresov, obcí a tried povolania*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1948.

⁴⁶⁹ The marks on the sheets were used in accordance with the methodology and processing principles according to: *Systematický a abecedný soznam povolání a návod na vyznačovanie sčítania ľudu 1940*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1942.

Table 6: Overview of the Czechoslovak population and its structure by nationality in Slovakia according to the results of the 1919–1940 census (Šprocha and Tišliar, 2012a:155).

Year*	Population	Nationality				
		Slovak (Czechoslovak)	Hungarian	German	Ruthenian	Other**
1919	2.923,214	1.954,446	689,565	143,466	81,332	54,405
1921	2.955,998	2.013,675	634,827	139,880	85,628	81,987
1930	3.254,189	2.345,909	571,988	147,501	91,079	97,712
1938	2.656,426	2.338,382	57,897	128,347	69,106	62,694
1940	2.591,368	2.244,264	45,880	130,192	61,270	109,762
%						
1919	100	66.9	23.6	4.9	2.8	1.9
1921	100	68.1	21.5	4.7	2.9	2.8
1930	100	72.1	17.6	4.5	2.8	3.0
1938	100	88.0	2.2	4.8	2.6	2.4
1940	100	86.6	1.8	5.0	2.4	4.2

* The data are for the population of Czechoslovak (Slovak) nationals; for 1921 not Ruthenian, but Great Russian, Ukrainian and Ruthenian nationality, in 1930 Russian and Malorussian, in 1938 again Ruthenian, in 1940 Ukrainian; data from 1938 and 1940 only for the then territory of Slovakia. In 1938 there were 77,488 Czechs and in 1940 were only 3,253. We counted these persons as of Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality.

** Included mainly Jewish and Gypsy nationality.

Civil population census 1946

The WWII, as well as the first post-war months dramatically affected the entire society in Slovakia, causing a few acute problems. However, resolving the problems has often been hindered by lack of quality and mainly timely data. Information related to certain economic and social structures of population turned out to be of crucial importance. (Jureček 1951:7*). Considering huge war changes at population of Czechoslovakia and significant time that has passed from the preceding census in 1930, or limited territorial extent of census in 1940, respectively, the data couldn't be considered supportive. As added by Jureček (1951:7*), further major changes and territorial movements of population have been in progress in Czechoslovakia, which has remarkably complicated the situation, and neither the Statistical Office nor other central authorities were able to implement the complex census within such a short period of time. Moreover, the plans were made already at that time on the next Czechoslovak census to be organised in 1950 (Fajfr and Sekera, 1951:3*). Thus, a compromise was made in the form of organizing two independent censuses implemented separately in Czechia and in Slovakia. Their main goal was to satisfy the most urgent needs for timely information in the selected area. In Czechia, census should gather especially the information about age and profession of the population, required for preparation of the Act of Retirement Savings. Behind the census in Slovakia, there were efforts for gathering information about current labor market situation, mainly in the context of required mobilization and redistribution of labor forces in certain professions (mainly selected craft guilds). Moreover, register of supplies for the population should be précised within the census. While German people have been displaced and the state border regions populated during 1947 in Czechia, census implementation was postponed to May 1947 (Jureček, 1951:7*). Upon agreement between the State Planning and Statistical Office and the Committee for Nutrition and Supplies, the census was held from September 23 till October 04, 1946. As added by Z. Jureček (1951:7*), *“both of them were ‘infants’ of the era that required fast and prompt solution and fairly preferred improvisation to long-term preparation and considerations.”*

Census preparation

The first impulse associated with census in Slovakia in 1946 came from the Planning Department of the State Planning and Statistical Office in Bratislava. Certain actual data for labor market organizations were required that weren't available and it was necessary to find out how to obtain them. As stated above, organization of a new census was impossible and an alternative solution should be found. Following mutual consultations and agreement with the Committee for Nutrition and Supplies, it was decided to organize a special census that

would provide for required information and concurrently also more precise register of population with provided supplies. It was one of main reasons why the census was implemented under control of the Committee for Nutrition and Supplies instead of the State Planning and Statistical Office. Regulation No. 168/1946 dated September 17, 1946 about Register of Population with Provided Supplies represented a legislative basis for census implementation. According to the Regulation, holders of the supply cards (permits) or other documents that entitled persons to food vouchers (mainly landlords) were obliged to buy, to have the card "Register of Population with Provided Supplies" filled in and deliver it to the local National Committees' offices according to their permanent address. This administrative act should be done within period from September 23 till October 04, 1946. Those who failed to fill in and deliver the census sheet were subject to sanction in the form of rejected food vouchers. Pursuant to additionally issued directives to the above stated Regulation (see Kriška 1947:V-VII), we can say that practically no territorial preparation had preceded the data gathering. The census was implemented without revision of house nomenclature numbers, the list of settlements and creation of census zones (counties). The absence of census commissaries and controllers represented another specific feature that distinguished this census from regular censuses. Gathering of data and check of the gathered data was fully in charge of officers from the local National Committees. This census distinguished from the others also with the people's obligation to show up at competent offices and deliver the census sheets, contrary to regular census when the census sheets were distributed by census commissaries to the households. Thus, we can exaggerate, saying that the census didn't come to people but people were forced to go for census.

Census content and its implementation

Preparation of census in Slovakia in 1946 was significantly curtailed. Compilation of the census sheets' content and their direct distribution from the printing company to particular supply departments of local National Committees represented the basis of the census. Census sheets had to be picked up and filled in within period from September 23 till October 04, 1946. Anyway, no decisive moment was determined to which the data should be gathered. Affected bodies of local National Committees had to ensure at that time that every independent household received and was enabled to deliver its census sheet. This process was preceded by a brief information campaign spread by "usual" information channels of particular local National Committees.

Persons subject to census whose data should be entered on the census sheet had to be the members of a common household where they have had regular meals. They weren't only family relatives but also menials supported (nurtured) by the employer/landlord (Jureček, 1951:10*). On the other hand, persons that weren't present in the household during period of census implementation because of employment, study, etc., weren't entered on the census sheet. Those persons were obliged to fill in the census sheet at the current place of stay or in the household where they received boarding. Completely different situation applied

to persons absent in the household as a result of temporary leave, hospitalization or stay in a therapeutic facility. Such persons had to be mandatorily entered on the census sheets of households where they had received boarding before the leave. However, the census didn't cover the entire present population of Slovakia. Persons subject to mass supplies and especially those that were not entitled to food vouchers weren't included in the census.

Considering the practical census implementation method, we cannot speak of either present or residing population. Administrative conscription of persons, according to their affiliation to food permits that one or another household was entitled to, was a decisive factor. Taking in account the need for prompt gathering of certain specific data, the census content was much curtailed. All persons were at first entered on the census sheet at the National Committee (ordered from the oldest down to the youngest ones) to whom the food vouchers were distributed in particular food permit. Thus, the number of entered persons had to equal to the number stated in the food permit and it was checked out by the National Committee officer. The officer then marked the census sheet issuance in the register of persons with provided supplies. Accordingly, it was possible to identify the number and particular persons that refrained from census, or the number of census sheets that weren't returned with filled in data. The lists of not entered persons were prepared by each National Committee upon the census ending and the lists were sent to the Committee for Nutrition and Supplies (Jureček, 1951:10*).

Along with particular person's order No., name and surname, required data included the birth date, family status, profession (accomplished education), company type at which the person is employed and the form of employment. Pursuant to census instruction, profession was interpreted as such that particular person studied, instead of profession discharged at the time of census. On the other hand, company should be specified according to actual status so as industrial branch could be identified in which the person worked, as well as his/her position in the company. If a person was unemployed at the time of census, it should be explicitly stated on the census sheet.

Such filled in census sheets had to be delivered to the National Committee within due deadline, and the authorised officer of the National Committee entered this fact in the file. All collected census sheets were ordered by National Committee officers according to streets and house nomenclature numbers. Such ordered census material was then sent to the Distribution Department at the Committee for Nutrition and Supplies in Bratislava till October 07, 1946.

Thus, special census related to population with provided supplies distinguished from regular planned censuses also with no partial actions implemented during the census material processing. Since no census zones (counties) were created within the preparation work, no overviews applicable to such units were prepared. Subsequently, county and district overviews weren't either prepared and the whole "raw" census material was automatically sent to central processing after collecting and sorting out. The absence of subordinate actions was substantiated with lower data priority about number of persons in villages

or districts. According to central authorities, these actions were rather sufficiently and timely covered by the register of distributed food vouchers. Thus, primarily the structural characteristics of population were of key importance since these couldn't be obtained without central processing.

Publishing of census results

Material from census was machine - processed through punch cards and it had allowed to rather quickly started publishing the first basic data from census (quickly for the time being). The data were published as a file by the State planning and Statistical Office in the summer 1947 as a source work named: *Povolanie obyvateľstva na Slovensku podľa súpisu civilného obyvateľstva zo dňa 4. októbra 1946* (Profession of Population in Slovakia Based on Civil Population Census dated October 04, 1946). The publication was divided in two basic blocks. The first block contained data about population structure according to profession classes and groups, in combination with gender and main age groups. The second block contained data about relation of the persons to employment and position of persons active in the profession in selected craft guilds (types of employment). In both cases, the data were published for entire Slovakia and also for particular Slovak districts.

However, it was necessary to wait for a longer time for publishing of further data. It was issued under sponsorship of the State Statistical Office in 1951 under name: *Soupis obyvatelstva v Československu v letech 1946 a 1947* (Censuses in Czechoslovakia during Years 1946 and 1947). As resulted from the name, the source work contained the data from both post-war censuses that were organised independently in Slovakia and in Czechia. It had also caused the delay but the main reason referred to the new administrative division of Czechoslovakia effective from February 01, 1949 and the efforts for provision of definite data from the censuses in the new form. This, however, required sorting out the material from censuses again according to newly established regions and districts. The publication is divided in 28 main tables and 3 additional tables that gradually cover all identified elements in both censuses. Considering more extensive content of the post-war census in Czechia, not all tables deal also with territory and population of Slovakia.

National census 1950

Demand for timely and as precise as possible data didn't end in Czechoslovakia either in years 1946 and 1947. Failed provision of information from all required areas by the post-war censuses also posed a problem since the censuses didn't cover the whole present population in Slovakia and they were characterised with a few specifics in the terms of preparation and implementation. It was decided before that regular and planned census should be traditionally organised in the year ending with zero. Moreover, conscription of houses and flat was added to census held in 1950 and surprisingly also conscription of agricultural, industrial and trade factories.

Primary goal of census 1950 was to deliver the most precise possible data about population, its new distribution and social structure, and to empirically capture all historical changes at displacement, migration and re-emigration that occurred after year 1945. Moreover, the census results should represent an irreplaceable database for the development of population movement review between particular censuses that, along with natural migration elements, included demographic statistics of migration since 1950 (Kučera, 1987:212). In the line with huge importance of such jointly gathered data especially for economic plan and the uniformity of overall implementation together with various types of conscriptions, census received the attribute "national".

Census preparation work

National census referred to Act No. 47 Coll. on Census dated March 17, 1927, and the Governmental Regulation No. 224 Coll. on Census and Related Conscriptions (On National Census) in 1950, dated October 18, 1949. In this way, the Government had to determine the census term in the Regulation, as well as the data that should be subject to census, the census implementation method and associated conscriptions. At the governmental session dated June 22, 1948, the Government made final decision on the census term in year 1950 associated with conscription of industrial factories. Along with, the Government authorised the Central Planning Committee to prepare the grounds for the census.

Originally, the census term should have been on December 01. It was reasoned with minimum population movement during winter months, which represented an important factor to ensure precise and complete census based on the present persons at the census locations (Kučera, 1987: 212). As stated by Kučera (1987), the national census date should be adapted to that fact because of prevailing idea of purposeful joining of national census with other conscriptions, taking also in account the farmer's cultures land conscription that has always been held in spring. Thus, the decisive census moment was determined in midnight from February 28 to March 01, 1950. Subsequently, the Central Planning Committee

created a basic scheme of the Governmental Regulation on Census, and authorised the State Statistical Office to prepare the package of census sheets and submit it to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Accordingly, the Ministry of Internal Affairs prepared the final version of the Governmental Regulation No. 224 Coll. on Census and Related Conscriptations (On National Census) in 1950.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs commenced the preparation work in the form of published circular on March 08, 1949, ordering thereby the local and central national committees to conduct house nomenclature numbers review. The review served as the database for compilation of the records of house nomenclature numbers, serving to district national committees for preparation of the list of census locations in September 1949.

Further important preparation work included demarcation of census zones. Detail description of census zones then represented an aid for field data gathering by the census commissaries, their appointment and allocation of census controllers, each in charge of a few zones. As stated in the Governmental Decree No. 224 Coll. On National Census from 1949, such offices could be discharged only by a person with Czechoslovak citizenship, older than 18 years of age, unimpeachable, providing for guarantee of fulfilling a task assigned in a correct, timely and proper manner. If there were no serious reasons preventing from such office, every person authorised to perform as a census commissary or controller had to accept the office at his/her area of residence. The office of census commissary and controller was a public office. When discharging this office, the persons appointed, similar to other public officials, had protection guaranteed in compliance with applicable penal regulations. Before assuming the office, every census commissary and controller received an official permit that allowed them to enter a real estate where the census was conducted. The census commissaries and controllers were authorised to require insight in personal ID and other documents in order to check out and verify the data stated therein. These officials were entitled to financial reward for discharge of the office from the district national committees, in the amount corresponding to the extent and nature of the tasks assigned. The census commissaries and controllers, as well as representatives of regional and district national committees, and regional and district statistical offices had to pass specialised trainings.

Census forms had been printed and delivered to the regional and district national committees from January till the mid February 1950. Considering the nature of national census, they were mainly the forms associated with particular conscriptions, and forms for census and conscription of houses and flats.

In relation to census 1950 implementation, order and penal provisions were determined. All persons included in the census implementation, especially the census and control authorities, were strictly obliged to keep confidential all private matters and conditions of persons subject to census, and information related to companies and industrial factories. Breach of this obligation as well as misuse of the data gathered within census were subject to punishment; so was a deliberate statement of false data and other deliberate acting that endangered the census complexity and correctness. It mainly included the cases when somebody

successfully avoided census, have him/herself counted in for more than once or insisted on other persons to declare false data, caused artificial migration of population or counted in the material from one to another village, or encouraged persons to do such restricted acts. It was also restricted to physically visit houses, flats and industrial factories in order to offer his/her services related to filling in the census forms/sheets, eventually to influence in whatever manner the persons subject to census so as they have them counted in at presence of a third (foreign) person. Similarly, it was restricted to deliver various flyers, representations along with census forms/sheets, and to use printings that weren't intended to be delivered for census purposes. Provided that the restrictions breaches weren't classified as a criminal act, sanction could be levied up to 5,000 CZK. In case of bad debt, detaining threatened up to 3 months of duration. In case of more serious breach, sanction could reach 10,000 CZK.

Concept of data gathering about houses, flats and persons

The conscription of all houses in the territory of Czechoslovakia was held for the first time during national census in 1950. House sheet represented the basis thereof. It was filled in per every house nomenclature number. If more than one residential real-estates were included in a single nomenclature number, they had to be entered on a single house sheet. All residential houses were subject to census, regardless somebody living therein or not. A building whose at least two thirds of built-up area was intended for residential purposes represented a residential house. House sheets were filled in also for various specific types of habitation objects (trucks, vessels, cowsheds, cottages), provided that somebody stayed therein overnight at the decisive moment (midnight from February 28 to March 01, 1950).

House owner or his/her authorised representative had to fill in the house sheet. District national committees weren't competent to specify villages/towns in which the census commissaries had right to fill in the whole census sheets. They were obliged to do it if the house sheets weren't completely filled in or if the house owner or his/her authorised representative didn't fill them at all.

Localization data were filled in every house sheet heading, namely: district, county, village, settlement, municipality or quartier, house number, etc. The next section contained data about the real estate owner: name, surname, profession, company/office/institution name and address where he/she worked at. If it was a house under national control, name, surname and address of national administrator should be entered.

Type of residential premises or main purpose of the building was specified in the next section of the sheet: family house, residential house, hotel, hospital, almshouse, school, etc. Afterwards the list of all residential buildings built on the land lot with the same nomenclature number was included therein. Every detached building that served to residential purposes had to be included in the list (regardless persons staying therein at the time of census, if any), as well as any other building where somebody stayed in overnight at the decisive moment (midnight from February 28 to March 01, 1950). Detached building was

understood as every freely standing construction or a construction that was separated from another one with fire protection wall.

Subsequently, each one building entered in the list (in order) had to be specified in detail on the census sheet. For example, it should be specified whether it was building with tenants, hospital pavilion, hotel, barracks, school, etc. Furthermore, it had to be defined whether it is a detached building or the one structurally interconnected with another building/s. Every building should specify number of floors without basement, cellar and attic. Regarding the building fittings, gas and water conduits and electricity cabling had to be entered on the sheet within census 1950, as well as central/other type/heating, elevator (personal or freight). Information was also required about branch line to the street sewer from the building and missing connection to sewer had to be explicitly declared. Number of flats should be stated per each building, number of residential facilities or companies (e.g. hotels, hostels, boarding schools, monasteries, dormitories for singles, barracks, almshouses, hospitals and other therapeutic facilities, prisons, gulags, etc.), and total number of other rooms.

In case of other rooms, it had to be specified on the house sheet whether they were offices, trade and similar rooms, workshops, production and other premises and total number of these rooms in the building.

The second and third page of the house sheet contained data related to particular flats identified in the building or buildings with the same house nomenclature number. Residential room or a set of rooms were defined as a flat.

Name and surname of flat owner or flat user was filled in per each flat. Subsequently, census commissary had to determine the owner's social status as of March 01, 1950. Required data included obligation to specify whether a trade or profession was performed in the flat and if yes, trade or profession/craft had to be specified. The census commissary had to identify the headcount of persons present in the flat and number of all households. Rented households and tenants should be stated separately. If a flat was vacant at the time of census, this fact was entered on the sheet including the reason thereof.

In the next section, the flat owner had to specify the flat status; i.e. information whether he/she lives in the flat included in his/her own house, if he/she is a member of housing cooperative owning the flat that he/she lives in, evtl. if it is a rented flat. If they were rented flats and flats owned by the housing cooperative, the amount of rental payment including all charges settled during 1949 should be specified. These items were differentiated to rental payment for flat, municipal allowances and charges, charges associated with housekeeping, central heating, hot water, house lighting system, phone cabling, etc.

The flat position was determined according to location of the flat within the house (e.g. cellar flat, basement flat, ground floor flat, flat located on the first, second floor, on the attic, etc.). The next question related to the existence of common residential premises with other flats. In particular, it was vestibule, kitchen, bathroom, restroom with/without flushing system. Then total number of rooms per a flat was specified but the above stated common residential premises with other flats should be included in any of the house flats. Information about

number of residential and non-residential premises within a flat was sought as well. For purposes of census 1950, residential premises were defined as rooms, inhabited pantries, menial rooms, repositories of layout size exceeding 4 m². This category included also kitchens if larger than 12 m². On the contrary, such room that was used for operating purposes, discharge of profession (outpatient's departments, offices, workshops, ateliers) wasn't considered as residential premises. Furthermore, vestibules were included, as well as kitchens with layout area up to 12 m², bathrooms, restrooms with/without flushing system and other rooms (they should be specified). The sum of all residential premises layout areas then comprised the total residential area. Total flat area corresponded to the sum of all residential and non-residential premises layout areas. Regarding the flat infrastructure equipment, installation of water, gas conduits, power cabling and central heating was subject to data gathering.

Record of accommodation facilities or companies in the building was pre-printed on the fourth page of the sheet. Data about particular accommodation facilities or companies were entered thereon according to order number. The data included: name of accommodation facility or company, whether somebody lived therein at the time of census, number of rooms intended separately for accommodation (separately employees out of flats, and guests, inmates, members, etc.) or for company/facility operation. Moreover, number of kitchens, bathrooms, restrooms with/without flushing system was stated per each unit. Information about total layout area and layout area of residential and non-residential premises had to be entered in this section as well, and also information whether the facility/company was connected to water and gas conduit, power network and central heating. At the end of the record, the census commissary had to state total headcount of persons present at the accommodation facility or company, separately divided to employees and guests, inmates, etc.

Signature of the house/building owner or his/her representative, evtl. signature of the one who filled in the house sheet, as well as signature of census commissary confirming correctness and complexity of the entered information represented an important part of the house sheet.

Census sheet applicable to persons consisted of two parts. Data were entered in the part A about all persons present in the flat at the census decisive moment. Moreover, persons had to be entered there that attended night work shift during the night from February 28 and March 01, 1950, were on duty at railroad station, post office or other facility, as well as all others who stayed overnight in the flat in question (or accommodation facility or company). Part B of the census sheet applicable to persons was intended for temporary absent persons. They were persons that weren't present in the flat at the census decisive moment but it was only temporary absence and they were expected to return. Moreover, persons were entered separately that were only temporarily present in the flat, thus such persons (e.g. on the business trip, voluntary work, visit, therapeutic stay, detention, as well as soldiers on basic/substitute army duty) that stayed at the permanent address for certain period of time only and didn't plan to stay there for longer. For purposes of census 1950, permanent address was interpreted as

such village/town/municipality where permanent address of a person subject to census was registered.

Every census sheet contained location data in the heading: district, village/town/settlement, municipality, house number. In case of town, street or "quartier" name was stated, and nomenclature number.

The above stated census sheet part A and B furthermore identified all households within a flat and persons pertaining to each of them. In case of more households within a flat, flat owner household was entered at first, and its members. Pursuant to census instructions, a household was interpreted as a group of persons that lived and kept house together. Independent households were considered also as persons living alone in a flat owned by them. On the other hand, individual tenants and persons staying overnight weren't considered an individual household but added to the flat lessor's household.

The following part of the census sheet identified the relatives or other relation of persons subject to census to the head of household (for example flat owner, spouse, partner, son, daughter, father, tenant, employee, guest, etc.). In case of persons belonging to the second/further household, it was required to specify in detail his/her relation to family along with the household head's name. As for the second/further household's heads, their relation to the flat owner should be specified.

Further information included in the census 1950 was: gender, birth date (day, month and year of birth), and family status. In case of family status, divorced and separated persons were stated separately since legislation had been enacted and came in force just a year before the census that unified the process of legal matrimony termination by divorce. Women had to specify the date of their last wedding. If they were divorced, separated or widowed, the date of divorce/separation/death of the spouse had to be entered on the census sheet.

Contrary to the last Czechoslovak census organised during period between WWI and WWII in 1930, the number of newly born children had to be entered by all women regardless their family status. Surviving newborns were subject to census, entered separately in total and in the last/current marriage. For census purposes, every child that demonstrated signs of vitality after delivery (breathing, heartbeat) was considered a surviving newborn despite of the fact that such child died soon after the delivery. Children that were born dead weren't included in the census records. The column "*children born in current/last marriage was filled in only by married women (as of the decisive census moment), as well as divorced/separated and widowed women (from the last marriage).*"

If a person hasn't lived at the permanent address from his/her birth date, the date of his/her moving in the village/town had to be entered on the census sheet, as well as the location where he/she moved from (name of village/town and district of the preceding permanent address). Information about re-emigrants was entered separately; in particular the state that they re-emigrated from to Czechoslovakia and the date thereof. Czech and Slovak citizens were included in this group that had permanently lived in the abroad before moving in Czechoslovakia.

In the following columns, a person subject to census had to enter his/her nationality, citizenship and religion, or without religion, respectively. The new definition of nationality used in the census 1950 interpreted nationality as affiliation to the nation whose cultural and work society the person subject to census has been inherently identified with, and avowed to. Namely, it was up to each individual to freely and without fear choose the nationality and to enter it on the census sheet. It was allowed to enter only one nationality. Self-declaration of nationality applied only to adult persons and persons not belonging to the flat owner family. Legal representative of minor persons and insane persons was authorised to declare nationality in census on their behalf.

Regarding the religion, information was entered on census sheet according to church that particular person pertained to. Deliberate change of church that the one pertained to wasn't allowed. If a person didn't pertain to any church, he/she should state "without religion". As for catholic and evangelic church, it was necessary to declare in detail the rite/particular church that the person is a member of.

Information about the highest education level reached represented a new element of the national census 1950. The preceding censuses were restricted to literacy, i.e. ability to read and write. Illiteracy wasn't a problem anymore during period between WWI and WWII, therefore the efforts emerged to evaluate the population educational level in a more objective manner. It was based on the declaration of the highest education level reached/accomplished. Thus, a person stated the school that he graduated from in the census sheet. Particular education level could be entered on the census sheet only if it was regularly finished (e.g. in the form of passed mandatory final exam). Otherwise the lower education level was automatically entered on the sheet.

The last section of the census sheet to be filled on by persons subject to census contained a set of questions related to their profession. At first, main profession had to be entered. It was interpreted as the activity that the highest income/pension yielded from to the person subject to census or his/her provider as of the decisive census moment, or the income that had formed his/her life standing. Within the main profession, the type of profession was entered at first, followed by position in particular profession (e.g. worker, trainee worker, apprentice, boy, etc.). In the first case, earning persons and retirees/pensioners entered personal profession therein. It had to be strictly a profession actually performed on February 28, 1950. Moreover, a group of persons was determined that have to enter their preceding profession. In particular, they were: soldiers attending the basic or substitute army duty, detailed persons, unemployed persons that weren't employed as of the decisive census moment for whatever reason (sickness, etc.). They had to specify the reason thereof. The other group referred to persons retired who had had profession before. It should be entered in particular columns with the remark that they were retirees or pensioners. The last, third specific group that had to enter the preceding profession was the inmates living in institutions, provided that before the institutional care they had had profession. Persons without earning activity that couldn't be included in any of the above groups, represented

so called category “*Others*”. They were for example children, students, incurably ill persons or fully dependant older persons) that didn’t have a profession and depended on a provider at the time of census. They were allowed to state that they helped at household, farm, trade, etc. However, they could declare this option only if such help work covered at least one fourth of the annual working time in particular specialization. If a person declared no employment at all, it was necessary to obtain as detail information as possible what the person lives from. Widows had to enter profession of the deceased husbands on the census sheet (widow after salesman, widow after teacher, etc.).

The next census section required from people to enter the employer, i.e. company, office or institution where the person performed his/her main profession. In particular, it should contain the name, type of production, trade or activities of the company where the person performed his/her profession e.g. cement plant, lime plant, etc.). Information about employment location/village/town was the last required data.

If the person subject to census ranked among free-lancers or traders, it was necessary to enter total headcount of employees. Personal employees of the person subject to census that didn’t work directly in the company/plant (cooks, maids) nor did they work as helping family members shouldn’t be entered in this category.

Secondary profession and position therein should be the last information stated on the sheet by the person subject to census. It was understood as a profession performed concurrently with the main profession.

Finally, the census commissary had to fill in the social standing of inhabitants as of March 01, 1950; January 01, 1946 and May 01, 1938. Validity of information stated on the census sheet was confirmed by the person who filled in the sheet and the census commissary with their signatures.

Data gathering

Field data were gathered by the appointed census commissaries under control by the supervisors. Speaking of set up work schedule, we can talk about three basic stages where detail description of particular actions was contained in the *Inštrukcie pre sčítacích komisárov a revízorov* (Instruction for census commissaries and supervisors). In the second half of February, census commissaries were acquainted with their census zone in the form of info walk-tour. Every census commissary received all census forms at local national committee and subsequently had to visit every house and flat in his/her census zone, and distribute the census-related printed material.

Census 1950 was based on self-counting method. The census sheet had to be filled in by the flat owner/user or a member of the household upon conferred consent by the flat owner/user. District national committees were competent to determine the villages/settlements where a census commissary had to assist with census sheet filling in, considering specific local conditions (Berrová, 2008:156). Census commissary was obliged to fill in the census sheet if it has not been fully or at all filled in by the flat owner/user or a person authorised by him/her. It

meant that the census commissary had to check the sheets for complexity and correctness, eventually to assist at their filling in in extraordinary cases (or fill them in on behalf of due persons). For this purpose, the census commissary was competent to insist on insight in personal and other IDs and confirmations of particular persons subject to census. If the census commissary doubted correctness of certain data, he was competent to interrogate such person without presence of other persons, if possible. The census commissary was competent to correct an entry on the census sheet only upon consent conferred by the person subject to census/legal representative in case of a minor person or a person *non sui juris*. Every such correction had to be verified by both parties in section "Remarks" on the census sheet.

Census sheets applicable to guests were filled in for persons absent in accommodation facilities and companies in the decisive census moment. Subsequently, the data were transferred to common census sheets and handed over to the census commissary. In case of institutional inmates, prisoners, persons in gulags, soldiers, members of National Security Corps, Prison Guard Corps, etc., these persons were subject to mass census on the joint census sheet, performed by a person in charge of the institution management or his/her representative. Employees of such institution were entered on the joint census sheet as first (provided they didn't live outside the institution), followed by other inhabitants of such an institution.

All census sheets were collected from March 01 till March 09, 1950; meanwhile the census commissary had to visit every flat and collect properly filled in census sheets. Such collected material was afterwards handed over to the census controller. Controller had to review the sheets and compile an overview of census zones. During the following two days (March 10 and 11), census controllers arranged the whole census material in order to deliver it to municipal national committees, make final summary in the census zones overviews, and compile complex overviews. Main controller was in charge of compiling the final complex overview in case of larger towns with more census controllers performed therein.

Completed census material was sent to the District National Committee by the municipal national committees during period from March 11 to March 13, 1950. Overviews of census zones and complex overviews were then sent to the State Statistical Office. However, the census sheets had to be thoroughly checked up by district national committees during the following two months. The census sheets were definitely delivered to the State Statistical Office during period from May 15 till June 15, 1950.

Census results processing and publishing

The State Statistical Office in Prague and the Slovak Statistical Office in Bratislava processed the complex collected census material in three stages. In overall process, preliminary results were obtained at first that were subsequently processed through representative selection method (selective results) and finally final results were published.

Prior to preliminary results publishing, the whole census material passed through a thorough examination. Census form *Prehľad sčítacieho obvodu* (Overview of Census Zone) compiled by census controllers represented the main source document serving to subsequent preparation of preliminary results. In particular, basic data related to the number of private households and headcount of present persons therein were used. Moreover, *complex zonal* overview was used. It also considered the number of private households and headcount of present persons therein. The first preliminary results were available in the spring of 1950 and more detail data obtained from machine processing of punch cards were published in the Statistical Information at the beginning of 1951.

Material from census 1950 was processed also by representative selection method for the first time in the history in order to provide preliminary basic data as soon as possible on the republic-wide and regional level for purposes of national economic planning process. The applied selection method finally enabled the process to have a nature of geographically stratified random selection.

The above stated goals were partly accomplished at the end of 1950 when the first selective results were published. Later the activity was finished in the first half of 1951 upon presentation of preliminary selective economic data. The preliminary selective data were repeatedly published in the *Statistické informace* (Statistical Information).

Final results processing was divided in two basic stages. Final data about houses and flats in regional towns and all villages/settlements included in the counties of particular regional (and concurrently also district) town were prepared during the first stage ending in 1952. Main importance of this stage was primarily in the processing of data about flats that weren't used in the next stage. Therefore the second stage was exclusively focused on the data about houses. These data were processed from all villages/settlements. Speaking of the processing method, manual and machine processing was used. Manual processing was used in case of house sheets from villages and exclusively the houses with a single flat. Machine processing through punch cards applied to all other houses. The second stage was held during the last quarter of 1952 until the mid of 1953.

The State Statistical Office processed the results of the national census, and the Slovak Planning Office in Slovakia, pursuant to the instructions issued by the State Statistical Office. The results obtained had to be subsequently published in the national publications issued by both named offices. As added in this regard by the chairman of the State Statistical František Fajfr (Fajfr and Kozák, 1957:3*), printing of particular source works had been significantly delayed despite of completion of the work on final results processing in the mid of 1953, i.e. more than 3 years after the census implementation. It was caused by the fact that those competent had not been aware of whether at all and, if yes, in what extent the final results should have been published. Finally, publishing of the results in the form of printing was finally proved as necessary. In total, four source works from the national census were published within the order A of the *Československá statistika* (Czechoslovak Statistics).

The first part of the results was published by the State Statistical Office in Prague in 1957 under name *Sčítání lidu a soupis domů a bytů v republice Československé ke dni 1. března 1950 Díl I. Nejdůležitější výsledky sčítání lidu a soupisu domů a bytů za kraje, okresy a města* (Census and Conscription of Houses and Flats in Czechoslovak Republic as of March 01, 1950 Part I. Most Important Results of Census and Conscription of Houses and Flats for Regions, Districts and Towns). The work was divided in two sections. The first section presented main information related to preparation and implementation of census, data gathering and processing. Moreover, demonstration of printed materials used within the census was included therein, as well as classification of economic branches, personal professions, governmental regulation on census in 1950 and related conscriptions, and the map of administrative division of Czechoslovakia in the regions and districts in 1950. The second section of the source work presented the selected essential census results in the form of tables. They were total five groups of tables according to particular topics, attached with 12 cartograms presenting selected information in the spatial view.

The second source work compiled from the national census presented some demographical data, focusing mainly on the data related to population profession and social structure. It was published by the State Statistical Office in Prague as late as in 1958, despite of the second work manuscript completion in the winter 1953. This source work also contains section of typescript and section of tables attached with diagrams and cartograms. The typescript section describes in detail the methodology of economic classifications and classification of economic branches and personal professions that we discussed above.

The third source work on census 1950 was published by the State Statistical Office in Prague in 1957. As stated in its foreword, the manuscript was finished at the end of 1953, similar to preceding cases, and printed out in March 1957. The third work contained final data about female fertility. In particular, the data include the number of all newborn children that survived and were delivered by all women regardless their family status but also according to the family status, born in current marriage (married women) or in the last marriage (divorced and widowed women).

The last, fourth source work on national census 1950 represented a specific economic lexicon published by the State Statistical Office in Prague in 1958.

Conclusion

Censuses in Slovakia provided the unique and, in many aspects, irreplaceable data on long-term basis, used not only during the study of history (especially the study of population), but also demography and further scientific specializations that consider population development as very important. Knowledge of methodology, preparation process and implementation of census allows for evaluation of data quality among other aspects. Identification of weak points of the data acquired, as well as the circumstances that had affected the entire census process, is necessary especially for the source quality criticism. Our research confirmed a few failures and difficult moments within the organization and the course of censuses implemented during the first half of the 20th century from declaration of Czechoslovakia.

Three of total seven censuses and conscription projects analysed and interpreted by us were of extraordinary nature, representing rather a curiosity in many aspects. They included already the first extraordinary census dated in 1919 that was successfully implemented after a few failed attempts but again at very unfavorable conditions. Finally, some obtained results corresponded to it. Anyway, extraordinary nature of this census refers to the fact that it was the first one that fully activated the not completely functional public administration yet after the declaration of Czechoslovakia. It was concurrently the first census that started considering a different methodology of the nationality statistics, which resulted in the introduction of nationality declaration based on the will of a person subject to census; while the actors fully realised the fact that the change at the attribute of the nationality statistics could and actually also had led to recession and instability of the declared nationality. Prestige of mother language was very negative especially after the last censuses organised in the Hungarian part of the Monarchy, and it was mainly associated with artificial statistical increase of the population with Hungarian language as a mother language, since it was the language that a person could learn at school. Thus, census 1919 offered another alternative, the subjective and perceptible one. However, implementation of the census in combination with incapability to process and publish the results thereof in sufficiently short time caused that the census was forgotten very quickly. Not only the new, state-wide Czechoslovak census should be blamed for it but also late and reluctant provision of required methodical and other preparation instructions and experiences from 1919 census implementation to the Statistical Office.

Statistical Office that was founded in 1919 and has become a state-wide institution, and it didn't intervene in the extraordinary 1919 at all. While Josef Mráz, later an employee of the State Statistical Office, had been engaged in the beginning stage of the census; his role ended with preparation of some census

forms and sheets. However, the Statistical Office has gradually started organizing the statistical services since its foundation and focused therein to population statistics inter alia. Thus, it was logical that the new Czechoslovak census should be methodically controlled by this institution. While census 1919 was controlled by the highest administration office in Slovakia that empowered the Minister for Administration of Slovakia and his office, census 1921 was exclusively in the competence of the Statistical Office. Preparation work schedule, set forth stages and their implementation were professionally prepared. On the other hand, implementation of censuses was in the competence of the public administration and older problems popped up also in 1921 in Slovakia, mainly corresponding to lack of candidates for census commissaries and controllers, but this troublesome element had not evolved in such dramatic dimensions as at the time of extraordinary census 1919.

The most extensive discussion within the census 1921 was mainly dedicated to definition of nationalities and nationality statistics. The discussions resulted in rather ambiguous characteristics with perceived efforts for compromise solutions. There were voices on one side, calling for nationality objectification by mother language and free will to identify oneself with a chosen nationality on the other side. It was not a statistical problem; had it been, it could have been resolved for example by adoption and questioning of both principles, i.e. entering both mother language and nationality, but it was rather a political problem. Many people saw the problem through the lenses of their own experiences and needs, and they apparently considered (and calculated) what would be more favorable for them in the given situation. Resulting compromise, nationality supported by mother language, finally ended mainly declaratively in praxis, based on preserved information. Legislation contributed to it in some way (the Constitution, language act, act on public administration organization, etc.) when the free will and own consideration was discussed. Similar process was reported also in 1930 when the second census during period between WWI and WWII was organised. Compromise solution was formed and continuity, resulting in nationality reflected more than mother language.

If we were about to evaluate the quality of census results from the mentioned three censuses, we could state that the quality was gradually increasing. The fact that the very first extraordinary census set the virtual bar rather low, while finally the results of 1919 census were less or more confirmed by regular Czechoslovak census dated in 1921, there were many faults and mistakes made. Censuses organised during period between WWI and WWII have improved the quality and the results were more exact in many aspects, and the extent of information obtained has gradually expanded. For example, investigation of certain indicators of marital fertility started in 1930, which definitely increased the prestige of Czechoslovak statistics. Some mistakes were made and found also in this area, which were mainly expressed during investigation of population nationality structure.

Complaints on faults and mistakes within the census represented kind of "traditional folklore" in many aspects and it's been always a part of such

a project. Representatives of national minorities were mobilised always during pre-census period, clearly encouraging other minority representatives to declare their nationality within census. It was of course a meaningful initiative since the Language Act was in effect in Czechoslovakia, determining 20% limit to be reached in order to perform administration acts in the language of particular national minority. Moreover, support of minority educational system and further areas of the public life of the minorities depended upon the representation of persons of particular nationality groups.

The state and the majority Czechoslovak nation stood on the other side, or the nations that were similarly interested in demonstration of their dominance. The situation has, however, changed. Before 1918, the majority Hungarian nation had made efforts to demonstrate its dominancy also statistically and upon declaration of Czechoslovakia, there was the interest in demonstrating reasonability of existential state formation also statistically. During period between WWI and WWII, finally some "legal" means were found, aimed at "improving" Czechoslovakia in the terms of nationality. It was the idea of Czechoslovak nation consisting of two branches - the Czech and the Slovak one that many people believed in from both political and societal spectrum. It allowed for demonstration of clear majority of Czechoslovak nation in the new state formation.

Free room has been also created to allow the Jewish nationality formation. The Jewish nationality was for the first time avowed during extraordinary census 1919 but it wasn't officially entered in the statistics. It was allowed to avow the Jewish nationality, as confirmed by the preserved census sheets and minutes of the preparation meetings. Practically the same rule was applied during the Czechoslovak censuses organised during period between WWI and WWI. While other nationalities were at least formally bound to mother language, it didn't apply to the Jewish nationality. Since a large part of the Israelis in Czechoslovakia spoke German and Hungarian, statistically numerous reduction of the mentioned minorities was reported. It strongly affected also Slovakia where approx. half of Israelis used up this opportunity.

Changes at nationality structure of Slovakia resulted not only from statistical methods or recording of common Czechoslovak nationality. While nowadays it is impossible to fully assess and calculate the possible effect of various recessions and mistakes on the censuses organised during period between WWI and WWI, they definitely happened. Preliminary results of the census 1930 represented a good example since they revealed significant downsizing of Hungarian and Russian (Ruthenian) minority in some regions of Slovakia during processing of results. While additional statistical audits were conducted in case of Hungarian minority and the final data were corrected, the results weren't corrected in case of Ruthenian population in the northeast of Slovakia. Ambiguous definition of nationality in many cases allowed for using up instability and recession in the declared nationality and to avow other, e.g. majority nationality with language not corresponding to mother language, for various reasons. If a census commissary heard in the northeast of Slovakia that people there identify themselves with Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality, while he was in the Ruthenian society, he

entered Slovak nationality and it worked similarly also in some parts of the southern Slovakia.

The end of period between WWI and WWI in Slovakia was held in the spirit of turbulent changes that affected both territorial and political upheavals. These changes were associated with each other and represent undoubtedly a significant historical milestone in the terms of population development. Slovakia had been gradually territorially reduced by Germany, Hungary and Poland. These were mostly the areas with mixed population nationality, which logically fully changed the inhabitants' headcount, as well as nationality picture of Slovakia. Problems with the minorities that had also political backgrounds were finally transformed in the second special regional conscription implemented at the end of 1938, together with the efforts for resolving the territorial-administration changes. Similar to census in 1919, neither this census was implemented by the Statistical Office. The then highest administration office in Slovakia was in charge – Regional Office in Bratislava – upon assistance of the newly founded autonomous Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic. Efforts were made already during this census to create kind of permanent (stable) national cadastre in as objective as possible way. However, regarding the objectiveness, the authors mainly aimed at avoiding intervention of various agitations in the census in maximum possible extent. On one hand, they managed it since the census was organised quickly and as fully unannounced, and on the other hand, since they didn't reveal their intention and failed to inform the population thereon, the census results were definitely influenced thereby. In the census, nationality was questioned as well, supported by mother language more remarkably in the definition than in case of Czechoslovak censuses organised during period between WWI and WWI. Since it was identification of nationality as a main indicator and purpose of the census, other commonly questioned indicators weren't traced. The results of the regional census also posed a problem. For political reasons, only selected data were published, practically contained in a single table. Therefore, a new census was organised in 1940 after declaration of the Slovak Republic. This census was a follow up of and methodically inspired by censuses organised during interwar period in 1921 and 1930. The census was organised by the Slovak Statistical Office and implemented by the public administration at standard conditions. Nationality again mostly resonated during this census. Nationality was associated with mother language but the Jewish inhabitants were directly ordered to avow exclusively Jewish nationality. It was a fully new element resulting from the new legislation that significantly prosecuted and had gradually completely segregated this group of population in Slovakia. The obligation initially applied only also to the Roma ethnics that should avow Roma nationality. Finally it was cancelled because of inadequately formulated and unfeasible definition during census 1940.

The society solved many problems during the post-war period. Supplies to the population represented one of them. This moment has become one of the impulses for organization of the third special conscription that was held in Slovakia in 1946 and that related to supplies to population. The efforts for getting known the post-war population was very actual at the time since the last censuses

dated in 1938 and 1940 captured only a part of the population in the reduced territory of Slovakia and the data from the Czechoslovak census in 1930 were already outdated. Through the conscription, information should be gathered about current labor market situation especially in interconnection with the efforts for mobilization and redistribution of labor forces in certain professions. The conscription was aimed also at preparing the register of supplied persons. The conscription wasn't organised by the Statistical Office and it was exclusively associated with distribution of food vouchers. People filled in the conscription sheets on their own and delivery of the sheets was conditioned with handover of the food vouchers. It also meant that the conscription didn't apply to the whole population in the territory of Slovakia but the persons entitled to food vouchers, and focus was laid on the information on profession and occupation. Decisive moment of the conscription wasn't determined but the time when the registration sheets should be delivered, and it represented another specific aspect of the conscription.

Finally, the last national census analysed in this publication was organised in 1950 and it also represented an important milestone in the history of censuses in Slovakia. It was a follow up of 10-year cycles of censuses, organised by the Statistical Office as many times before. The census results allow for detail analysis of mainly post-war condition of the Slovak society. Concurrently with the census, further specialised conscriptions were held regarding houses and flats, agricultural, industrial and trace factories. As for content aspect, the census included a few new data that had not been investigated before. For the first time, detail data about houses and flats, as well as habitation fund quality was sought in the whole territory of the then Czechoslovakia; and data about the highest education accomplished that replaced the preceding identification of population literacy. Extended question about live newborns to all women represented also quality improvement within census. Accordingly, overall successful fertility could be analysed for the first time in history. National census 1950 was the last one for rather long period of time that gathered the information about religion structure of the Slovak society.

Censuses and conscriptions of population undoubtedly represent the culmination of the demographical statistics. These were the most demanding censuses and similar projects in the terms of logistics, finances, methodology, personnel and time. They have been censuses and conscriptions that the data gathered from represent an irreplaceable source of information since they capture the population status in particular moment, reflecting the development during a few last decades. Moreover, thanks to long time sequence, results of such projects enable to monitor and compare the development of particular indicators and characteristics in time and space. Knowledge of circumstances of the censuses and conscription preparation and implementation can present the explanation of significant changes at results and help its more precise interpretation.

We included a few circumstances in the publication that definitely influence the quality of censuses but in some moments they reduce their importance as a fully reliable historical source. Therefore we are ascertained that it is important to pay

attention to historical context of the census results, along with their analysis, as well as to the conditions at which the results were obtained.

Archival Sources and References

Archival Sources

Národní archiv České republiky v Praze (NAČR)

[National Archives of the Czech Republic in Prague]

- f. Ministerstvo sociální péče, 1918–1951 (f. MSP)
- f. Ministerstvo vnitra – Stará registratura, 1918–1938 (f. MV-SR)
- f. Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí – výstřižkový archiv, 1916–1944 (f. MZV-VA)
- f. Nejvyšší správní soud, 1918–1951 (f. NSS)
- f. Státní úřad statistický, (1916) 1919–1946 (1950) (f. SÚS)
- f. Ústřední archiv Ministerstva vnitra, 1949–1950 (f. ÚAMV)
- f. Předsednictvo ministerské rady, 1918–1945 (f. PMR)

MVSR – Slovenský národný archív v Bratislave (SNA)

[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the Slovak national archives in Bratislava]

- f. Kancelária prezidenta republiky Slovenskej republiky, 1939–1945 (f. KPR)
- f. Krajský úrad v Bratislave, 1928–1940 (f. KÚ)
- f. Minister Československa s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska, 1918–1928 (f. MPS)
- f. Ministerstvo vnútra Slovenskej republiky, 1939–1945 (f. MVSR)
- f. Ministerstvo zahraničných vecí, 1939–1945 (f. MZV)
- f. Sčítanie ľudu 1930 (f. SĽ 1930)
- f. Sčítanie ľudu 1940 (f. SĽ 1940)
- f. Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1945–1951 (1952) (f. ŠPŠÚ)
- f. Úrad predsedníctva vlády SR, 1939–1945 (f. ÚPVSR)
- Osobný fond Vavro Šrobár, 1900–1948 (f. OFVŠ)

MVSR – Štátny archív v Banskej Bystrici (ŠABB)

[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Banská Bystrica]

- f. Gemersko-malohontská župa I., (1784) 1786–1790

MVSR – Štátny archív v Bratislave (ŠABA)

[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Bratislava]

- f. Bratislavská župa I., 1398–1922 (f. Župa Bratislava I)

- f. Slúžnovský úrad v Dunajskej Strede, 1862–1922 (f. SÚ Dunajská Streda)
- f. Slúžnovský úrad v Trnave, 1856–1922 (f. SÚ Trnava)

MVSR – Štátny archív v Nitre so sídlom v Ivanke pri Nitre (ŠANI)
[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Nitra with headquarters Ivanka pri Nitre]

- f. Slúžnovský úrad v Nitre, 1885–1922 (f. SÚ Nitra)
- f. Slúžnovský úrad v Prievidzi, 1851–1922 (f. SÚ Prievidza)
- f. Župa Nitra I., 1919–1922 (f. Župa Nitra I)

MVSR – Štátny archív v Košiciach, pobočka v Rožňave (ŠAKE, p. Rožňava)
[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Košice, branch in Rožňava]

- f. Magistrát mesta Dobšiná, 1326–1922 (f. MM Dobšiná)
- f. Magistrát mesta Jelšavy, 1299–1922 (f. MM Jelšava)
- f. Magistrát mesta Rožňava, 1323–1922 (f. MM Rožňava)
- f. Magistrát mesta Revúcej, 1612–1922 (f. MM Revúca)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Brzotíne, 1883–1939 (f. ObvNÚ Brzotín)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Hucíne, 1913–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Hucín)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Kameňanoch, (1886) 1920–1944 (1949)
(f. ObvNÚ Kameňany)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Lubeníku, 1914–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Lubeník)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Revúcej, 1937–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Revúca)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Roštári, 1922–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Roštár)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Stratenej, 1895–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Stratená)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Muráni, 1908–1946 (f. ObvNÚ Muráň)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Rejdovej, 1917–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Rejdová)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Rožňavskom Bystrom, 1903–1945
(f. ObvNÚ Rožňavské Bytré)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Sirku, 1907–1944 (f. ObvNÚ Sirk)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad v Slavošovciach, 1914–1945
(f. ObvNÚ Slavošovce)
- f. Obvodný notársky úrad vo Veľkej Polome, 1865–1945 (f. ObvNÚ Veľká Poloma)
- f. Okresný úrad v Dobšinej, 1938–1946 (f. OÚ Dobšiná)
- f. Okresný úrad v Revúcej, 1923–1945 (f. OÚ Revúca)
- f. Okresný úrad v Rožňave, 1923–1938 (f. OÚ Rožňava)

Štátny archív v Žiline so sídlom v Bytči, pobočka v Čadci (ŠABY, p. Čadca)
[Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Slovak Republic – the State archives in Žilina with headquarters in Bytča, branch in Čadca]

- f. Okresný úrad v Čadci, 1923–1945 (f. OÚ Čadca)
- f. Okresný úrad v Kysuckom Novom Meste, 1923–1945 (f. OÚ KNM)

Statistical editions and reports

- A *Magyar Korona Országában Az 1881. Év Elején Végrehajtott Népszámlálás Eredményei*. I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar Kir. Statisztikai Hivatal, 1882.
- A *Magyar korona országában az 1881. Év Elején Végrehajtott Népszámlálás Eredményei*. II. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1882.
- A Magyar korona országainak 1900. évi népszámlálása. Első rész. In: *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, Új sorozat I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1902.
- A *Magyar korona országainak helységnévtára*. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1892.
- A Magyar szent korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása. Első rész. In: *Magyar statisztikai közlemények*, Új sorozat I. kötet. Budapest: Az Országos Magyar kir. Statisztikai hivatal, 1912.
- Administrativní lexikón obcí v republice Československé*. I. díl Čechy. Praha: SÚS, 1927; *Administrativní lexikón obcí v republice Československé*. II. díl. Morava, Slezsko, Slovensko, Podkarpatská Rus. Praha: SÚS, 1928.
- Az 1850. és 1857. évi népszámlálás*. Budapest: KSH, 1993.
- Az 1869. évi népszámlálás vallási adatai*. Budapest: KSH Levéltár, 2005.
- Az első magyarországi népszámlálás (1784–1787)*. Budapest: Központi statisztikai hivatal, 1960.
- Hírdetés a magyarországi cs. k. főkörmánytól 1856-diki június 20-káról 10,323 sz. a.; 12,376 sz. a. I.*
- II. *József népszámlálásának községi adatai*. Budapest: Központi statisztikai hivatal, 1960/61.
- Lexikón obcí Slovenskej republiky*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1942.
- Lexikón obcí v krajine Slovenskej : Úradný soznam miest podľa zákona zo 14. apríla 1920, čís. 266 Sb. zák. a nar.* Praha: Orbis, 1936.
- Mimořádné zprávy Státního úřadu statistického, vol. I., 1931*. Praha: SÚS, 1931.
- Předběžné zprávy Státního úřadu statistického republiky Československé, vol. I., 1931*. Praha: SÚS, 1931.
- Povolanie obyvateľstva na Slovensku podľa súpisu civilného obyvateľstva zo dňa 4. októbra 1946*. In: *Publikácie Štátneho plánovacieho a štatistického úradu*, vol. 1. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1947.
- Předběžné výsledky sčítání lidu z 15. února 1921*. Praha: SÚS, 1921.
- Sčítání bytů ve větších městech republiky Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 107, series XIII., statistika domů a bytů, workbook 2. Praha: SÚS, 1935.
- Sčítání bytů ve větších městech republiky Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 40, series XIII., statistika domů a bytů, workbook 1. Praha: SÚS, 1929.
- Sčítání domácího zvířectva v republice Československé podle stavu k 31.XII.1925. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 45, series XII., zemědělství, workbook 7. Praha: SÚS, 1928.

- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část II. Povolání podle věku a rodinného stavu, povolání podle velikosti místa pobytu, objektivní povolání, veřejní zaměstnanci, vedlejší povolání, nezaměstnanost. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 113, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 9. Praha: SÚS, 1935.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část III. Povolání a sociální rozvrstvení obyvatelstva podle národnosti (také cizinců) a podle náboženského vyznání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 116, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 10. Praha: SÚS, 1935.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část I. Počet dětí živě narozených v posledním manželství. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 126, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 12. Praha: SÚS, 1936.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část 2. Domácnosti a rodiny. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 151, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 13. Praha: SÚS, 1938.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl IV. Část 3. Plodnost manželství. Konkubináty. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 153, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 14. Praha: SÚS, 1938.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. Díl III. Ostatní data demografická (vnitřní stěhování, tělesné vady, znalost čtení a psaní, cizinci). In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 146, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 11. Praha: SÚS, 1937.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl I. Růst, koncentrace a hustota obyvatelstva, pohlaví, věkové rozvrstvení, rodinný stav, státní příslušnost, národnost, náboženské vyznání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 98, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 7. Praha: SÚS, 1934.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. *Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Část I. Druhy, skupiny a třídy hlavního povolání, poměr k povolání a sociální příslušnost, třídy vedlejšího povolání. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 104, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 8. Praha: SÚS, 1934.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 1. díl. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 9, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 1. Praha: SÚS, 1924.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 1. část Čechy. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 20, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 2. Praha: SÚS, 1925.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 2. část Morava a Slezsko. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 21, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 3. Praha: SÚS, 1925.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 3. část Slovensko a Podkarpatská Rus. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 22, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 4. Praha: SÚS, 1925.
- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 2. díl. (Povolání obyvatelstva) 4. část Československá republika. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 23, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 5. Praha: SÚS, 1927.

- Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. 3. díl. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 37, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 6. Praha: SÚS, 1927.
- Sčítanie ľudu na Slovensku zo dňa 15. XII. 1940: príslušnosť prítomného obyvateľstva k povolaniu podľa okresov, obcí a tried povolania*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1948.
- Soupis obyvatelstva v Československu v letech 1946 a 1947. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 184, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 15. Praha: Státní úřad statistický, 1951.
- Statistická příručka republiky Československé*. Praha: SÚS, 1920, 1925, 1928 a 1932.
- Statistická ročenka republiky Československé 1934*. Praha: SÚS, 1934.
- Statistická ročenka republiky Československé*. Praha: SÚS, 1934.
- Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé I. Statistický lexikón obcí v Čechách*. Praha: SÚS, 1923.
- Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé II. Morava a Slezsko*. Praha: SÚS, 1924.
- Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé III. Slovensko*. Praha: SÚS, 1927.
- Statistický lexikón obcí v republice Československé IV. Podkarpatská Rus*. Praha: SÚS, 1928.
- Statistický obzor*, vol. XII–XIV, 1931–1934.
- Statistický přehled o Československé republice 1936. Rozbor stavu a vývoje*. Praha: SÚS, 1936.
- Statistický přehled republiky Československé*. Praha: SÚS, 1930 a 1936.
- Systematický a abecedný soznam povolání a návod na vyznačovanie sčítania ľudu 1940*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1942.
- Štatistická príručka Slovenska 1947*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1947.
- Štatistická príručka Slovenska 1948*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1948.
- Štatistické zprávy*, No. 6, vol. II/1941, series A, 1.
- Történeti statisztikai tanulmányok 2. Pótlás az első magyarországi népszámláláshoz 1786–1787*. Budapest, 1975.
- Územie a obyvateľstvo Slovenskej republiky a prehľad obcí odstúpených Nemecku, Maďarsku a Poľsku*. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1939.
- Zpráva o činnosti Statistické rady státní a Státního úřadu statistického za rok 1921, In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 3, 1922, pp. 8–9.
- Zpráva o činnosti výborů Statistické státní rady v době od 24. března do 13. června 1920. Výbor pro sčítání lidu. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, 1920, p. 331.
- Zprávy Státního úřadu statistického, 1920–1938*.
- Zprávy Štátného plánovacieho a štatistického úradu 1946*. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, 1946.

References

- ACSÁDI, György (1957). Az 1785–85. évi népszámlálás és az ezen alapuló népesség nyilvántartások. In: KOVACSICS, József (ed.). *A történeti statisztika forrásai*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és jogi könyvkiadó, pp. 224–241.
- ACSÁDY, Ignác (1896). *Magyarország népessége a Pragmatica sanctio korában*. Magyar statisztikai közlemények, ú. f. XII. Budapest: Athenaeum.
- BAKA, Igor (2018). Die Deutsch-slowakischen Beziehungen und der Krieg gegen die UdSSR (1941–1945). In: *Vojenská história*, vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 35–69. ISSN 1335-3314
- BERROVÁ, Petra (2008). Poválečné soupisy obyvatelstva a sčítání lidu 1950 v Československu v kontextu zjišťování národnosti obyvatel a se zohledněním nálezů Nejvyššího správního soudu. In: *Historická demografie*, vol. 32, pp. 151–174. ISSN 0323-0937
- BEZDĚK, Bohuslav (1920). *Menoslov obcí na Slovensku*. Bratislava: vlastným nákladom.
- BIELIK, František (1961). Vývin kompetencie ministra s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska. In: *Historický časopis*, vol. IX, pp. 636–640. ISSN 0018-2575
- BODNÁR, J. (1902). Príspevky k miestopisu Slovenska. Oprava. In: *HLAS: Mesačník pre literatúru, politiku a otázku sociálnu*, vol. IV., 5.4.1902, pp. 236–238.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1928). Český útok na naše sčítání lidu. In: *Lidové noviny*, July 12, 1928.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1930). *Národnost a sčítání lidu (K Rádlovi sociologickému rozboru naší národnostní statistiky)*. Praha.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1931). Národnost při druhém sčítání. In: *Statistický obzor*, vol. XII. Praha: SÚS, pp. 14–30.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1926). *Národnostní mapa republiky Československé : Podrobní popis národnostních hranic, ostrovů a menšin*. Praha: Národopisní společnost československá.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1929). Naše národnostní statistika a prof. Rádl. In: *Lidové noviny*, No. 332, 3.6.1929.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1920a). Příští soupis obyvatelstva. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, pp. 89–97; 194–197; 268–275.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1920b). Sčítání lidu: Předpoklady. In: *Večerní České slovo*, October 24, 1920.
- BOHÁČ, Antonín (1924). Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 9. Praha: SÚS, pp. 7*–129*.
- BOTTLÓ, Béla (1957). Az 1828. évi országos összeírás. In: KOVACSICS, József (ed.). *A történeti statisztika forrásai*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és jogi könyvkiadó, pp. 242–272.
- BRANDES, Detlef, IVANIČKOVÁ, Edita, and Jiří PEŠEK (1999). *Vynútený rozchod: vyhnanie a vysídlenie z Československa 1938–1947 v porovnaní s Poľskom, Maďarskom a Juhosláviou*. Bratislava: Veda. ISBN 978-80-224-0586-8

- BURKE, Edmund (2004). *Modernity's Histories: Rethinking the Long Nineteenth Century, 1750–1950*. In: *“Modernity's Histories: The Long Nineteenth Century, 1789–1914”*. A Conference of the University of California World History Workshop University of California, Davis, May 19–21, 2000. World History Workshop e-Repository, June 2004.
- CSÉFALVAY, František (2007). *Začiatok maďarsko-slovenského ozbrojeného konfliktu v marci 1939 (o mýtoch a nepresnostiach)*. In: PEKÁR, Martin, and Richard PAVLOVIČ (eds.). *Slovensko medzi 14. marcom 1939 a salzburskými rokovaniami: Slovenská republika 1939–1945 očami mladých historikov VI*. Prešov: Universum, pp. 241–250. ISBN 978-80-8068-669-7
- CZAMBEL, Samuel (1906). *Slovenská reč a jej miesto v rodine slovanských jazykov*. 1. čiastka. *Východoslovenské nárečie*. Martin.
- CZOERNIG, Karl Freiherrn (1861). *Statistisches Handbüchlein für die Oesterreichische Monarchie*. Wien.
- ČAPLOVIČ, Dušan, ČIČAJ, Viliam, KOVÁČ, Dušan, LIPTÁK, Ľubomír, and Ján LUKAČKA (2000). *Dejiny Slovenska*. Bratislava: AEP, 2000. ISBN 80-88880-39-4
- ČÉPLÖ, Slavomír, ŠPROCHA, Branislav, KAČÍREK, Ľuboš, MAJO, Juraj, POCISKOVÁ, Miriam, ŠPROCHOVÁ, Terézia, TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Lenka VARGOVÁ (2017). *Historický atlas obyvateľstva Slovenska 18.–1. pol. 20. storočia*. Bratislava: Centrum pre historickú demografiu a populačný vývoj Slovenska FiF UK. ISBN 978-80-89881-06-2
- ČÉPLÖ, Slavomír, TIŠLIAR, Pavol, KAČÍREK, Ľuboš, POCISKOVÁ, Miriam, ŠPROCHA, Branislav, ŠPROCHOVÁ, Terézia, and Lenka VARGOVÁ (2016). *Vybrané populačné štruktúry obcí na Slovensku (18.–1. pol. 20. storočia)*. Bratislava: MKD, 2016. ISBN 978-80-89881-04-8
- DÁVID, Zoltán (1957). *Az 1715–20. évi összeírás*. In: KOVACSICS, József (ed.). *A történeti statisztika forrásai*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és jogi könyvkiadó, pp. 145–199.
- DEÁK, Dušan (1998). *Viedenská arbitráž – “Mníchov pre Slovensko”*. Bratislava: Nadácia KORENE. ISBN 9788096758777
- Dejiny Slovenska V. (1918–1945)*. Bratislava: SAV, 1985.
- BIANCHI, Leonard et al. (1973). *Dejiny štátu a práva na území Československa v období kapitalizmu 1848–1945. II. 1918–1945*. Bratislava: SAV.
- FAJFR, František, and Otto KOZÁK (1957). *Předmluva. Sčítání lidu a soupis domů a bytů v republice Československé ke dni 1. března 1950. Díl I. Nejdůležitější výsledky sčítání lidu a soupis domů a bytů za kraje, okresy a města*. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 3, series A. Praha: Státní úřad statistický, p. 3*.
- FAJFR, František, and Václav SEKERA (1951). *Předmluva*. In: *Soupisy obyvatelstva v Československu v letech 1946 a 1947. Československa statistika*, vol. 184, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 15. Praha: Státní úřad statistický, p. 3*.
- GYURGYÍK, László (2020). *Szlovákia lakosságának községsoros nemzetiségi összetétele az 1950. évi népszámlálás adatai alapján*. In: *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, vol. XXII, 2020, No. 3, pp. 107–128. ISSN 1335-4361

- GYURGYÍK, László (2021). The Ethnic Composition of Slovakia's Municipalities, Based on the Data of the 1950 census. In: *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, vol. XXIII, No. 5, pp. 13–34. ISSN 1335-4361
- HETÉNYI, Martin (2011). *(Zjednotená) Maďarská strana na Slovensku 1939–1945*. Nitra: UKF. ISBN 978-80-8094-851-1
- HETÉNYI, Martin (2007). Postavenie maďarskej menšiny na Slovensku v rokoch 1939–1940. In: PEKÁR, Martin, and Richard PAVLOVIČ (eds.). *Slovensko medzi 14. marcom 1939 a salzburskými rokovaniami: Slovenská republika 1939–1945 očami mladých historikov VI*. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita, pp. 93–111. ISBN 978-80-8068-669-7
- HNATJUK, Volodymyr (1899). Hungarian – Ruthenica. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, vol. XXVIII, No. 2, pp. 29–38.
- HNATJUK, Volodymyr (1900). Rusyny Prjašivs'koji eparchiji i ich hooray. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, vol. XXV, No. 1, pp. 1–70.
- HNATJUK, Volodymyr (1901). Slovaky či Rusyny?: pryčynok do vyjasnenna sporu pro nacionalnisč zachidnych rusyniv. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenka*, vol. XLII, No. 4, 1901, pp. 1–81.
- HORÁČEK, Cyril (1920). Národnostní statistika. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. I, pp. 184–193.
- HOUDEK, Fedor (1901). Príspevky k miestopisu Slovenska. In: *HLAS: Mesačník pre literatúru, politiku a otázku sociálnu*, vol. III., 1.9.1901, pp. 258–350.
- HOUDEK, Fedor (1931). *Vznik hraníc Slovenska*. Bratislava: Prúdy.
- HRONSKÝ, Marián (1998). *Boj o Slovensko a Trianon 1918–1920*. Bratislava: NLC. ISBN 8088878144
- HÚSEK, Jan (1925). *Národopisná hranice mezi Slováky a Karpatorusy*. Bratislava: Prúdy.
- CHORVÁT, Michal (2018). "Die Katze muss weg!": odchod českého obyvateľstva zo Slovenska 1938. In: *Právněhistorické studie*, vol. 48, pp. 75–92. ISSN 0079-4929
- CHURA, Alojz J. (1936). *Slovensko bez dorastu? I. diel*, Bratislava.
- JANAS, Karol (2004a). K problematike hraničných sporov s Nemeckou ríšou v rokoch 1938–1943 v Bratislave a okolí. In: *Bratislava : Zborník Múzea mesta Bratislavy*, vol. 16, pp. 121–128. ISBN 80-968264-6-2
- JANAS, Karol (2004b). Slovensko–poľské územné spory a spôsoby ich riešenia na severozápadnom Slovensku v rokoch 1938–1939. In: *Vlastivedný zborník Považia*, vol. XXII, pp. 93–103. ISBN 80-88877-44-X
- JELÍNEK, A. Ješajahu (1999a). Hľadanie identity: slovenské Židovstvo a nacionalizmus (1918–1938). In: *Židia na Slovensku v 19. a 20. storočí*. I. časť. Bratislava: Judaica Slovaca. ISBN 80-8060-021-X
- JELÍNEK, A. Ješajahu (1999b). Kde ste boli Židia z Oberlandu? Poznámky o identite Židov na Slovensku. In: *Židia na Slovensku v 19. a 20. storočí*. II. časť. Bratislava: Judaica Slovaca. ISBN 80-8060-024-4
- JUREČEK, Zdeněk (1951). Úvodní poznámky. Příprava, provedení a zpracování soupisů. In: *Soupisy obyvatelstva v Československu v letech 1946 a 1947*. Československa statistika, vol. 184, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 15. Praha: Státní úřad statistický, pp. 7*–19*.

- KAČÍREK, Ľuboš, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2019). *Petržalka v rokoch 1919–1946*. Bratislava: Miestna knižnica v Petržalke. ISBN 978-80-970194-3-3
- KADLEC, Petr, KLADIWA, Pavel, GAWRECKI, Dan, POKLUDOVÁ, Andrea, and Petr POPELKA (2016). *Národnostní statistika v českých zemích 1880–1930*. II. díl. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita. ISBN 978-80-7422-551-2
- KAMENEC, Ivan (1992). *Slovenský štát*. Praha: Anomal. ISBN 80-900235-3-3
- KLIMKO, Jozef (1979). *Slovenská republika rád : Pokus o socialistickú štátnosť*. Bratislava: Pravda.
- KONEČNÝ, Stanislav (1999). Rusíni na Slovensku a rozpad Rakúsko-Uhorska. In: ŠVORC, Peter – HARBULOVÁ, Ľubica (eds.). *Stredoeurópske národy na križovatkách novodobých dejín 1848–1918*. Prešov: Univerzum, pp. 290–299. ISBN 8096775324
- KORABINSZKY, Johann Matthias (1786). *Geographisch-historisches und Produkten Lexikon von Ungarn*. Preßburg.
- KORČÁK, Jaromír (1934). Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 98, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 7. I. díl. Růst, koncentrace a hustota obyvatelstva, pohlaví, věkové rozvrstvení, rodinný stav, státní příslušnost, národnost, náboženské vyznání. Praha: SÚS, 193, pp. 9*–55*.
- KOVACSICS, József (1957). Bevezetés a történeti statisztika forrásainak tanulmányozásába. In: KOVACSICS, József (ed.). *A történeti statisztika forrásai*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és jogi könyvkiadó, pp. 5–50.
- KRAJČOVIČOVÁ, Natália (2004). Začleňovanie Slovenska do Československej republiky (1918–1920). In: ZEMKO, Milan, and Valerian BYSTRICKÝ (eds.). *Slovensko v Československu*. Bratislava: VEDA, 2004, pp. 57–94. ISBN 978-80-224-0795-X
- KREJČÍ, Dobroslav (1921a). Jak se pracuje na konečných číslech o našem sčítání lidu. In: *Národní politika*, 17. augusta 1921.
- KREJČÍ, Dobroslav (1920). Má se při našem příštím sčítání lidu zjišťovati národnost nebo řeč mateřská? In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, 1920, pp. 275–285.
- KREJČÍ, Dobroslav (1921b). Naše první sčítání národnosti. In: *Lidové noviny*, vol. 29, February 13, 1921.
- KRIŠKA, Samuel (1947). Súpis civilného obyvateľstva na Slovensku zo dňa 4. októbra 1946. In: *Povolanie obyvateľstva na Slovensku podľa súpisu civilného obyvateľstva zo dňa 4. októbra 1946*. Publikácie Štátneho plánovacieho a štatistického úradu, vol. 1. Bratislava: Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad, pp. V–VII.
- KUČERA, Milan (1987). Poválečná sčítání lidu, domů a bytů v Československu (1946/47–1950–1961–1970–1980). In: *Historická demografie*, vol. 11, pp. 207–234. ISSN 0323-0937
- LETZ, Róbert (2000). Postavenie gréckokatolíkov slovenskej národnosti v rokoch 1918–1950. In: *Slovensko-rusínsko-ukrajinské vzťahy od obrodzenia po súčasnosť*. Bratislava: Slavistický kabinet SAV, pp. 101–118. ISBN 80-967722-5-2

- LIPSZKY de SZEDLICSNA, Joannes (1808). *Repertorium Locorum objectorumque in XII. tabulis Mappae Regnorum Hungariae, Slavoniae, Croatiae et confiniorum militarium magni item principatus Tansylvaniae occurentum*. Budaë.
- MIČIANIK, Pavel (2007). Pokračovanie slovensko-maďarského vojnového konfliktu po oficiálnom skončení maďarskej agresie (marec–apríl 1939). In: PEKÁR, Martin, and Richard PAVLOVIČ (eds.). *Slovensko medzi 14. marcom 1939 a salzburskými rokovaniami: Slovenská republika 1939–1945 očami mladých historikov VI*. Prešov: Universum, pp. 251–267. ISBN 978-80-8068-669-7
- MIČKO, Peter, and Pavol MARTULIAK (2014). Špecifiká pôsobenia českých zamestnancov na Slovensku a ich odchodu v rokoch 1938–1945. In: ŠMIGEL, Michal, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (eds.). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918–1945)*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, pp. 208–229. ISBN 978-80-557-0804-1
- MOSNÝ, Peter (1997). *Dejiny štátu a práva na Slovensku po roku 1918*. Košice: UPJŠ. ISBN 9788070973790
- MRÁZ, Josef (1920a). Dva důkazy o falešnosti maďarských dat o řeči mateřské na základě dat o znalosti řeči. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, pp. 120–134.
- MRAZ, Josef (1920b) Místopis a národnostní statistika obcí slovenských. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. 1, pp. 226–227.
- MRÁZ, Josef (1920/1921). O předběžném sčítání lidu na Slovensku roku 1919. In: *Československý statistický věstník*, vol. II, workbook 1.–2., December 1920 and vol. II. February 1921, workbook 3., pp. 1–38, and 120–143.
- NIEDERLE, Lubor (1919). *Místopis a národnostní statistika obcí slovenských*. Praha: Společnost národopisného musea československého.
- NIEDERLE, Lubor (1903). *Národopisná mapa a statistika uherských Slováků na základě sčítání lidu z roku 1900*. Praha: Národopisná společnost československá.
- PACELT, Vincenc (1935). *Prevrat na Rožňavsku 1918–1919*. Rožňava.
- PETRANSKÝ, Ivan A. (2017). *Dejiny cirkví a náboženských spoločností na Slovensku v 20. storočí*. Trnava: UCM. ISBN 9788081058851
- PETRANSKÝ, Ivan A. (2015). Slovensko v Československu (1918–1939). In: *Slovenské dejiny: od úsvitu po súčasnosť*. Bratislava: Perfekt. ISBN 9788080467302
- PETROV, Alexej (1923). K otázce slovensko-ruské etnografické hranice. In: *Česká revue*, vol. XVI, No. 5–6, pp. 115–119, and pp. 234–243.
- PODJAVORSKÝ, [sine] (1901). Príspevky k miestopisu Slovenska. In: *HLAS: Mesačník pre literatúru, politiku a otázku sociálnu*, vol. III., 1.10.1901, pp. 52–58.
- PODZIMEK, Jaroslav (1974). *Vývoj čs. statistiky : do vzniku Státního úřadu statistického*. Praha: VÚEI.
- RÁDL, Emanuel (1929). *Národnost jako vědecký problém*. Praha: O. Girgal.
- SEKERA, Václav (1934). Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 1. prosince 1930.* Díl II. Povolání obyvatelstva. Textová část. In: *Československá statistika*, vol. 104, series VI., sčítání lidu, workbook 8. Praha: SÚS, pp. 9*–54*.
- SCHVARC, Michal, HOLÁK, Martin, and David SCHRIFFL (eds.) (2008). *“Tretia ríša” a vznik Slovenského štátu: Dokumenty I*. Bratislava: ÚPN. ISBN 978-80-89335-02-2

- SCHVARC, Michal (2007). Guľka pre štátneho tajomníka. Atentát na Franza Karmasina v Nižnom Medzeve 11. decembra 1938. In: *Pamäť národa*, vol. 4, pp. 42–50. ISSN 1336-6297
- SCHVARC, Michal (2009). Majorita – minorita. Vzťah Nemcov a Slovákov v rokoch 1939–1945 na príklade obce Handlová. In: Mičko, P. a kol. *Historické špecifiká stredného Slovenska v rokoch 1938–1948*. Banská Bystrica: UMB, pp. 65–90. ISBN 9788080838805
- SOBOLEVSKIJ, Alexej (1894). Kak davno russkije život v Karpatach i za Karpatami. In: *Živaja starina*, vol. IV, No. 3–4, St. Peterburg, pp. 60–78.
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2018). *100 rokov obyvateľstva Slovenska: od vzniku Československa po súčasnosť*. Bratislava: MKD. ISBN 978-80-89881-14-7
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2016). *Demografický obraz Slovenska v rokoch 1938–1945*. Bratislava: MKD. ISBN 978-80-89881-03-1
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2012a). *Demografický obraz Slovenska v sčítaniach ľudu 1919–1940*. Brno, Tribun EU. ISBN 978-80-263-0264-3
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2009a). *Lexikóny obcí pre územie Slovenska I. Vybrané úradné lexikóny z rokov 1920–2002*. Bratislava: Infostat. ISBN 978-80-89398-80-9
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2014). Možnosti sledovania vnútornej migrácie na Slovensku vo výsledkoch medzivojnových sčítaní ľudu. In: ŠMIGEL, Michal, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (eds.). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918–1945)*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, pp. 145–169. ISBN 978-80-557-0804-1
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2015). Možnosti využitia ekonomických štruktúr obyvateľstva v rokoch 1921, 1930, 1940 a sčítania podnikov a závodov na Slovensku v roku 1930 pre komplexný výskum populačných dejín Slovenska. In: *Remeslo má zlaté dno... : cechy, živnosti, manufaktúry a továrne v dejinách Slovenska*. Bratislava: Slovenský národný archív, pp. 375–387. ISBN 9788097176716
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2008a). *Náčrt vývoja sobášnosti na Slovensku v rokoch 1919–1937*. Bratislava: Stimul. ISBN 978-80-89236-38-1
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2008b). *Plodnosť a celková reprodukcia obyvateľstva Slovenska v rokoch 1919–1937*. Bratislava: Stimul. ISBN 978-80-89236-50-3
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2009b). *Štruktúry obyvateľstva Slovenska v rokoch 1919–1940*. Bratislava: Infostat. ISBN 978-80-89398-07-2
- ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2012b). Znalosť čítania a písania obyvateľstva Slovenska podľa výsledkov sčítania ľudu 1921 a 1930. In: *Slovenská štatistika a demografia*, vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 67–84. ISSN 1210-1095
- ŠVORC, Peter (2003). *Krajinská hranica medzi Slovenskom a Podkarpatskou Rusou v medzivojnovom období (1919–1939)*. Prešov: Univerzum. ISBN 8089046169
- THIRRING, Gusztáv (1938). *Magyarország népessége II. József korában*. Budapest: A Magyar tudományos akadémia kiadása.

- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2022c). *Malé dejiny veľkých akcií: Sčítania ľudu a súpisové akcie na Slovensku v rokoch 1919–1950*. Trnava: UCM, 2022. ISBN 978-80-572-0267-7
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2022a). Povojnový súpis zásobovaných osôb na Slovensku v roku 1946. In: *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 52–73. ISSN 1338-7219
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2017a). *Premeny vybraných charakteristík obyvateľstva Slovenska v 18.–1. pol. 20. storočia*. Bratislava: MKD. ISBN 978-80-89881-08-6
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2022b). Slovenské sčítanie ľudu z roku 1940. In: *Historická demografie*, vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 69–86. ISSN 0323-0937
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2017b). The rise of civil marriage and divorce in marriage law in Slovakia and changes in marriage law in the interwar period. In: *European journal of science and theology*, vol. 13, No. 5, pp. 35–44. ISSN 1842-8517
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol, and Branislav ŠPROCHA (2015). Zaznávaný a nepoznaný Cenzus 1919 či len kuriozita? In: *Historický časopis*, vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 253–274. ISSN 0018-2575
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2011a). Charakteristika rodín a domácností obyvateľstva Nitrianskeho okresu v roku 1919. In: *Slovenská štatistika a demografia*, vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 3–22. ISSN 1210-1095
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2008a). Kontinuita a diskontinuita fungovania okresného zriadenia na Slovensku v roku 1938 na príklade okresov Rožňava a Dobšiná. In: *České, slovenské a československé dejiny 20. století : (osudové osmičky v našich dejinách)*. Ústí nad Orlicí: Oftis, pp. 139–148. ISBN 978-80-7405-032-9
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2007a). *Mimoriadne sčítanie ľudu na Slovensku z roku 1919: Príspevok k populačným dejinám Slovenska*. Bratislava: STATIS. ISBN 978-80-85659-44-3
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2011b). Náčrt ekonomickej aktivity obyvateľstva Slovenska v medzivojnovom období na základe výsledkov sčítaní ľudu. In: *Kapitoly z dejín hospodárskeho vývinu Slovenska v medzivojnovom období (1918–1939)*. Bratislava: Slovenský národný archív, pp. 33–60. ISBN 978-80-970666-0-4
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2020). Najstaršie lexikóny sídel Slovenska úradu Ministra ČSR s plnou mocou pre správu Slovenska. In: *Populačné štúdie Slovenska 13*. Bratislava: MKD, 2020, pp. 37–58. ISBN 978-80-89881-04-8
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2007b). Národnostná a konfesijná štruktúra obyvateľstva Nitrianskeho okresu podľa výsledkov Šrobárovho sčítania z roku 1919. In: *Acta historica neosoliensia 10*. Banská Bystrica: UMB, pp. 166–174. ISSN 1336-9148
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2011c). *Národnostný kataster Slovenska z roku 1940*. Bratislava: SNA. ISBN 78-80-970666-2-8
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2008b). Nemecké národnostné ostrovy na Slovensku podľa výsledkov Šrobárovho popisu ľudu z roku 1919. In: *Historica*, vol. 47. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, pp. 89–118. ISBN 978-80-223-3658-1
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2013). *Okresné zriadenie na Slovensku v rokoch 1918–1945*. Krakov: SPS, pp. 11–13. ISBN 9788374906333

- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2011d). Populačný vývoj a zamestnanosť z rodovej perspektívy : ekonomická aktivita obyvateľstva Slovenska v medzivojnovom období so zreteľom na zamestnanosť žien. In: *Na ceste k modernej žene: z dejín rodových vzťahov na Slovensku*. Bratislava: Veda, pp. 343–364. ISBN 978-80-224-1189-9
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2014). Population censuses in Slovakia between 1919–1940. In: *Bylye gody*, vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 266–270. ISSN 2073-9745
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2007c). Predpoklady na uzavretie a ukončenie manželstva na Slovensku v medzivojnovom období. In: *Slovenská štatistika a demografia*, vol. 17, No. 1–2, pp. 93–105. ISSN 1210-1095
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2015). Prípravný proces súpisu domov a bytov a sčítania ľudu na Slovensku v roku 1940. In: TIŠLIAR, Pavol (ed.). *Populačné štúdie Slovenska* 6. Bratislava: MKD, pp. 33–61. ISBN 978-80-971715-7-5
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2019). Smerovanie populačnej politiky na Slovensku po vzniku Československa do roku 1945. In: TIŠLIAR, Pavol (ed.). *Populačná a rodinná politika na Slovensku v 20. storočí*. Bratislava: MKD, pp. 9–62. ISBN 978-80-89881-18-5
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2009). Štátny plánovací a štatistický úrad (1945–1951). In: ŠPROCHA, Branislav, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (eds.). *Pramene demografickej povahy v archívnych fondoch štatistického úradu I. (1945–1960)*. Bratislava: Infostat, pp. 8–26. ISBN 978-80-89398-10-2
- TIŠLIAR, Pavol (2008c). Vznik a fungovanie okresu Dobšiná v rokoch 1938–1945. In: *Gemer-Malohont 4*. Rimavská Sobota: Gemersko-malohontské múzeum, pp. 75–87. ISBN 9788085134292
- TIŠLIAROVÁ, Ingrid, and Pavol TIŠLIAR (2013). K problematike plebiscitu na severnej Orave a na Spiši v 20. rokoch 20. storočia. In: *Almanach 14: Slowacy w Polsce*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Slowaków w Polsce, pp. 35–75. ISSN 1233-0205
- TOMAŠIVSKIJ, Stjepan (1910). Etnograficna karta Uhorskoji Rusi. In: *Stati po slawjanovedenju*, vol. III. St. Petersburg, pp. 178–269.
- TOMAŠIVSKIJ, Stjepan (1905). Pryčynky do piznanna etnograficnoji terytoriji Uhorskoji Rusy teper i davniše. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, vol. LXVII.
- TOMAŠIVSKIJ, Stjepan (1903). Uhorski rusyny v svitli maďarskoji urjadovoji statystyky. In: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, vol. LXVI, pp. 1–46.
- TULKISOVÁ, Jana, BAKA, Igor, and Eduard NIŽŇANSKÝ (2007). Ozbroyený maďarsko-slovenský konflikt z marca 1939 v správach Sicherheitsdienstu. In: *Vojenská história*, vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 124–156. ISSN 1335-3314
- VÁLYI, András (1796–1799). *Magyar Országának leírása. I.–III. kötet*. Budan: A Királyi Universitásának Betüivel.
- VARSÍK, Branislav (1940). *Národnostná hranica Slovensko-maďarská v ostatných dvoch storočiach*. Bratislava: SUS.
- VARSÍK, Branislav (1987). *O čom mlčia archívy*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- VOJÁČEK, Ladislav, KOLÁRIK, Jozef, and Tomáš GÁBRIŠ (2013). *Československé právne dejiny (1918–1992)*. 2. vyd. Bratislava: Eurokódex. ISBN 9788089447992

- VOJÁČEK, Ladislav, and Karel SCHELLE (2007). *Právní dějiny na území Slovenska*. Ostrava: Key Publishing. ISBN 8087071434
- ŽÁK, František (1928). Zprostředkování práce slovenskému zemědělskému dělnictvu se zvláštním zřetelem na vystěhovalectví a slovenské zemědělství. In: *Československé vystěhovalectví : jeho příčiny, důsledky a výhledy*. Publikace Sociálního ústavu č. 39. Praha, pp. 61–68.

The period presses

České slovo
Československá republika
Lidové noviny
Národní listy
Národní politika
Národné noviny
Prágai Magyar Hírlap
Právo lidu
Reforma
Slovák
Slovenská politika
Slovenská pravda
Slovenské ľudové noviny
Slovenský denník

Sources of law

Krajinský vestník pre Slovensko, 1930
Sbírka zákonů na nařízení republiky Československé, 1918–1939
Slovenský zákonník, 1939–1945
Tesnopisecké správy zo zasadnutia Národného zhromaždenia ČSR, Snemu Slovenskej krajiny, Snemu Slovenskej republiky, <<https://www.nrsr.sk>>
Věstník Ministerstva vnitra republiky Československé, 1929

Censuses in Slovakia in the interwar and post-war period

prof. PhDr. Pavol Tišliar, PhD. and doc. RNDr. Branislav Šprocha, Ph.D.

Muniscrypt translation, language editing and proofreading:

Agentúra PREKLADY A TLMOČENIE

Južná Trieda 48/A

040 01 Košice

Published by Masaryk University Press

Žerotínovo nám. 617/9

601 77 Brno

First electronic edition, 2023

ISBN 978-80-280-0443-9

MUNI
PRESS

ISBN 978-80-280-0443-9

MUNI
ARTS