

UDC 94(100=161.2)“1870/1940”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226564

Michal ŠMIGEL

PhD (History), Associate Professor of Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University, 40 Tajovského Street, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, postal code 974 01 (michal.smigel@umb.sk)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2255-3135

ResearcherID: F-9451-2019

Scopus ID: 56598616800

Web of Science ResearcherID: F-9451-2019

Pavol TIŠLIAR

PhD (History), Professor of Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk university, 1 Arna Novaka Street, Brno, Czech Republic, postal code 620 00 & Professor of Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, 2 J. Herdu Street, Trnava, Slovakia, postal code 917 01 (tisliar@phil.muni.cz)

ORCID: 0000-0002-0886-7499

ResearcherID: C-1383-2017

Scopus ID: 55225944700

Web of Science ResearcherID: C-1383-2017

Міхал ШМІГЕЛЬ

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії філософського факультету Університету ім. Матія Бела, вул. Тайовського 40, м. Банська Бистриця, Словаччина, індекс 974 01 (michal.smigel@umb.sk)

Павол ТИШЛЯР

кандидат історичних наук, професор кафедри археології та музеєзнавства філософського факультету Університету Масарика, вул. Арна Новака 1, м. Брно, Чехія, індекс 620 00 та професор кафедри історії філософського факультету Університету Св. Кирила та Мефодія, вул. Й. Герду 2, м. Трнава, Словаччина, індекс 917 01 (tisliar@phil.muni.cz)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Šmigel, M. & Tišliar, P. (2021). “When men moved across the world for a piece of bread...” Emigration of the Rusyns-Ukrainians from the North-Eastern Slovakia in the years 1870 – 1940. *Skhidnoievropejskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 64–87. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226564

**“WHEN MEN MOVED ACROSS THE WORLD FOR A PIECE OF BREAD...”
EMIGRATION OF THE RUSYNS-UKRAINIANS
FROM THE NORTHEASTERN SLOVAKIA IN THE YEARS 1870 – 1940**

Abstract. The aim of the research is to define causes and impulses of Rusyns-Ukrainians migration flows from the territory of (today's) Slovakia in 1870 – 1940 and review the dimensions of

their emigration in relation to population development. It also depicts the formation of the population climate in the overall context of emigration waves from Slovakia and Transcarpathia, as well as government migration and population policy. **The research methodology** is based on the principles of historicism, scientific verification, the author's objectivity, moderated narrative constructivism and use of the specially-historical (statistical, historical-typological, historical-systemic, etc.) and general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) methods. **The scientific novelty.** The issue of migration flows of the population of Slovakia, mainly the issue of migration of Rusyns and Ukrainians since the 1870s and in the first half of the 20th century, is a relatively broad and still open topic. While many historical works are dedicated to the emigration of Slovaks, it does not go for the issue of emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia. **Conclusions.** The emigration (permanent or temporary) of Rusyns-Ukrainians from Slovakia had divided families and reduced the settlement area of the minority in many cases and Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia still feel its consequences. Moving of thousands of economically active people for work abroad from the economically backward region in the last third of the 19th – early 20th century and during the interwar years 1920s – 1930s meant that the population of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia stagnated due to migration. At the end of the 1930s, it even had statistically declining character because of political tension.

Key words: Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia, migration, population development, population climate, demographic processes, population of Slovakia, emigration from Slovakia.

**“КОЛИ ЧОЛОВІКИ РОЗІЙШЛИСЯ ПО ВСЬОМУ СВІТУ
ЗА ШМАТКОМ ХЛІБА...”
ЕМІГРАЦІЯ РУСИНІВ-УКРАЇНЦІВ ІЗ ПІВНІЧНО-СХІДНОЇ
СЛОВАЧЧИНИ В 1870 – 1940 РР.**

Анотація. Мета дослідження полягає в розкритті причин та імпульсів міграційних рухів русинів-українців з території (сьогоднішньої) Словаччини в період 1870–1940 рр. та в аналізі розмірів їх еміграції відносно популяційного розвитку менишин, а також формування популяційного клімату в загальному контексті еміграційних хвиль зі Словаччини та Підкарпатської Русі. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, науковості, авторської об'єктивності, поміркованого нарративного конструктивізму та використання спеціально-історичних (статистичних, історико-типологічних, історико-системових тощо) і загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез тощо) методів. **Наукова новизна:** Питання міграційних рухів населення Словаччини і, зокрема, питання міграції русинів-українців в період з 1870-х рр. – у першій половині ХХ ст. є відносно широкою та досі відкритою темою. Хоча велика кількість історичних праць була присвячена еміграції словаків, не можна це сказати про проблему еміграції русинів-українців зі Словаччини. **Висновки.** Еміграція (постійна чи тимчасова) русинів-українців зі Словаччини у багатьох випадках розділяла сім'ї та розріджувала територіальне розселення менишин. Її наслідки ще й досі відчуває русино-українське населення у Словаччині. Міграція тисяч економічно активних людей за роботою за кордон з економічно відсталого та аграрно переповненого регіону в останній третині ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. та в міжвоєнні 1920 – 1930 рр. означав, що популяція русинів та українців у Словаччині під впливом міграції тривалий час стагнувала, а під впливом політичної напруженості наприкінці 1930-х рр. набула статистично занепадаючий характер.

Ключові слова: русини та українці в Словаччині, міграція, популяційний розвиток, популяційний клімат, демографічні процеси, населення Словаччини, еміграція зі Словаччини.

The Problem Statement. Migration, together with population growth, forms the basis of total population growth or decline. It affects not only the population itself, but also all characteristics and demographic processes in the life of the population. It has an influence on economic, social and demographic structures and is an important component of urbanization, territorial concentration of the population, etc., as well. Migration is thus one of the most important factors in population development not only at the national, but also at the regional level (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 144).

Undoubtedly, the population of Slovakia in the last decades of the 19th century and during the first half of the 20th century, its number, characteristics and particularly population development, were to a large extent conditioned by migration flows. These had been influenced by various factors, but mainly by economic motivation. This surely goes for the case of Rusyn-Ukrainian population¹ living in the northeast of Slovakia, who participated in the various stages of emigration (temporary or permanent) from the country since the last third of the 19th century and during the first half of the 20th century. Foreign migration represents one of the main phenomenon of population development in Slovak history and in the history of the Rusyns in this period.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. Many historical works in Slovak (Czechoslovak) historiography have so far been dedicated to migration flows in Slovakia, i.e. flows of Slovaks (emigration or labor migration) in the given period. Czechoslovak demographers, historians, sociologists – pioneers of the issue such as A. Boháč, J. Svetoň, F. Bielik, E. Rákoš, J. Sirácky, E. Jakešová, A. Štefánek, J. Botík, M. Botíková, etc., as well as current researchers (M. Kmeť, P. Tišliar, B. Šprocha, I. Harušíák) had done a remarkable “piece of work” in this topic. There are several specialized proceedings (e.g. Slovaks abroad) and journals, as well as older and newer monographic works and the research continues. However, this cannot be said about the issue of emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia in the years 1870 – 1950. Although this field includes mainly older works by F. Bielik, I. Vanat, L. Tajták and several newer works in the form of scientific studies, i.e. more comprehensive works, there is only a partial representation of the issue from M. Belej, M. Gajdoš – S. Konečný, M. Šmigel’ and others. Rusynian emigration has long been in the shadow of migration of Slovaks.

The Purpose of Publication. The aim of our paper is to “open” the issue of Rusyn-Ukrainian emigration from the territory of (today’s) Slovakia from the last third of the 19th century to the end of the 1930s. Following older and newer research, we specify the causes and impulses of migration flows of members of this minority and review the dimensions of emigration in relation to population development. The paper also focuses on the formation of population climate in the overall context of emigration waves from Slovakia and Transcarpathia (during Hungarian and Czechoslovak period), regarding government migration and population policy, too.

The Basic Material Statement. The marginal geographical location of the Rusynian settlement area at the foothills of northeastern Kingdom of Hungary, as well as the low social and educational level, probably had protected them from assimilation for a long time (Magoczi, 2016, p. 180). Although this had been happening for several centuries, it had fast pace in the second half of the 19th century. The national revival of the Rusyns in the Kingdom of Hungary – as S. Konečný stated – began to develop very promising after the revolution in 1848 – 1849, but obviously, it had stagnated after the change in political conditions and the social atmosphere during the period of dualism. However, the main cause of the national movement crisis even among the Hungarian Rusyns had been demographic development, complex socio-economic conditions and emigration, not new political circumstances (Konečný, 2015, p. 119).

¹ We are of the opinion that this is one minority (Ukrainian ethnographic group) within a part of its members had identified (identifies) themselves as Rusyns and the other part as Ukrainians. Therefore, we choose a neutral name from our point of view – Rusyns-Ukrainians, although they had been most often marked as Rusyns in the given period.

Table 1

Number of Rusyns in the Kingdom of Hungary (1840 – 1910)

(Magoczi, 2016, p. 181, tab. 10.1)

Years	Total number of Rusyns	Number of Rusyns in Transcarpathia	Number of Rusyns in Slovakia
1840	442, 900	180, 100	203, 300
1851	447, 400	216, 100	113, 100
1869	455, 000	257, 200	183, 500
1880	353, 200	244, 700	88, 000
1890	379, 800	276, 600	96, 300
1900	424, 800	314, 500	84, 900
1910	464, 300	331, 600	97, 100

Note: Data rounded to the nearest hundred

In the second half of the 19th century, the population of the Kingdom of Hungary grew by 46%, while the number of Hungarians grew by 81.4%. However, non-Hungarian ethnic groups only grew by 25.8% (Slovak population grew by 16%). We can even notice a decline of Rusynian population (Konečný, 2015, p.119). To be more precise, there had been a differentiated development in the case of Carpathian Rusyns – while the number of Transcarpathian Rusyns between 1851 – 1900 increased (but their share in the total population declined), the number of Rusyns from northeastern Slovakia began to decline strongly in the same period (see Table 1).

According to the census of October 31, 1857, there were 230,000 Rusyns living in four Transcarpathian counties, i.e. 69.7% of the county’s total population (about 330,000 people). In 1900, there already were 405,994 Rusyns, i.e. 47.8% of the counties’ total population (848,000 people). Thus, in the second half of the 19th century, the population of the region actually grew by 157%, but the number of Rusyns by only 76.5%. Most Rusyns had lived in the Marmarosh county – 171,000 (47.7%) and in the Bereg county – 117,000 (49.4% of the county’s population). There had been 70,000 Rusyns in the Uzh county (43.3%) and 48,000 in the Ugoch county (52% of the county’s population) (Konečný, 2015, p. 119).

In the middle of the 19th century, there were about 113,000 people living in the east Slovak regions according to Hungarian statistics. In 1900, number of Rusyns declined to 85,000 (Magoczi, 2016, p. 181, tab. 10.1). At that time, the Rusyns lived mainly in three counties and represented a minority population. Thirty-five thousand Rusyns lived in the Zemplin county (10.6%), 34,000 in the Sharish county (19.4%) and 14,000 Rusyns in the Spish county (8.3% of the county’s population). Although Hungarian statistics from this period should not be taken too seriously – “*Sharish and Spish county authorities allegedly did not like to record Russian nationality and they often registered Rusyns as Slovaks*“, the main reason of this phenomenon had included: escalating emigration, Magyarization of Rusyns and Slovakization of Rusynian localities in the regions of Slovakia. According to data, there were 37 magyarized and 176 slovakized Rusynian villages in Slovakia in 1850 – 1900 (Konečný, 2015, p. 120).

The abolition of serfdom in the Austrian Empire in 1848 meant for the peasants not only liberation from their landowners, but also bigger freedom. However, it had not improved their economic conditions. These even had gotten worse in certain periods and regions, requiring new agricultural mobility. It had been the beginning of massive emigration processes for Hungarian Rusyns living at the southern hillsides of the Carpathians (i.e. from the northeastern

Slovakia and Transcarpathia), as well as for Rusyns from the Western Galicia (Lemkovyna) (see Tišliar & Šprocha, 2018, pp. 1010–1017).

First of all, since the beginning, i.e. during the second half of the 19th century, some of the Rusyns moved every year during the harvest for seasonal work (6 – 8 weeks) in the fertile plains of the Kingdom of Hungary. While seasonal migration had only been a way for Rusynian families to make some extra money and improve the economic situation, there had also been those who had begun to consider moving to the fertile plains of the Kingdom of Hungary permanently. Others had been attracted by even more distant “fertile plains”. Basically, it had not been innovative in any way – this is how they just followed the large colonization programme of internal resettlements to the Great Hungarian Plain – so-called Lowland area (Kmeť, 2010, p. 134) happening since the end of the 17th century. During the 18th century, one fifth of the then Upper-Hungarian (Slovak) population, including Rusyns, emigrated there (Kmeť, 2012, pp. 20–21; Janto, 2016, p. 96). Rusynian families had settled in the village of Komlóška in the region of the Hungarian town of Sárospatak and together with the Slovaks had gone to the area of Békés, Csanád and Arad county. Since the half of the 18th century, they went to Vojvodina – historical Bacska, i.e. Bács-Bodrog county (to be more precise, Bácskeresztúr /later renamed as Ruski Kerestur/ and Kucury) and in the first half of the 19th century, they went even more far to the south, the easternmost area of Slavonia – Srem (Magoczi, 2016, pp. 126–127, 191; Botík, 2007, p. 119). According to some data, in years 1850 – 1860, about 5,000 Rusyns from eastern Slovak counties moved to other regions of the Habsburg monarchy. In the years 1870 – 1875, there were about 100 – 200 Rusynian families moving from Transcarpathian counties every year (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 237).

At the end of the 19th century, Austria-Hungary was characterized by great contrasts in all spheres of social life, which was the result of unfinished capitalist changes in its individual countries and regions. Central industrialized areas “strongly” contrasted with border backward regions, which had just been entering the early stage of industrialization. Although Upper Hungary (basically mainly the territory of Slovakia) had been one of the most industrial areas in the Kingdom of Hungary, contrasts had manifested themselves in this Carpathian country as well. It had been the Slovak as well as the Transcarpathian settlement area of Rusyns-Ukrainians that belonged to the economically most backward regions of the Kingdom of Hungary. Moreover, social status of this population had been the worst of all groups of other nations in this country.

The demographic revolution had begun to affect the population of Upper Hungary much later than in western countries. At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, this population was one of the youngest in Europe, with a high fertility rate (it began to gradually decline only after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic) (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 96 a f.). Due to its combination with the traditional way of life in the Slovak countryside and the characteristics of the economy, in which agriculture predominated as a primary source of living, it all resulted into *an agrarian overcrowding and an increase in unemployment* (Jakešová, 1987, p. 381). However – if we talk about the backwardness of economic sphere in eastern Slovakia – we must not omit that this had manifested itself both in industry and agriculture. Local development had been hindered by a lack of domestic capital (Jewish capital spread there in the first decades of the 20th century. Czech capital expanded later – after the establishment of Czechoslovakia) and poor infrastructure in the indented mountain terrain (particularly in relation to distance to rail transport). Underdeveloped agriculture and the low agrotechnical level of peasantry had been conditioned by the overall economic and cultural backwardness of this region, the lack of arable land and its low yield. Moreover, the law

of inheritance had caused the land had constantly been dividing and became economically insecure for the maintenance of families. The only solution would be the restructuring of the then economy which, however, had not been possible due to the possibilities offered by the weak, insufficiently built Hungarian industry. This fact had inevitably driven Rusyns to look for extra income outside the region and later a main income that could support a large family. To some extent, this goes for foreign migration for work which, however, in many cases had taken the character of permanent emigration (Tišliar, 2014b, p. 56).

Within the industrialization of the dualistic monarchy in the second half of the 19th century, its accompanying processes and the effects on the mechanical movement of the population, more and more Rusynian families looked for work in the arising industrial centers of the country. Some of the Rusyns (under the influence of an extensive advertising campaign) had begun to adopt the bold idea of moving to the industrializing United States of North America (after 1865). However, it had not yet been a mass migration of Rusyns (Magoczi, 2016, p. 193). The turning point came after the beginning of economic crisis in 1873. This crisis caused by overproduction (1873 – 1879), lasting in the Kingdom of Hungary until the mid-1990s and also by the barren year 1879 are considered to be the main impulses of massive emigration flows from the country, mainly to the New World.

Table 2

Population of Slovakia in 1880 – 1950
(Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel', 2014, pp. 22, 35)

Year*	Population	Native language / nationality				
		Slovak (Czechoslovak)	Hungarian	German	Rusynian and Ukrainian**	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	87, 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
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
1950	3, 442, 317	2, 982, 524	354, 532	5,179	48, 231	51, 851

* Data from years 1880 – 1919 for present population, in 1921 – 1940 for only Czechoslovak (Slovak) nationals, in 1950 for present population again;

Data from 1938 and 1940 only for the then territory of Slovakia. In 1938, 77,488 Czechs were counted, but in 1940 there were only 3,253 of them in Slovakia. These persons were counted as of Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality.

** In 1919 – Rusynian nationality, in 1921 – Great-Russian, Ukrainian and Carpatho-Russian, in 1930 – Russian and Little-Russian, in 1938 – Rusynian, in 1940 – Ukrainian (Rusynian); in 1950 – Russian and Ukrainian nationality.

Pre-war emigration (1880 – 1914). Emigration abroad/overseas from the counties of Upper Hungary had not been a mass phenomenon until the 1880s. The turning point came in the 1880s and 1890s, when *the mass emigration of the population* from this area became a

part of a massive emigration flow from almost all European countries. During this period, the former initial areas of emigration (so-called old immigration to America – *old immigration*) consisting of the regions of Western, Central and Northern Europe, had gradually been replacing the Southern, Eastern, i.e. South-Eastern Europe and partly Central Europe (so-called *new immigration*). This mass labor migration included emigrants from Italy, the Balkan, the Russian Empire and from the Austro-Hungarian monarchy as well (Harušťák, 2013, p. 215).

The causes of mass emigration from Europe to overseas destinations in the last third of the 19th century – early 20th century (particularly to the USA, less to Canada and South America) did not differ in principle in individual states (or regions). They were mainly the result of demographic and economic “pressure” arising from the imbalance between population growth and its living opportunities (Bade, 2005, p. 152). Starting factors had clearly included *the economic situation*– the already mentioned economic crisis since 1873, lack of job opportunities, lack of land and *massive population growth* (Bade, 2005, p. 153). The population in the region of Central and Eastern Europe grew by an average of 75% in 1860 – 1910. This *demographic boom*, together with the stagnating and declining economic situation and the ongoing process of land division had provoked emigration process of hundreds of thousands of people (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 215, 221–222). Emigration had also been caused due to political or confessional reasons (e.g. massive emigration of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe to overseas, particularly the USA) (Joseph, 1914, p. 164).

On the other hand, the appeal of the New World, spreading through returnees from overseas, correspondence, legally or illegally active agents of the so-called steam navigation companies and pictures in the periodical press had also played a role here. “*Technological progress in transport and communication, lower travel fares and the construction of transnational networks and structures between immigrants in the new society and their country of origin had enabled mobility of these dimensions, which had led to the so-called chain migrations*” (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 215–216).

In the last decade before the outbreak of World War I, this mass transfer of the population had still been continuing. According to statistics, emigration in the years 1900 – 1915 is the most powerful flow of European emigration since 1846 (Bade, 2005, p. 132). In general, about 20 million people left Europe in the years 1870 – 1914. Most emigrants from Central, Eastern and Southern Europe (7.5 million) had belonged to minority “ethnic groups” of the Habsburg monarchy (Poles, Slovaks, Czechs, Rusyns-Ukrainians, Jews, Slovenes), the German Empire (mainly Poles) and Russian Empire (especially Jews), living in economically marginal regions (Harušťák, 2013, p. 216, note. 74). Regarding the number of emigrants to the USA, Austria-Hungary took the third place in the years 1890 – 1900 (15.5% of all immigrants). In the years 1901–1910, the monarchy took with the number of resettled persons from Europe the first place (23.8%), while Italy (Fatula, 2018) took the second place. In the years 1861 – 1870, there were 7,800 people moving from Austria-Hungary to the USA. In the years 1871 – 1880, it had already been 73,000 people, in 1881 – 1890 – 353,700; in the years 1891 – 1900 – there were 597, 000 people, during years 1901 – 1910 – 1,125,200 people and in 1911 – 1920 – 1,046,200 people. Total number of resettled people reached 3.2 million (in 1861 – 1920) (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 231).

Speaking of emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary² – in 1901, the authorities recorded more than 70,000 emigrants from the country to the USA, in 1903 there were already 120,000

² The first consistent statistics on migration flows from the Kingdom of Hungary was published in 1893 and included an annual balance of emigrants since 1881 at the level of counties and some towns. However, the data are approximately the same every year until 1897, so it is assumed that this happens due to interpolation and data had not been systematically collected each year. More comprehensive data on emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary are dated back to years 1899 – 1913 (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 145).

of them and in 1905 the number of emigrants even reached 180,000 (1/4 of the Hungarian emigration consisted of Slovaks and Carpathian Rusyns). Around 1907, emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary (and thus also from Slovakia) culminated and exceeded number of 200,000 official migrants to the United States. However, efforts to emigrate declined – for example, in 1913, there were 119,159 Hungarian inhabitants emigrating to the USA, including 27,234 Slovaks (Harušťák, 2013, p. 216) and later, just before the war, the numbers reached slightly over 100,000 inhabitants per year (Syrný, 2016, pp. 14–15). To sum up this period, there were about 1.5 million emigrants in total, mostly members of non-Hungarian ethnic groups who had left the Kingdom of Hungary (emigrated especially to the USA) (Štefánek, 1944, p. 253). According to *Hungarian official statistics*, about 27% of Hungarians, 5% of Germans, 24% of Slovaks and 43% of Carpathian Rusyns out of the total number of all emigrants in the last decades of the 19th – early 20th century emigrated (Vanat, 1990, p. 23).

However, current research indicates that at least half of all emigrants from the Kingdom of Hungary had come from the Upper Hungarian counties – Uzh, Zemplin, Sharish, Spish, Orava, Liptov and Turchan counties. Mass emigration of the population from the Upper Hungarian counties had been first noticed in Sharish county, followed by emigration from Zemplin, Spish and other counties (Harušťák, 2013, p. 221). Regarding the extent of emigration from the territory of (today's) Slovakia – current demographers estimate that there were 590,000 of emigrants in the years 1870 – 1910 (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 147). According to J. Svetoň, the total number of emigrants in 1871 – 1914 is 650,000 (Svetoň, 1970, p. 191). Hungarian official statistics in 1899 – 1913 recorded 394,713 emigrants from Slovak counties, and data from US ports documented 451,457 Slovak immigrants to the United States (Svetoň, 1958, p. 152; see Tab. 3). The Ministry of Social Welfare of the Czechoslovak Republic (Czechoslovakia) assumed for the years 1899–1914 more than 477,000 emigrants that would purely statistically mean resettlement of approximately 30,000 people a year from Slovakia (Deset let..., 1924, p. 94). Based on Hungarian statistics, L. Tajták calculated that in the years 1900 – 1913, there were 361,074 people who emigrated from the territory of 15 Slovak counties (25,791 people per year). Speaking about mentioned counties, 212,930 persons had emigrated from the territory of four eastern Slovak counties (Zemplin, Sharish, Spish and Abov-Turnian), while from the remaining eleven Slovak counties it had been 148,144 persons. This represented a mutual ratio of 58.9% – 41.1% in favor of emigration from eastern Slovakia, although the mutual ratio of the population represented 27.5% – 72.5% to the east Slovak counties disadvantage (Tajták, 1980, p. 504; see also Tajták, 1975, p. 383).

Based on the data above, it can be seen there are significant differences between the published statistics about emigration from Slovak counties (depending on who and how collected and recalculated these data). A similar situation goes for the emigration of Carpathian (Hungarian) Rusyns during this period.

Part of the Carpathian Rusyns continued in their resettlement to Lowland in the last decades of the 19th and early 20th century. Some Lemko-Rusynian families moved to Slavonia and Northern Bosnia as well (since 1878 under the administration of Austria-Hungary). Rusyns from Spish county, Marmarosh county and other Transcarpathian counties had moved to the eastern Banat and the foothills of the southern (Transylvanian) Carpathians in the 1890s and the beginning of the 20th century. In 1910, the number of Banat Rusyns reached 2,500 and Bacs-Srem Rusyns in Vojvodina reached 15,000 (Magoczi, 2016, pp. 189–191)

Table 3

Emigration from Slovakia in 1899 – 1913

(Svetoň, 1958, p. 152)

Year	Data from Hungarian statistics from 15 Slovak counties		Data from American ports about Slovaks	
	Emigrants	Returnees	Immigrants to USA	Emigrants from USA
1899	18, 214	2, 873	15, 838	*
1900	19, 085	3, 853	29, 243	*
1901	25, 886	4, 170	29, 343	*
1902	25, 285	5, 824	36, 934	*
1903	23, 205	9, 857	34, 427	*
1904	24, 404	7, 289	27, 940	*
1905	49, 284	5, 600	52, 368	*
1906	42, 476	9, 968	38, 221	*
1907	42, 586	15, 070	42, 041	*
1908	12, 794	17, 765	16, 170	23, 573
1909	30, 597	4, 954	22, 586	8, 894
1910	23, 175	6,799	32, 416	9, 259
1911	15, 844	8, 844	21, 415	15, 561
1912	22, 508	6, 734	25, 281	12, 526
1913	19, 370	6, 499	27, 234	9, 854
1899– 1913	394, 713	116, 099	451, 457	79, 667

* Datis missing

However, a much larger number of Hungarian Rusyns had gone overseas during this period, mainly to the USA. Some authors state that in the last decades of the 19th century, more than 150,000 Rusyns from Northeastern Slovakia and Transcarpathia emigrated to the USA, Canada, Argentina and other countries (Pop, 2011, p. 57). According to other data – approximately 130 – 155,000 persons moved from the territory of Hungarian Russia to the USA until 1914, i.e. almost 1/3 of its population (Švorc, 2007, p. 25). P. R. Magocsi declares (his information are based on US migration statistics) that the number of Hungarian Rusyns who emigrated to the USA during 1880 – 1914 was not less than 225,000 people (Onufrak, 2019, p. 143 – referring to Magocsi, 2005). The numbers of Carpathian Rusyns who had temporarily or permanently moved from the Kingdom of Hungary abroad / overseas in 1870 – 1914/1920 are estimated to 300 – 400,000 in total (Vanat, 1990, p. 23, note 35; Marunchak, 1991, p. 21). They were mainly from Uzh, Bereg, Zemplin and Sharish county. To conclude, about 500 – 550,000 Rusynians and Ukrainians emigrated from Austria-Hungary in this period (including 360,000 people from Austrian Galicia and Bukovina) (Makar, 2007, p. 12; Kabuzan, 2006, p. 252).

Undoubtedly, the emigration of Rusyns from Northeastern Slovakia began in the late 60s – early 70s and gained mass character in the late 70s – 80s of the 19th century. In the 1880s, about 20,000 people emigrated from Sharish and almost 25,000 persons from Zemplin – they were mostly Rusyns living in the northern districts of these counties (Konečný, 2015, p. 124). Obviously, a similar extent of emigration continued in the 1890s as well. The end of the 19th and particularly the beginning of the 20th century represented crucial

periods of foreign emigration from Slovakia. Since more accurate statistics are missing until 1900, the only way is to estimate the numbers – in the last third of the 19th century, it was at least 50,000 Rusyns who emigrated from the eastern Slovak counties (in 1880 – 1900, about 2,300 people a year; including repeated migrations). About 100,000 people had emigrated from the Transcarpathian counties (Konečný, 2015, p. 124), including about 70 – 75,000 Rusyns. To sum up, there had been 125,000 Carpathian Rusyns in total – 80,000 emigrated to the USA, 25,000 to Canada and 18,500 to the Latin America (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 238).

In 1899 – 1913, about 82,500 people emigrated from Zemplin county, 50,000 from Sharish and 46,000 from Spish county – i.e. 178,500 people in total, including 128,900 Slovaks (Šaposová, 2004, pp. 11–12, tab. 1 – referring to Szarka, 1995, pp. 246–247). About 17,000 – (Konečný, 2015, p. 124) 20,000 Rusyns had emigrated from these three counties (at first places in ranking of emigration from Slovak counties) in the mentioned period, i.e. 10–11% from the number of emigrants of these counties (*an average of 1,250 people per year*). From 1900 to the World War I, over 200,000 people emigrated from the four Transcarpathian counties, including about 60 – 70,000 Rusyns (Fatula, 2018, referring to Ílko, 1973; Kabuzan, 2006, p. 252). Of course, some emigrants had returned home after some time (but some had been emigrating repeatedly, even several times), so the absolute decline in population had been much lower. However – as S. Konečný emphasized – it does not change the fact that in the years 1899–1914, an average of 3,500 Rusyns per year emigrated abroad (according to Hungarian incomplete statistics). There had been Rusynian villages from where up to a quarter of the population had emigrated (Konečný, 2015, p. 124). *“In some places in Zemplin County, only women, children and the elderly remained, because men moved across the world for a piece of bread,”* – contemporaries state (Vanat, 1990, p. 23).

In 1870 – 1914, about 70,000 Rusyns from northeastern Slovakia and 130 – 145,000 Transcarpathian Rusyns migrated to various parts of the world (temporarily or permanently). Although moving abroad/overseas had meant to be only a temporary solution in many cases, it is estimated that up to 2/3 of all emigrants had stayed in the new country and 1/3 returned home (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 250). If we regard this aspect and deal with the number of 300 – 400,000 Hungarian Rusyns-emigrants, this construct is being fulfilled. According to data, more than 200,000 Rusynian emigrants from Hungary lived in the United States during the World War I. (Konečný, 2015, p. 128), while the number of people from Slovakia reached 620,000 (Pútnik..., 1928, p. 98). However, these figures include the natural increase of settled emigrant families as well (at the beginning, the habit of starting traditional large families had been obvious here).

An important aspect of foreign emigration from Slovakia until the World War I. had been significant prevalence of men. This only confirms the originally prevailing intention of temporary labour migration. In 1899 – 1913, only 544 women per 1,000 men on average emigrated. Regarding their age, emigrants had been of younger age (approximately 1/3 of emigrants were 20-29-year-old, the second most numerous group were persons under 20). The low educational structure of emigrants had also been a specific feature of emigration (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 146)

According to Harušťák, the social structure of Upper Hungary emigrants had logically been dominated by agricultural workers (up to 80%), who at first only looked for temporary work in order to earn money to improve living conditions or pay off debts. Some of them had settled in the New World permanently and others had made several other journeys (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 216–217). Labour migration had meant an improvement in socio-economic situation of emigrants from other European countries, while most Hungarian Rusyns had considered it a way of maintaining a bare existence which is indicated by its mass character (Vanat, 1990, p. 22).

For many emigrants, emigration was a form of *silent social protest* against unsatisfactory living conditions in their native land, which emigration could easily get them rid of (Harušťák, 2013, p. 217).

However, the causes had varied within the Upper Hungary region depending on the economic, cultural, demographic and natural specifics of the particular counties as well (Janto, 2017, p. 52). In addition to the main factors, i.e. the economic situation and population growth, other factors such as migration social networks, chain migration and individual decision-making process had an impact on emigration, too. Further factors include the so-called emigrant fever, evasion of military service, the activities of emigrant agents, preserving positive image of America (Harušťák, 2013, p. 222) and Magyarization.

The intensity and extent of emigration from the Upper Hungarian counties had not only been influenced by the desire for a better (or any) financial reward and a better life. It had been determined by emigration policy of the Kingdom of Hungary and immigration policy of the United States as well (in fact, until the beginning of the World War I., immigration to the United States was almost unrestricted). The Hungarian government had not prohibited emigration from the country *de jure* (which would be contrary to the Hungarian constitution), but only regulated the activities of emigration agents and agencies with activities in the territory of the kingdom of Hungary (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 217–218).

Mass emigration from the entire region of Central and Eastern Europe had left permanent traces in the population structure of the affected regions. Since the end of the 19th century, the number of men had decreased in some areas which affected not only the natural increase of the population, but also the labor market, supply and demand for men's labor (Harušťák, 2013, p. 219).

In the case of Rusyns-Ukrainians from northeastern Slovakia, migration for work abroad/overseas had a *direct population effect* – in contrast to seasonal labor migration appearing indirectly in the form of longer partners separation (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 103) – and it is possible to speak of a *significant population stagnation* (see Table 4). Actually, for 40 years – in 1880 (78,941 people) – 1921 (85,629 people), the number of Rusyns grew only by 6,687 people in total, i.e. by 8.4% (to compare – in 1880 – 1921 the number of Rusyns increased from 244,700 to 376,200 in Transcarpathia, i.e. by 131,500 people – which is almost 54%). Of course, regarding the numbers of “Slovak” Rusyns, it is necessary to see the results of the process of Magyarization/Slovakization, as well as the demographic crisis of the war years 1915 – 1918 and the increase in mortality. However, the total population of Slovakia had statistically grown by 500,000 people – almost 20.4% in the same period. The cause of such a difference between the whole Slovak and Rusynian population growth is undoubtedly emigration factors.

Table 4

**Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia and their share
in the total number of population in the years 1880 – 1921**

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians (%)
1880	2, 455, 928	78, 941	3.2
1890	2, 587, 485	87, 787	3.4
1900	2, 792, 569	84, 906	3.0
1910	2, 926, 833	97, 014	3.3
1919	2, 923, 214	81, 332	2.8
1921	2, 955, 998	85, 628	2.9

Note.: Tables 4, 6 and 7 are based on data from table 2.

Interwar migration of the Rusyns-Ukrainians

Migration in the 1920s. In the years 1914 – 1915, the Eastern Carpathians became the scene of World War I and front-line operations of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian army. The war had left great material damage here and the suffering of inhabitants had been enormous. Many villages of the Bardejov, Svidnik, Stropkov, Medzilaborce and Sninadistricts (including a major part of the Rusynian population) had been destroyed. Both armies had confiscated cattle and horses. Roads and bridges had also been destroyed, limiting access to particular villages quite far from railway connections. After moving the front back to the Carpathians, the Hungarian government had confirmed relief activities to provide emergency shelter to the war-affected population. However, this assistance was insufficient. The allocation of discarded military horses and young cattle had represented only a partial help for revive long-term backward agriculture in the region (Vanat, 1976, pp. 52–53).

With this legacy, Rusyn-Ukrainian society had entered the created Czechoslovak state (according to Czechoslovak statistics from 1921 – there were 461,849 Rusyns in total, including 85,628 living in Slovakia) (Tóth, Novotný & Stehlík, 2012, p. 625; Československá statistika, sv. 9, 1924, p. 60*). It had consisted of two different economic units: the Czech lands belonging to the most economically developed areas of Austria and the relatively backward parts of the Upper Hungary – Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus’ (Shnitser, 2019, p. 99). In the settlement area of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia, i.e. in the northern parts of Zemplin, Sharish and Spish counties, socio-economic problems had still persisted.

The population of the northeastern areas of Slovakia had expected improving its position from the newly created Czechoslovak state. However, their living conditions had not improved. On the contrary – due to the loss of the Hungarian lowland, where some poor farmers from mountainous areas went for seasonal agricultural work until the war – they had worsened. Even employment in industry in eastern Slovakia did not increase in 1920 when compared to the western and central part of the country. Moreover, it fell below the level of the year 1900. Poor supply situation, shortage of daily consumer goods (flour, sugar, footwear, clothing, kerosene) and flourishing smuggling (export of rations and scarce goods to Poland which had led – after government intervention – to the declaration of martial law in border districts and guarding borders by selected military units) had exacerbated the situation (Vanat, 1976, pp. 53–54). It is understandable that under such socio-economic conditions there could be no improvement in the social position of the population. Especially languishing of agriculture in this region had required several immediate measures which the new Czechoslovak administration had not really been able to implement in a short time.

After the end of World War I, the emigrant fever had returned to Slovakia (and Subcarpathian Rus’). If we could specify it more, it had happened after expulsion of Hungarian Bolsheviks and integration of the eastern Slovakia and Transcarpathia into integral Czechoslovak republic superiority in August, 1919 (Šmigel’ & Syrný, 2019, p. 63). Particularly in the USA, the first post-war years had brought considerable prosperity for immigrants and home returning re-emigrants (for example, in 1922 up to 5,220 people (Štefánek, 1944, p. 247)) aroused the interest of others which was used by several migration agencies and ocean shipping companies. In the imagination of Rusynian peasants, emigration thus had become the only option how to earn money for living as soon as possible, i.e. acquire capital to build a house, enhance own farm or buying land. In the post-war years, the region had been flooded with expatriate agents and crowds had been waiting daily in front of the authorities for a passport to be issued.

Emigration agitation and illicit emigration in Eastern Slovakia had taken on such extension that the Chamber of Deputies (at the suggestion of deputies Sopka, Hodža, Stodola etc.) passed a resolution on December 20, 1920, demanding the Czechoslovak government to prevent mass emigration from this region. According to US statistics, in the fiscal year 1920/21, 40,884 emigrants from the Czechoslovak Republic moved to the USA, including migrants from Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' as the major group (Vanat, 1976, p. 56; Bielik, 1964, p. 301).

The Czechoslovak state had failed to take such economic and social measures that would provide employment and support for living for this population. Thus, the state had not restricted economic migration at all – it had tried to give it an organized character by helping people with leaving a country (Tišliar, 2014a, pp. 43–62). Foreign migration had been seen as a kind of “necessary release” removing the possible causes of the various economic and social conflicts that had thus been prevented to some extent (Tišliar, 2014b, pp. 59–60). However, the measures came from the other side – in May 1921, the US government passed the so-called *Emergency Quota Act* restricting the number of immigrants annually to 3% of the number of residents from that same country. The quota for the Czechoslovak Republic had been initially set at 14,282 persons per year and in 1924 it was reduced to 3,073 persons. As a result of measures of the US government, the number of emigrants from the Czechoslovak Republic declined after 1922 when compared to the pre-war years and the direction of migration changed as well (Vanat, 1976, pp. 56–57). Mainly Slovaks and Rusyns-Ukrainians from Czechoslovakia had continued to move to countries such as Canada, Argentina, Brazil and Western Europe, but also to Uruguay, Chile, Venezuela, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand etc. For example, demand for emigrant passports to Central American countries in the years 1920 – 1925 had been gradually increasing every year by 200–300 people (Fordinálová, 1983, p. 33).

According to I. Vanat, the number of people who were issued an emigration passport in the years 1922 – 1927 is 195,183, including 107,222 who went overseas. According to Czechoslovak statistics in the years 1922 – 1929, there were 6,262 Rusyns-Ukrainians who emigrated from the northeastern Slovakia (Vanat, 1976, p. 57) – i.e. an average of 783 people per year, but these figures are clearly questionable and the number of emigrants had been much higher. Statistics of foreign migration from Czechoslovakia (keeping since 1922) had been incomplete, as many left without emigrant passports with the help of emigrant agents (therefore numbers stated above should be perceived as *the lowest*). Emigrants from Eastern Slovakia (and also from Subcarpathian Rus') had continued to look for their place in “overseas” and – unlike Slovaks – only a small percentage had stayed in European countries (Kmeť, 2014, p. 73).

Seasonal migration of the population had still belonged to common (and since Hungarian times also traditional) forms of earnings, especially for population of the northern regions of Slovakia (Slovaks and Rusyns). It displayed as internal migration within Slovakia, for example, seasonal migrants had found work more often in southwestern Slovakia and since the early 1920s in Bohemia and Moravia as well, but also abroad – especially migration to neighbouring countries (Hungary, Austria, but also Germany, French, etc.) (Tišliar, 2014b, p. 58). In the period from the 1920s to the 1930s, more than 220,000 people in total seasonally migrated abroad in this way. persons (on average more than 11,000 persons per year). In the first half of the 1920s, more than 40,000 people per year participated in internal migration (within the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic. These numbers had not fallen significantly until the 1930s due to the global economic crisis (Svetoň, 1958, pp. 176–178), when particular states closed their economies off to immigrants. In comparison to these

figures, it is evident that official statistics of Rusyns migrating for labour in the 1920s (i.e. the above-mentioned 6,262 people – an average of 783 people per year) are unlikely and the real number probably reached at least 900 – 1000 people per year.

Although the interwar emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia had not been as massive as in the previous period, the possibilities of emigration had not been comparable to the natural increase in population and the chances of free labor employment in the industrial sectors of the region. The issue of reviving agriculture by its gradual intensification had become very urgent after the war. The improvement of the social status of the population had depended on the solution of this problem, requiring several immediate measures: compensation for war damage, expansion of agricultural land – including forest land (expansion of pasture lands), land consolidation, increasing qualification of farmers and their temporary exemption from taxes, provision of state support for the purchase of high-quality seeds, seedlings, breeding cattle and agricultural inventory, accelerated construction of infrastructure. Although some steps had been taken, several of them had not been completed and thus had only a partial effect. Similarly, land reform in Northeastern Slovakia lasting practically throughout the whole interwar period, had not helped to expand the land fund of Rusynian-Ukrainian agriculture (unlike other regions of Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia and even Transcarpathia), suffering from shortages of land (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2012, p. 220). As a result, the social status of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia, where a small agrarian element had predominated, had been the worst of all nationalities in the republic (Vanat, 1976, pp. 58–59, 62–63, 72).

Migration during the 1930s. The global economic crisis of the 1930s, result of which the whole world had felt, had been another “blow” during the interwar period. It had led the masses of peasants of the interwar Czechoslovakia national peripheries to a total collapse, including Subcarpathian Rus’ and northern districts of the eastern Slovakia. The economic crisis had paralyzed the most sensitive area of the economy of these regions – forestry and woodworking industry, glass industry and tinkers. This had led to massive unemployment and in some cases to the hopeless situation of the mountain regions population in the Eastern Slovakia as well. During the crisis, the agrarian overpopulation of the region had appeared again (the number of inhabitants in the northern districts of eastern Slovakia grew by an average of 12% in 1921 – 1930) (Vanat, 1990, p. 199). For impoverished farmers, the only solution of the difficult situation had been migration for earnings again.

According to Czechoslovak official statistics of the year 1930, the largest number of people willing to emigrate from the Czechoslovak Republic were Rusyns-Ukrainians among all ethnic groups of the republic. In 1929, there were 2,606 Rusynian inhabitants (762 from Slovakia and 1,944 from Transcarpathia), 1,668 Hungarian, 1,641 German, 252 Polish and 346 Jewish inhabitants who applied for a passport. Speaking in whole-state figures, while in the 1920s the share of resettlers from Slovakia represented 55% and 61.3% from Subcarpathian Rus’, in 1929 the number of resettlers from the eastern part of the republic (i.e. Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus’ together) reached 75.6%, t. j. 2/3 of all Czechoslovak emigrants. Natives of Subcarpathian Rus’ and Slovakia had represented 86.4% of the total number of emigrant farmers (Vanat, 1990, p. 200).

Emigration to European and transoceanic countries from the eastern parts of the Czechoslovak Republic reached its imaginary peak in 1930 when passports were issued to 16,682 inhabitants from Slovakia and 2,706 from Transcarpathia. In the following years, the number of issued passports (according to official statistics) had decreased significantly (Vanat, 1990, pp. 200–201, tab. 21), however, it had not corresponded to the actual number of the resettlers.

Table 5

**Number of emigration passports issued to persons from Slovakia (1920 – 1938)
and Subcarpathian Rus' (1920 – 1936)**

(Bielik, 1964, p. 301; Šprocha & Tišliar, 2009, p. 194, tab. 64)

Year	Number of issued emigration passports:					
	Slovakia			Subcarpathian Rus'		
	Total	To(from the total amount):		Total	To(from the total amount):	
Europe		overseas	Europe		overseas	
1920	13, 683	2, 410	11, 273	1,766	*	*
1921	15, 061	2, 949	12, 112	2,147	*	*
1922	16, 737	14, 188	2, 549	1,803	86	1, 712
1923	16, 596	9, 919	6, 677	313	35	278
1924	35, 202	25, 772	9, 430	2,493	173	2, 318
1925	8, 715	2, 885	5, 830	475	339	136
1926	14, 409	10, 945	3, 464	1,561	753	808
1927	12, 053	10, 854	1, 199	2,411	85	2, 326
1928	13, 544	10, 475	3, 069	2, 286	433	1, 853
1929	19, 401	11, 948	7, 453	3, 822	2, 309	1, 513
1930	16, 682	5, 709	10, 973	2, 706	1, 921	785
1931	4, 527	1, 603	2, 924	358	129	229
1932	2, 222	858	1, 364	123	24	99
1933	3, 009	987	2, 022	241	89	152
1934	3, 016	1, 520	1, 496	343	67	276
1935	3, 707	1, 868	1, 839	445	14	431
1936	4, 831	2, 267	2, 564	471	129	342
1937	8, 595	4, 069	4, 526	*	*	*
1938	6, 557	3, 752	2, 805	*	*	*
1920–1938	218, 547	124, 978	93, 569	23, 764	6, 586	13, 258

* Data is missing.

A total of 218,547 emigration passports were issued in Slovakia in 1920 – 1938 (see Table 5). In the years 1920 – 1930 there were 182,083 passports (on average of 16,553 per year) and in the years 1931 – 1938 there were 36,464 passports (on average of 4,558 per year). Just to remind – in the years 1900 – 1913, there were 361,074 people moving out, i. e. an average of 25,791 people per year when compared to the previous period (according to Tajták's calculations). In 1920 – 1936, there were issued 23,764 emigration passports in total in Subcarpathian Rus' (see Tab. 5), including 21,783 passports (on average of 1,980 per year) in the years 1920 – 1930 and 1,981 passports (on average 330 per year) in the years 1931 – 1936.

However, according to the calculations of Milan Belej, in the years 1922 – 1937 there were issued 183,246 passports in Slovakia (in the years 1922 – 1930 it was 153,339 and in the years 1931 – 1937 only 29,907 passports). These include 56,834 passports (31%) in the eastern Slovakia, in 1922 – 1930 there were 49,267 issued passports and in 1931 – 1937 only 7,567 of them (Belej, 2007, pp. 210–211). Thus, it is evident that the dynamics of emigration flows in Slovakia and eastern Slovakia had quite declining tendency, similar to Subcarpathian Rus'.

From the point of view of the ethnic structure of emigrants during 1922 – 1937 and the total number of 183,246 passports issued in Slovakia, 153,289 persons of them were of Slovak nationality (83.7%), 13,581 people of Hungarian nationality (7.4%); 8,202 – Rusynian nationality (4, 5%); 6,597 – German nationality (3.6%); 807 – Jewish inhabitants (0.4%), 21 – people of Polish nationality and 749 persons (0.4%) of other nationalities. In the case of figures entirely for Eastern Slovakia – 56,834 passports had been issued to applicants from the region, including 8,046 for Rusyns (14.2%) at the second place after Slovaks – they had applied for 39,855 passports (70.1%) (Belej, 2007, p. 211). Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the number of issued passports is not equal to the actual number of emigrants. Rather, it was the number of people who thus had expressed a willingness to migrate.

The above-mentioned Belej's data thus indicate that in the years 1922 – 1937 there were 503 Rusyns-Ukrainians from Eastern Slovakia on average per year, who were ready to emigrate (when compared to Slovaks from Eastern Slovakia, where it was an average of 2,491 persons per year). If we reconsider data from Vanat for the years 1922 – 1929 (about the emigration of 6,262 Rusyns – an average of 783 people per year) and deduct them from the data from Belej (for 20 – 30 years together), we can find out that in 1930 – 1937 there were at least 1,940 Rusyns willing to emigrate, i.e. 243 people per year. Although these are obviously incomplete data from official statistics, they suggest the fact that the emigration of Rusyns in the 1930s, under the influence of external factors, decreased and was around 1/3 of the number compared to the emigration in the 1920s. Although these data from official statistics are obviously incomplete, they suggest the fact that the emigration of Rusyns in the 1930s, under the influence of external factors, declined and represented 1/3 of the number when compared to the figures of emigration in the 1920s.

When comparing all-European statistics, it is evident that emigrants from Slovakia in the 1930s belonged to the largest group of social migrants. While in 1924 there were 1,174 emigrants per 100,000 inhabitants in Slovakia, the most in the whole Europe (!), in 1931 (similarly as in the following years) Slovakia with the number of its migrants (322) followed Ireland (826), Portugal (476) and Italy (335) (Jakešová, 1971, pp. 117–118). The fact is that more people had travelled overseas from the east Slovak regions within Slovakia, while from other areas they had gone to the Western Europe countries, usually for just seasonal work. However, it should be remarked that in the years of the economic crisis (1929 – 1933) a significant number of emigrants returned to Slovakia.

As a result of the economic crisis and the loss of extra income in local industry and abroad/overseas, tens of thousands of small landowners in northeastern Slovakia (as well as in Subcarpathian Rus') had found themselves in critical conditions. Many of them had been starving for several years (see also Verbytska & Kuzmin, 2019, p. 25) which had been the result of the barren year 1932 and partly 1934 as well. Low immunity due to malnutrition had led to the spread of epidemics and the increase of mortality of this population. According to Czechoslovak statistics from 1931, an average of 14.3 people out of 1,000 died (15.08 men and 13.68 women). It should be noted that the mortality of Rusyns had represented around 20 people, Poles – 18.7, Hungarians – 17.4, Czechs with Slovaks – 13.4, Jews – 12.9 and other nationalities – 12.5 people. Infant mortality had been particularly high, especially for children up to the first year of their life (e.g. in the Snina district, it had reached 15%) (Vanat, 1990, p. 204). Statistically speaking of 1,000 children born to Rusynian women in the early 1930s, up to 190 out of them did not survive the first year (it was 160 children on average in Slovakia; in some countries of northern and western Europe only 50) (Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel', 2017, p. 219).

On the other hand, Rusyns-Ukrainians had the highest birth rate among all ethnic groups in interwar Slovakia. The birth rate in Slovakia had begun to gradually decline from an average gross rate of 35‰ in the years 1919 – 1923 and in the years 1934 – 1937 to 24‰ (Tišliar, 2014c, pp. 47–48) (in 1920 – 4.25 children per woman on average, in 1930 – 3.49 and in 1937 – 2.77 children (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2008, p. 36)). However, the birth rate of Rusynian women had remained stable at 37–39 ‰ until the end of the 1920s. Despite the fact that it had begun to decline gradually in the 1930s, it had been still higher than 30 ‰ in the second half of the 1930s (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2016, p. 230; Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel, 2017, pp. 220–221). Although Rusynian women in the whole interwar period had been characterized by the lowest extramarital fertility (the share of illegitimate children was 4–7%), it is interesting that in the early 1930s, Rusynian women also had the highest index of extramarital fertility when compared to women from other ethnic groups in Slovakia (Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel, 2017, p. 220, tab. 4).

In 1921 – 1930 (see Table 6), the total number of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia had grown by 5,451 persons (6%), while the number of population (affected by emigration) of Slovakia grew by almost 300,000 (10%) in total in the same period. Even in this case as well, it is possible to speak of the Rusyns *population stagnation* in the 1920s where *migration factors played a significant role* (at least 6,262 migrating Rusyns had been mentioned). And since the year 1930 when the census (!) happened was one of the last prime years of interwar emigration, it had been obviously reflected in the statistics of the number of Rusyns.

Table 6

**Number of the Rusyns and the Ukrainians in Slovakia and their share
per total number of population in 1921 – 1940**

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians(%)
1921	2, 955 998	85, 628	2.9
1930	3, 254 189	91, 079	2.8
1938	2, 656 426	69, 106	2.6
1940	2, 591 368	61, 270	2.4

However, it is much more difficult to analyze the number of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia between 1930 – 1940. The thing is that data about number of population in Slovakia from census in 1938 and 1940 are not comparable to previous interwar records. The reason is mainly *extensive territorial losses* that Slovakia went through in the years 1938 – 1939 after the Munich Agreement, the Vienna Arbitration, so-called Little war and as a result of “Polish territorial demands”. This was closely connected with the loss of the country’s population, including Rusyns.

However, the number of Rusyns would be expected to increase and by 1940 it would approach 100,000 people due to the trends in the population development of Rusyns-Ukrainians from the previous period, consideration data on the mortality and natality of the Rusynian population, as well as the declining trend of Rusynian emigration in the 1930s (only around 243 persons per year). Despite these factors, results of official censuses had shown that by the end of 1930s, overall number of Rusyns *had significantly and unnaturally declined* – from 91,079 people in 1930 to 69, 106 persons in 1938. In 1940, it was 61, 270 people, i.e. in ten years it statistically lost 29,809 persons – 32.7% (see Table 6). The reason for this “difference” from the actual numbers must be seen in the context of the time and especially in the special circumstances in which the 1938 and 1940’s censuses happened.

The so-called regional census of December 31, 1938 happened in the reduced territory of the (already autonomous) Slovakia, i. e. after the secession of large areas of Slovakia by Germany, Hungary and Poland following the Munich Agreement (September 29, 1938) and the Vienna Arbitration (November 2, 1938). It was a provisional, simple and inaccurate census, politically motivated in connection with territorial changes (*however, these had not yet affected the Rusynian settlement area*). Minorities had criticized the secret preparation for the census pointing out that some groups of the population had not been recorded with nationalities to which they had referred (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2012, pp. 18–21). Speaking about Rusyns – the decline in their number in 1938 (statistically by 24%; from the expected number – by 30%) when compared to 1930 meant an unnatural decline which was obviously of a non-migration nature.

Undoubtedly, members of the Rusyn-Ukrainian ethnic group in Slovakia in 1938 reflected several facts: escalating of the situation in the country – especially relations in Eastern Slovakia due to the national orientation of Rusyns and the determination of the Slovak-Rusynian land border in this period; Russophobic and Hungarophobic prejudices supported by the state propaganda; measures limiting the political life of the minority; attacks against the Greek Catholic Church because of its Rusynian character; alarm reports on the Hungarian-Polish division of Subcarpathian Rus', the annexation of area from the eastern Slovakia to Prešov, etc. (Konečný, 2005, p. 284). During the census in 1938, there were around 22 – 27,000 Rusyn-Ukrainians who did not refer to their own nationality under the influence of complex political and social situation both in the country and the region (of course, the “pressure of the Slovak environment” or the influence of natural assimilation is obvious there).

Another, for this time a proper census of December 15, 1940 and an additional census of January, 1941 had never been comprehensively compiled and published (Tišliar, 2011). What is the most important (from the point of view of the number of “Slovak” Rusyns), both censuses took place on the territory of the then Slovak Republic, which in March, 1939 was “impoverished” by a part of territory, *this time from the Rusynian settlement area*. The fact is that due to the so-called Little War (Slovak-Hungarian armed conflict at the end of March, 1939), Hungary which had previously annexed Subcarpathian Rus', expanded its territory to the exclusion of Eastern Slovakia – from the borders of Transcarpathia to Snina (part of territory from Stakchin in the north to Sobrance in the south). It had annexed 74 villages with about 40,000 population, 36 of them were Rusynian villages with about 20,000 inhabitants (Magocsi, 2016, p. 349; see *Územie a obyvateľstvo...*, 1939). This means that during census in 1940, there were about 80,000 Rusyns (i.e. without 20,000 of them, who actually lived in the territory of Hungary). However, about 20,000 of them still did not refer to their nationality (apparently because of combination of natural and purposeful assimilation).

This had happened due to the tense situation in the region, despite the fact that Greek Catholic Bishop Peter Pavol Gojdič had asked Greek Catholics (Rusyns, Russians, Ukrainians, “Rusnaks”) to state their nationality in the census as Rusynian (Konečný, 2005, p. 284; compare Vanat, 1985, p. 91). As the historian S. Konečný claims – the establishment of the Slovak Republic (March 14, 1939) and the Hungarian occupation of Subcarpathian Rus' and parts of eastern Slovakia at the end of March 1939 meant a certain isolation of the local Rusyns and further weakening of their political and national ambitions. *“The official ideology of the Slovak state had considered the national principle to be the driving force of all state-building processes and the basis of political life in the country. This doctrine divided the population into three groups. Slovaks and Germans represented first-class citizens, while members of the Hungarian and Rusynian minorities were accepted only as “bearable”*

communities. Jews and Romanies who had been called as “saboteurs of the nation” and “enemies of the state”, were in fact deprived of their civil and later also human rights”. (Konečný, 2005, pp. 283, 285). Obviously, some Rusyns did not want to be second-class citizens and therefore chose to change their nationality.

It is apparent that at the end of the 1930s, another factor had played its role. It had been reflected in the statistical number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia and it had not been an emigration factor. It is a phenomenon of *denationalization* of the Rusyn-Ukrainian ethnic group with significant manifestations known from the later (post-war) period. Precisely speaking – this phenomenon had been repeated during the census in 1950 (see Table 7), when the revision of census data in northeastern Slovakia showed that up to 20 – 23,000 Rusyns had already referred to their Slovak nationality (Gajdoš & Konečný, 2014, pp. 215–218, supplem. – doc. 11), i.e. after subtracting of minority post-war emigration manifestations (see Šmigel, 2004, pp. 31–66; Šmigel & Kruško, 2011).

Table 7

Number of the Rusyns in Slovakia and their share in the total number of inhabitants during the years of 1930 – 1950

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians (%)
1930	3, 254, 189	91, 079	2.8
1938	2, 656, 426	69, 106	2.6
1940	2, 591, 368	61, 270	2.4
1950	3, 442, 317	48, 231	1.4

In the analysis of the post-war state of Rusyns-Ukrainians and the results of the census in 1950, Slovak historians M. Gajdoš and S. Konečný had pointed to the phenomenon of the so-called *purposeful statistical assimilation*, which had been observed since 1938. Mentioned authors stated that “*the unnatural decline of the number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia in 1930 – 1950 is obviously the result of polydetermination, i.e. the effect of several causes or factors that had differentiated significance and impact in this context, with different political, socio-economic and particular, or rather immanent character*”. The above-mentioned authors had mainly included assimilation policy of the Slovak government and regional authorities, dated from the declaration of autonomy of Slovakia (1938) until the end of the First Slovak Republic (1945), in the category of political causes. According to their opinion: “*...therefore, the number of Rusyns in 1940 was lower by more than 40% when compared to the year 1930, although this figure distorts the fact that the borders of the territory were not identical during the censuses and the methodology used in recording had been different*” etc. (Gajdoš & Konečný, 2014, pp. 40–41).

The Conclusions. Economically motivated migration flows of the population of Slovakia from the end of the 19th century to the end of the 1930s aiming to get a job and thus ensure the living of their family, had been mainly connected with people of both productive and reproductive age. These were mostly breadwinners – mostly married male part of the population which was directly reflected not only in the fertility rate, but also in the number and structural characteristics of the population. At the same time, Slovakia had been failing from an economic point of view due to moving of people of economically active age. In addition, after getting a permanent job abroad or overseas, other family members had often followed their father. Although the total number of migrants decreased in the interwar period (when

compared to pre-war emigration – until 1914), Slovakia and the Rusynian-Ukrainian settlement area had long been among the migration loss-making countries/regions. A very important factor that points to this statement is the total volume of the migration balance of Slovakia, which in the years 1919 – 1937 meant a migration decrease of more than 186,000 people. Because of migration, the population of Slovakia had practically been only losing until 1932 (Tišliar, 2014c, pp. 44–45) and Rusyns-Ukrainians figuring as a part of it, had been seriously involved in the whole process. As the calculations of this study show, during the Hungarian period in 1870 – 1914, about 70,000 Rusyns migrated from Slovakia – on average of 1,550 people per year (while by the year 1900, it was about 1,700 people a year and in the years 1900 – 1914 it was about 1,250 people per year) and in the Czechoslovak period in 1920 – 1937 the number reached 9 – 10,000 Rusyns – an average of about 500 people per year (while in the 1920s, it was 783 people a year; in the 1930s – 243 people a year).

Emigration of Rusyns-Ukrainians from Slovakia – moving for work from an economically backward, poor, overpopulated and climatically raw ethnic settlement area – had been an economic necessity. It had also become *an important psychological aspect of their behaviour* during critical periods (economic crises, famine years, post-war periods). In addition, it had influenced the population development of the ethnic group (as indicated by the censuses from the years 1900 – 1930). For many Rusynian emigrants, such migration had embodied a form of *silent social protest* against unfavorable living conditions in their native country. However, at the end of the 1930s – when it was no longer possible to emigrate (as a result of the escalating war conflict in Europe) and political-national relations had been intensified in Slovakia – they had been isolated (after the Hungarian occupation of Subcarpathian Rus’) and begun to denationalize. Thus, it was another form of *silent social protest* of Rusyns which began in the late 1930s (appeared in the censuses in 1938 and 1940) and repeated (in combination with emigration) in the years after World War II (in census in 1950).

Undoubtedly, the population policy of the state had also played an important role in the migration flows of Rusyns. As it had already been mentioned, the Hungarian government had not prevented emigration from the country *de jure*, it had only regulated the activities of emigration agents and agencies acting in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. Similarly, the Czechoslovak Republic had not restricted emigration, but rather directly helped it and facilitated the moving of people. The Immigration Act (Act No. 71/1922 Coll.), passed in 1922, did not restrict emigration itself, but tried to give it an organized character and prohibited the promotion of emigration through an implausible form (Sbírka zákonů..., 1922, pp. 77–78).

Interwar Czechoslovakia obviously held opposite, i.e. seemingly contradictory attitudes from the population policy point of view. On the one hand, the population in Czechoslovakia had been perceived from the position of *populationism*, where a typical example is bigger effort to improve the position of families (especially mothers and children from lower social classes) and social and family policy in general. On the other hand, there had also been typical positions of neo-Malthusianism visible mainly in the field of foreign migration. This was considered a kind of “*necessary relief*” (as a regulatory mechanism of the population, eliminating the possible causes of various economic and social conflicts). Therefore this attitude must be perceived particularly as a solution to the issue of rural agrarian overcrowding and social tensions, as well as an active means of dealing with high unemployment and problematic living standards.

However, the position of the leading representatives of the Czechoslovak Republic in the migration policy sphere had not been completely unified. In a particular way, some politicians

had approved and positively received mass emigration, the other part perceived had been concerned as foreign migration mainly affected people of economically active age. The direction that finally dominated had been, to a certain extent, a compromise between the two political starting points. Such a “contradiction” between migration policy and pro-population measures had been the result of a long-absent conception of a wellthought-out population policy, but also of the inability to use the economic potential of the population to the benefit of the state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bade, K. J. (2005). *Evropa v pohybu. Evropské migrace dvou staletí [Europe on the move. European migration of two centuries]*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. [in Czech]

Belej, M. (2007). Vyst'ahovalectvo z východného Slovenska v medzivojnovom období na základe analýzy štatistických údajov (1922 – 1937) [Emigration from Eastern Slovakia between the world wars based on the analysis of statistical facts (1922 – 1937)]. *Annales historici Presovienses*, 7, 175–219. [in Slovak]

Bielik, F. (1964). Vyst'ahovalectvo z východného Slovenska za prvej ČSR [Emigration from eastern Slovakia during the first Czechoslovakia]. In: *Príspevky k dejinám východného Slovenska [Studies on the history of eastern Slovakia]*. Bratislava: SAV. [in Slovak]

Botík, J. (2007). *Etnická história Slovenska [Ethnic history of Slovakia]*. Bratislava: LÚČ. [in Slovak]

Československá statistika – svazek 9. Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921 [Czechoslovak Statistics – Volume 9. Census in the Czechoslovak Republic of 15 February 1921]. Praha: [s.n.], 1924. [in Czech]

Deset let Československé republiky III [Ten years of the Czechoslovak Republic III]. Praha: [s.n.], 1928. [in Czech]

Fatula, R. (2018). Do pershoyi svitovoi 150 tysiach zarobitchan iz Zakarpattia vyikhaly za okean [Before the First World War, 150,000 workers from Transcarpathia went oversea]. In: *Holos karpat [Voice Carpathian]*, 10. 3. 2018. URL: <https://goloskarpat.info/society/5aa421c7455e1/> [in Ukrainian]

Fordinálová, E. (1983). Vyst'ahovalectvo zo západného Slovenska v medzivojnovom období [Emigration from western Slovakia in the interwar period]. In: *Slováci v zahraničí [Slovaks abroad]*, 9. Martin: Matica slovenská, 31–43. [in Slovak]

Gajdoš, M. & Konečný, S. (2014). *Ukrajinská menšina na Slovensku ako objekt a subjekt politiky II. (1945 – 1953) [Ukrainian minority in Slovakia as an object and subject of policy II. (1945 – 1953)]*. Prešov: UNIVERSUM. [in Slovak]

Harušťák, I. (2013). Príspevok k diskurzu o dejinách slovenského vyst'ahovalectva. Migračné impulzy a vyst'ahovalectvo z hornouhorských žúp na americký kontinent v kontexte migračných pohybov v strednej a východnej Európe v poslednej štvrtine 19. storočia [Contribution to the discourse on the history of Slovak emigration. Migration impulses and emigration from the highlands to the American continent in the context of migratory movements in Central and Eastern Europe in the last quarter of the 19th century]. In: Kováč, D. et al. (2013). *Sondy do slovenských dejín v dlhom 19. storočí [Probes into Slovak history in the long 19th century]*. Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 214–226. [in Slovak]

Ílko, V. (1973). *Zakarpatske selo na pochatku XX st. (1900 – 1919 rr.) [Transcarpathian village in the early XX century (1900 – 1919)]*. Lviv, 1973. [in Ukrainian]

Jakešová, E. (1971). Slovenské kultúrne združenie v Kanade v období druhej svetovej vojny [Slovak Cultural Association in Canada during the Second World War]. In: *Slováci v zahraničí [Slovaks abroad]*, 1. Martin: Matica slovenská. [in Slovak]

Jakešová, E. (1987). Sociálno-ekonomické aspekty migrácie obyvateľstva Slovenska v dvadsiatych rokoch 20. storočia [Socio-economic aspects of migration of the population of Slovakia in the twenties of the 20th century]. *Historicky casopis*, 3, 381–399. [in Slovak]

Janto, J. (2016). Salašný chov oviec v Detve a na Slovensku [Salaš-type sheep farms in Detva and in Slovakia]. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo – Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 4 (2), 95–106. [in Slovak]

Janto, J. (2017). Slovenské bryndziarstvo a vagačovská výrobnia v Detve. K 230. výročiu vzniku prvej bryndziarne [Production of bryndza in Slovakia and the Vagač bryndza manufacture in Detva: On the 230th anniversary of the founding of the first industrial site for the production of bryndza]. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo- Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 5 (2), 51–59. [in Slovak]

Joseph, S. (1914). *Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910*. New York: Columbia University. [in English]

Kabuzan, V. M. (2006). *Ukraintsy v mire: dinamika chislennosti i rasseleniya. 20-e gody XVIII veka – 1989 god* [Ukrainians in the world: dynamics of numbers and settlement. 20s of the XVIII century – 1989]. Moskva: Nauka. [in Russian]

Kmeť, M. (2010). *Na margo dvoch storočí* [On the margin of two centuries]. Békešská Čaba: Výskumný ústav Slovákov v Maďarsku. [in Slovak]

Kmeť, M. (2012). *Krátke dejiny dolnozemsých Slovákov I* [A Brief History of Lowland Slovaks I]. Nadlak: Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko. [in Slovak]

Kmeť, M. (2014). K problematike vystaňovalectva zo Slovenska v medzivojnovom období [On the issue of emigration from Slovakia in the interwar period]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948)* [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 71–85. [in Slovak]

Konečný, S. (2005). Rusínska a ukrajinská menšina po vzniku prvej Slovenskej republiky [Rusynian and Ukrainian minorities after the establishment of the first Slovak Republic]. In: *Slovenská republika 1939 – 1945 očami mladých historikov IV* [Slovak Republic 1939 – 1945 through the eyes of young historians VI]. Eds.: M. Šmigel', P. Mičko. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici, 283–291. [in Slovak]

Konečný, S. (2015). *Náčrt dejín karpatských Rusínov* [Sketch of the history of the Carpatho-Rusyns]. Prešov: Prešovska univerzita v Prešove – Ustav rusinskeho jazyka a kultury. [in Slovak]

Magocsi, P. R. (2005). *Our people: Carpatho-Rusyns and their descendants in North America*. Wauconda (Il.): Bochazy-Carducii Publishers. [in English]

Magoczi, P. R. (2016). *Chrbtom k horám. Dejiny Karpatskej Rusi a karpatských Rusínov* [With Their Backs to the Mountains: A History of Carpathian Rus' and Carpatho-Rusyns]. Prešov: UNIVERSUM. [in Slovak]

Makar, Yu. (2007). Ukraiinska diaspora: pokhodzhennia, kharakter, suchasnyi stan [Ukrainian diaspora: origin, nature, current state]. In: *Науківі записки /Національного університету “Острозька академія”. Історичні науки* [Scientific notes /National University “Ostroh Academy”. Historical sciences], 9, 9–19. [in Ukrainian]

Marunchak, M. (1991). *The Ukrainian Canadians a History. Vol. 1*. Second Edition. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts & Science. [in Ukrainian]

Onufrak, A. (2019). Štátotvorné úvahy Uhro-Rusínov na konci 1. Svetovej vojny – príklon k Československej republike [State-Building Considerations of Uhro-Rusins at the End of World War I – Inclination towards the Czechoslovak Republic]. *Historická sociologie*, 2, 141–155. DOI:10.14712/23363525.2019.21 [in Slovak]

Pop, I. (2011). *Malé dejiny Rusínov* [Small history of the Rusyns]. Bratislava: Združenie inteligencie Rusínov Slovenska. [in Slovak]

Pútnik svätovojtešský na rok 1928 [Pilgrim “svätovojtešský“ for 1928]. Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 1928. [in Slovak]

Sáposová, Z. (2004). Migračné procesy Stredného Zemplína v období dualizmu (1867 – 1918) II. [Migration Processes of Central Zemplin in the Period of “Dualism“ (1867 – 1918) II.]. *Človek a Spoločnosť* [Individual and Society], 7 (1), 11–18. [in Slovak]

Sbírka zákonů a nařízení státu československého, č. 23/1922 [Collection of Laws and Regulations of the Czechoslovak State, No. 23/1922]. Praha: Statní tiskárna, 1922. [in Czech]

Shnitser, I. (2019). Museum Affairs at the Territory of Subcarpathian Rus' in the Years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1919 – 1938). *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo – Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 7 (1), 99–110. [in English]

- Svetoň, J.** (1958). *Obyvateľstvo Slovenska za kapitalizmu [The population of Slovakia in capitalism]*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SVPL. [in Slovak]
- Svetoň, J.** (1970). Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo v období uhorského kapitalizmu [Slovak emigration in the period of Hungarian capitalism]. In: *Vývoj obyvateľstva Slovenska: výber z diela k nedožitým 65. narodeninám J. Svetoňa [Development of the population of Slovakia: a selection from the work dedicated to the undead 65th birthday of J. Sveton]*. Bratislava: Nakladateľstvo EPOCHA, 181–206. [in Slovak]
- Syrný, M.** (2016). *Slovenské dejiny. 20. storočie. Diel I. (1900 – 1945) [Slovak history. 20th century. Part I (1900 – 1945)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum. [in Slovak]
- Szarka, L.** (1995). *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés-magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867 – 1918 [Slovak National Development – Hungarian Nationality Policy 1867 – 1918]*. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó. [in Hungarian]
- Šmigel', M. & Kruško, Š.** (2011). *Opcia a presídlenie Rusínov do ZSSR (1945 – 1947) [Option and resettlement of Rusyns to the USSR (1945 – 1947)]*. Bratislava: Goralinga. [in Slovak]
- Šmigel', M. & Syrny, M.** (2019). “Revoliutsiya v Karpatakh”: zusyillia uhorskoii ta cheskoii polityky shchodo vtrymannia Slovachchyny ta Pidkarpattia u 1918 – 1919 rr. [Revolution in Carpathia: Hungarian and Czech politics efforts to keep Slovakia and the Subcarpathian region in 1918 – 1919]. In: *Istorychna panorama: Naukovyi zbirnyk ChNU [Historical panorama: Scientific collectio ChNU]*, 28–29, 43–69. [In Ukrainian]
- Šmigel', M.** (2004). Historické otázky a súvislosti opcie a presídlenia občanov Československa do Sovietskeho zväzu v roku 1947 [Historical questions and links of option and resettlement of Czechoslovak citizens in the Soviet Union in 1947]. *Historicky casopis*, 52, 31–66. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P. & Šmigel', M.** (2014). Pohyb etník, etnické hranice, etnický priestor na Slovensku v 1. polovici 20. storočia [Ethnic movement, ethnic borders, ethnic space in Slovakia in the first half of the 20th century]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948) [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 10–42. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2008). *Plodnosť obyvateľstva a celková reprodukcia na Slovensku v rokoch 1919 – 1937 [Fertility of the population and total reproduction in Slovakia in the years 1919 – 1937]*. Bratislava: Stimul. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2009). *Populačný vývoj Podkarpatskej Rusi I. Demografická reprodukcia [Population development of Subcarpathian Russia I. Demographic reproduction]*. Bratislava: Infostat. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2012). *Demografický obraz Slovenska v sčítaniach ľudu 1919 – 1940 [Demographic image of Slovakia in the 1919 – 1940 census]*. Brno: Tribun EU. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2016). *Transformácia plodnosti žien Slovenska v 20. a na začiatku 21. storočia [Transformation of female fertility in Slovakia in the 20th and early 21st century]*. Bratislava: MKD. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2018). *100 rokov obyvateľstva Slovenska: od vzniku Československa po súčasnosť [100 years of the population of Slovakia: from the establishment of Czechoslovakia to the present]*. Bratislava: Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z., - Centrum pre historickú demografiu a populačný vývoj Slovenska, FF UK v Bratislave. [in Slovak]
- Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P. & Šmigel', M.** (2017). Demographic development Ruthenians (Rusyns) in Slovakia in the interwar years (1920 – 1930). *Rusin*, 47 (1), 213–231. [in English]
- Šprocha, B. & Majo, J.** (2016). *Storočie populačného vývoja Slovenska I.: demografické procesy [Century of population development of Slovakia I.: Demographic processes]*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, INFOSTAT – Výskumné demografické centrum, Centrum spoločenských a psychologických vied SAV. [in Slovak]
- Štěfánek, A.** (1944). *Základy sociografie Slovenska. Slovenská vlastiveda III [Basics of sociography of Slovakia. Slovak Homeland Studies III]*. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied a umení. [in Slovak]
- Švorc, P.** (2007). *Zakletá zem. Podkarpatská Rus 1918 – 1946 [Cursed Land. Subcarpathian Rus 1918 – 1946]*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. [in Czech]

Tajták, L. (1975). Slovenské vysťahovalectvo a migrácia v rokoch 1900 – 1914 [Slovak emigration and migration in the years 1900–1914]. *Historicky casopis*, 3, 377–415. [in Slovak]

Tajták, L. (1980). Vývin, pohyb a štrukturálne zmeny obyvateľstva v predvojnovom období (1900 – 1914) [Development, movement, and structural-changes of the population of Slovakia in the pre-war period (1900 – 1914)]. *Historicky casopis*, 28 (4), 497–530. [in Slovak]

Tišliar, P. & Šprocha, B. (2018). Topography of the Ruthenian Population in Slovakia in the 18th century through the first half of the 20th century. *Bylye Gody*, 49, 1009–1018. [in English]

Tišliar, P. (2011). *Národnostný kataster Slovenska v roku 1940 [National Cadastre of Slovakia in 1940]*. Bratislava: Slovenský národný archív. [in Slovak]

Tišliar, P. (2014a). Beginnings of Organisation of Emigration in the Czechoslovak Republic. In: Tišliar, P., Čéplö, S. (eds.) (2014). *Studies in the Population of Slovakia 2*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Słowaków w Polsce, 43–62. [in English]

Tišliar, P. (2014b). Formy organizovania vysťahovalectva zo Slovenska po vzniku Československej republiky [Forms of organizing emigration from Slovakia after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948) [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 56–71. [in Slovak]

Tišliar, P. (2014c). Migračná politika na Slovensku v kontexte populačnej politiky v medzivojnovom období [Migration policy in Slovakia in the context of population policy in the interwar period]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948) [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 44–56. [in Slovak]

Tóth, A. & Novotný, L. & Stehlík, M. (2012). Národnostní menšiny v Československu 1918 – 1938. Od státu národního ke státu národnostnímu? [*National minorities in Czechoslovakia 1918 – 1938. From the national state to the ethnic state?*]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta. [in Czech]

Územie a obyvateľstvo Slovenskej republiky a prehľad obcí a okresov odstúpených Nemecku, Maďarsku a Poľsku [Territory and population of the Slovak Republic and an overview of municipalities and districts ceded to Germany, Hungary and Poland]. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1939. [in Slovak]

Vanat, I. (1976). Sociálno-ekonomické postavenie Ukrajincov na východnom Slovensku v rokoch 1918 – 1929 [Socio-economic position of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia in the years 1918 – 1929]. In: *Nove obzory*, 18. Košice: Výchoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 39–73. [in Slovak]

Vanat, I. (1990). *Narysy novitnoii istorii ukraintsiv skhidnoii Slovachchyny I (1918 – 1938) [Essays on modern history of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia I (1918 – 1938)]*. Bratislava: Slovatske pedahohichne vydavnytstvo. [in Ukrainian]

Vanat, I. (1985). *Narysy novitnoii istorii ukraintsiv skhidnoii Slovachchyny II (1938 – 1948) [Essays on modern history of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia II (1938 – 1948)]*. Bratislava, Priashiv: Slovatske pedahohichne vydavnytstvo. [in Ukrainian]

Verbytska, P. & Kuzmin, R. (2019). Between amnesia and the “war of memories”: politics of memory in the museum narratives of Ukraine. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo- Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 7 (2), 23–34. [in English]

*The article was received on June 08, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*