

## INTERNATIONAL MIGRATIONS IN POLAND AFTER WORLD WAR II

War and its consequences result in an intensification of mass migrations; the statement is an obvious truth. Demographers generally classify these migrations separately. Some, e.g. W.S. Thompson, tend to see the only common characteristic between war and peacetime migrations in the separation from the environment.<sup>1</sup> According to them, the basic difference lies in the involuntary character of the war migrations. The compulsory aspect is a broad definition; it is applied to refugees and contemporary slave labor, as well as to the mass transfer of population resulting, for example, from a change of borders.

This classification, though accepted by a number of outstanding demographers, presents certain difficulties. Analysis of population migrations not confirm that compulsion or free will can function as criteria for the differentiation of wartime and peacetime migrations. In reality, migratory movements of a voluntary and compulsory nature occur simultaneously during both, war and peacetime. Refugees may serve as an example. Compulsion inherent in a situation is the result of circumstance and not of an organization of the movement; it need not disprove the voluntary character of the migration.<sup>2</sup> Otherwise we would have to consider as compulsory practically all mass movements of population, including economic

---

<sup>1</sup> W. S. Thompson, *Social and Economic Consequences of Wartime Migration in Europe* (lecture in Academy of Political Sciences, 8 XI 1945), Columbia University 1946, p. 51; W. S. Thompson, *Population Problems*, 1953, p. 291; also J. Issac, *Economics of Migration*, London 1947.

<sup>2</sup> E. Rosset, *Prawa demograficzne wojny* [*Demographic Laws of War*], Łódź 1933, pp. 31 - 54. He distinguishes voluntary escapes and compulsory evacuation; also R. Ginesy (*La Seconde Guerre mondiale et les déplacements de populations*, Paris 1948, p. 7 ff.) distinguishes voluntary escapes. A. Sauvy (*Théorie générale de la population*, vol. II, Paris 1950, pp. 249 - 250) says "migration forcée s'applique mieux encore, lorsque le migrant ne peut exercer aucun choix (déportation, expulsion)."

migration.<sup>3</sup> It is a fact that compulsion resulting from a situation can occur in peacetime as well as in wartime.

Does this mean that we should not distinguish wartime migrations? They undoubtedly constitute a certain historical category, a set of typical demographic processes which inevitably accompany each war. The specific character of these processes has not, as yet, been defined. Generally, wartime migrations rarely awake the interest of demographers and geographers. Even their intensification during and after the last World War has not provoked greater scientific interest.<sup>4</sup> Though history has known not many similar demographic changes, the problem is still underestimated.

The state of studies in Poland is even less satisfactory, despite the fact that it is a truism to say that the Poles have one of the first places among the contemporary "wandering" nations.<sup>5</sup> It seems unnecessary to add that, because of their intensity and differentiation, an analysis of these processes in Poland could have great importance not only for the study of this historical process in Poland.

The character of demographic changes which took place in Poland in effect of World War II was determined primarily by the combined movements of the Polish, German, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, and Jewish population which either started or ended on the territory of the new Polish state.<sup>6</sup> Some of them took place entirely within the state borders, others extended beyond them. Taking this into account, Władysław Skowron in his classification of the post-

<sup>3</sup> It is highly questionable whether forced labor deportations can, as it is done by some writers on the subject, be treated as economic migrations (see Ginesy, op. cit., p. 22). This would be in accord with Sauvy's position who in his *Théorie* states that the reasons for migration determine either the motives of the emigrant or, as in the case of forced migrations, of the authorities (Sauvy, op. cit., p. 251). In practice, in a number of cases all wartime migrations are considered to be political; see M. P. Herremans, *Personnes déplacées, essai*, Bruxelles 1948, p. 15. The author worked for the Belgian Committee for Repatriation.

<sup>4</sup> An *expressis verbis* statement can be found in *The Study of Population* edited by Ph. M. Hauser and C. D. Duncan, Chicago 1959, p. 510; see also Q. Pether, *L'Institut national d'études démographiques. Organisation, travaux et résultats*, "Population," vol. I, 1949, pp. 9 - 32; W. Bickel, *Zur Neueren Entwicklung der Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, "Schweizerische Zeitschrift," vol. IV, 1951, pp. 510 - 520. With the exception of a few early articles, the subject has not been represented in the French "Population," the English "Population Studies" or the American "Population." See also *Demographic and Economic Change in Developed Countries. A Conference of the Universities' National Bureau Committee for Economic Research*, Princeton 1960.

<sup>5</sup> The more important general works: M. Latuch, *Współczesne migracje zewnętrzne ludności w Polsce* [*Contemporary External Population Migrations in Poland*], "Zeszyty Naukowe SGPIŚ," vol. XI, 1959, pp. 159 - 230; *Ruchy migracyjne między Odrą a Bugiem w czasie II wojny światowej* [*Migration Movements between the Odra and Bug during world War II*], Poznań 1960.

<sup>6</sup> K. Kersten, *Migracje powojenne w Polsce (Próba klasyfikacji i ogólna charakterystyka zewnętrznych ruchów ludności)* [*Post-War Migrations in Poland. (An Attempt at Classification and a General Characteristic of the External Population Movements)*], "Polska Ludowa," vol. II, 1963, p. 3 ff.

war migrations which was elaborated eighteen years ago, rejected the distinction between internal and external migrations, and instead grouped them according to their causes. His choice does not seem to be fully justified. The approach to wartime is a matter of discussion, but we see no basis for rejecting the generally accepted distinction between migrations within the state borders and those that extend beyond them, if the territory of Poland is a clearly defined concept. Despite certain complications, this distinction finds confirmation and justification in the areas of law, politics, economics, and sociology.

The most important role in the shaping of demographic conditions was certainly played by what Skowron termed as "structural" migrations; it was the complex of phenomena which followed the changes of borders and was the result of the policy of the Polish state concerning national minorities.

The isolation of a certain type of group migrations which are most often defined as the population transfer and sometimes as "the exchange" is at present generally accepted by world science as a classifying procedure. A monograph on the problems of organized transfer, containing an attempt at definition, a historical outline, and an analysis of the economic, legal, and sociological aspects of the so classified migrations was published in France as early as 1946, that is before the intensification of post-war transfers in Europe and Asia. It was published under the auspices of the Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques which is connected with the Ministry of National Economy.<sup>7</sup> So far it is the most complete definition, and it contains the following elements: a permanent, voluntary or compulsory, separation of a particular group of people from their native environment, and an organized transfer of this group into the territory of another state carried out according to international law, on the basis of international agreements, for the sake of creating homogeneous national organisms.

The intensification of transfer migrations during the war and the five years which followed it, found expression in a number of monographs, and primarily in the studies of Schechtman, Kulischer and others concerning similar processes in various countries.<sup>8</sup> Almost all of the more important studies concerning the problems of migration and the majority of outlines, mimeographed lectures, and

---

<sup>7</sup> *Les Transferts internationaux de population*, Paris 1946.

<sup>8</sup> J. B. Schechtman, *European Population Transfers 1939 - 1945*, New York 1949; J. B. Schechtman, *Post-War Population Transfer in Europe 1945 - 1955*, Philadelphia 1962; J. B. Schechtman, *Population Transfers in Asia*, New York 1949; E. Kulischer, *Europe in the Move, War and Population Changes 1917 - 1947*, New York 1947; E. Kulischer, *The Displacement of Population in Europe*, Montreal 1943; P. George, *Le Problème allemand en Tchécoslovaquie 1919 - 1946*, Paris 1947; R. I. Koehl, *German Resettlement and Population Policy, 1939 - 1945. A History of the Reich Commission for the Strengthening of Germanism*, Cambridge 1957; P. R. Brakmananda, *The Impact on India of Population Transfers in 1947 and After*, in: *Economics of International Migrations*, London 1958.

demography textbooks contain a discussion of transfers.<sup>9</sup> In Poland, though, where these problems are especially important, neither detailed studies nor a general outline has been written so far.<sup>10</sup> A number of authors are interested in the Polish problems which are discussed whenever post-war political migrations are studied, but the actual knowledge of the development of these processes is poor and superficial.

Superficial treatment and lack of precision are characteristic not only for studies concerning the situation in Poland. Political migrations, and transfer is one of them, are always the margin of demographers' interest. This is true about studies concerning international migrations, not to mention general demographic outlines. In monographs on transfer there is a predominance of the descriptive element insufficiently supported by methodology and theory. Most obvious is the lack of clear and well defined criteria determining transfer migrations; the 1946 definition proves to be inadequate. There is a great deal of arbitrariness in interpretation and difference of opinion in deciding which movements of population ought to be termed as transfer. A narrow interpretation was, for instance, applied by the American authors of an extensive monograph on international migrations; they denied the transfer character of the migrations of Germans from Poland and Czechoslovakia.<sup>11</sup>

It seems unnecessary to enumerate all of the mass migrations which either preceded or were simultaneous with these processes in Poland. The goal was the same as in all great exchanges of population starting with the one that followed the pact signed between Bulgaria and Turkey in Annopol in November 1913 and up to the greatest, so far, transfer of population between India and Pakistan in the years 1947 - 1948 and 1949 - 1950, which included 14-15 million people; it was the elimination of minority groups. Not only our contemporary civilization

<sup>9</sup> Let us cite only the most representative examples: P. George, *Étude sur les migrations de populations*, Paris - Sorbonne, pp. 3 - 5; J. Isaac, *Economics of Migration*, London 1947, p. 5; M. Reinhard, *Histoire de la population mondiale de 1700 à 1948*, Paris 1949, p. 732; *International Migration, 1945 - 1947*, International Labour Office, p. 62; J. Proudfoot, *European Refugees 1939 - 1952. A Study in Forced Population Movements*, London 1956, p. 22; L. Chevalier, *Démographie générale*, Paris 1951, p. 439; L. Dollot, *Les Grandes migrations humaines*, Paris 1949, pp. 88 ff; Th. Brinley, *International Migration; The Study of Population*, ed. P. M. Hauser and O.'D. Duncan, Chicago 1959, p. 510; D. Kirk, *European Migrations; Pre-War Trends and Future Prospects; Post-War Problems of Migration. Papers Presented at the Round Table of Populations Problems, 1946 Conference of the Milbank Memorial Found, October 29 - 30, 1946*, New York 1947, p. 64; also the reprint from "The Milbank Memorial Found Quarterly," vol. XXV, No. 2, April 1947, p. 13; *The Detriments and Consequences of Population Trends*, United Nations, New York 1953, p. 100; W. S. Thompson, *Population Problems*, New York 1953, pp. 274 - 275 and pp. 290 ff.

<sup>10</sup> E. Rosset, *Prawa demograficzne wojny...*, p. 54 — to define migration in the Balkans the author mentions the mass deportations. E. Sturm de Strem, *Elementy demografii [Elements of Demography]*, Warszawa 1955, does not mention the problem.

<sup>11</sup> D. Taft, K. Robbins, *International Migration*, New York 1959, pp. 246 - 247.

has shown this tendency when faced with the problems of ethnic, racial, religious, and in the 20th century most often, the national minorities. Throughout history we can observe not only a tendency toward assimilation on the part of and in relation to national minorities, not only examples, rare as they might be, of true tolerance, and some extremely infrequent examples of equality, but also a tendency to eliminate minority groups from society. The forms of elimination vary from mass extermination, through ghettos and reservations, to expulsion which can take on the form of simple exile, deportation, or even of transfer conducted according to law and under civilized conditions.

The historical process of the recent centuries, the shaping of contemporary nations, the growing emancipatory tendencies in Europe in the 19th and in Asia in the 20th century, everything that was part of the concept of an era of nationalism in the history of humanity, a concept so often used in the literature, has made necessary a discussion of the ways to solve the problem of minorities which would satisfy both the principle of national states and would honor the "rights of man and citizen".<sup>12</sup>

The originator of the concept of population transfer is George Montadon, a French anthropologist and ethnographer of Swiss origin. While being active in l'Union des Nationalités, an organization which studied the problem of national states, he published a memorandum for the first conference on nationalities which took place in Lausanne in 1916.<sup>13</sup> In the memorandum he supported the transfer of minorities and the application of ethnic criteria for the determination of future borders.

The idea of national self-determination and of ethnic borders gained followers among the representatives of the countries which won the war and were establishing a new order in Europe. Even before Wilson, his predecessor Theodor Roosevelt had expressed the view that Europe must be reconstructed on the basis of the principle of nationalities.<sup>14</sup> The Covenant of the League of Nations and the

---

<sup>12</sup> The literature on the subject is extremely large; there are three selective bibliographies of works on the national question. Let us mention only the cited work of H. Kohn, *The Age of Nationalism, and his Nationalism, its Meaning and History*, Princeton 1955, which ties the development of contemporary nations with the birth of capitalism and C. J. II. Hayes, *Nationalism, a Religion*, New York 1960, according to whom nationalism in Europe started developing in the beginning of the 19th century, while the lack of tolerance and imperialist tendencies are dated to the Franco-Prussian war. Let us also mention a very interesting study by F. Znaniecki, *Modern Nationalities*, Urbana 1952, who mentions these problems accidentally, from the historical point of view, and the study by E. Lemberg, *Nationalismus*, vol. I: *Psychologie und Geschichte*, vol. II: *Soziologie und Politische Pädagogik*, Hamburg 1964; R. Wittram, *Das Nationale als Europäisches Problem*, Göttingen 1954.

<sup>13</sup> G. Montandon, *Frontières nationales : détermination objective de la condition primordiale à l'obtention d'une paix durable*, Lausanne 1916; cf., O. Gabrys, *Le Problème de nationalité et du paix durable*, Lausanne 1917.

<sup>14</sup> Th. Roosevelt, *The Works, Memorial Edition*, vol. XXI, New York 1922 - 1926, p. 409, cited after Kohn, *The Age...*, p. 27.

protection of rights guaranteed by governments and international organizations were to be the solution of the problem of minorities. Such was the expression of the idea of tolerance.

Even at that time the realization of the idea was difficult, especially in those regions of Europe in which nationalist tendencies had come into power and where conflicts of nationalities were made even stronger by religious hostility. And so Montadon's solution was accepted; Taft and Robbins were right in terming it as a compromise between expulsion and minorities' treaties.<sup>15</sup> According to American demographers, the new aspect of the contemporary idea of transfer is the fact that it is upheld by the prestige of the League of Nations and the minorities' treaties. This particular character of transfer is sometimes not noticed. Starting from abstract principles of liberalism, transfer migrations are treated on a par with expulsions, deportations, etc., and as an expression of a great intensification of nationalism.

Sometimes transfer of population is grouped in the same category with all compulsory migrations; linked are the "white" Russian émigrés, the Armenians expelled by the Turks during World War I, the exchange between Greece and Turkey, the Japanese who left the colonies after World War II, the transfer between India and Pakistan,<sup>16</sup> and even the Spanish republicans with the Sudeten Germans and the Germans "ousted" from Poland.<sup>17</sup>

It would be difficult to deny the fact that from the point of view of certain criteria of classification all of the above processes have certain similarities, for example, all of them would have to be classified as migrations caused by political, and not by economic factors. It seems worth while to point out the difference between the 19th century, in which there was a predominance of free economic migrations, and our times, with the dominant political motive of migrations.<sup>18</sup> Emphasizing this element, though, may result in disregard for the basic differences between the various types of political migrations. The accepted systems of classification are generally based not only upon the causes which bring about movements of population, but also on their forms and results. Particularly apt are the proposals of Pierre George, a geographer interested in history, the author of a special study on the problems of transfer of Germans from Czechoslovakia. His grouping of migrations is based on two separate criteria: duration and distance. In the first group he distinguished movements of extended duration (*migrations prolongées*) and circumstantial, short-lived migrations. In this group of *migrations circonstanciellles* of our times, he includes "the displacement of population in effect of the war and the changes in political geography caused by the creation of new

<sup>15</sup> D. Taft, K. Robbins, op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>16</sup> K. and K. Organsky, *Population and Power*, New York 1961, p. 124.

<sup>17</sup> D. Villey, *Leçon de démographie*, vol. I, Paris 1957, pp. 287 - 288.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 287; Pierre, *Étude...*, p. 6; Thompson, *Population Problems...*, pp. 274 - 275.

national states". Cited as examples are: the transfer of Germans from Poland and Czechoslovakia, of Poles from the Ukraine and Byelorussia, and the exchange between India and Pakistan.<sup>19</sup> He also points out the fact that, because of their intensity, the new dislocations which are carried out on the basis of international agreements have a great influence on the shaping of demographic relations.

The reference to international agreements concerning migrations is not accidental; this is one of the most important elements distinguishing transfer from other historical and contemporary forms of eliminating minority groups in the social, of course, not the biological sense. Without discussing the details of the legal questions related to the character of transfer agreements, which differ in many respects, it is worth noting that in all instances there is a tendency to diminish the negative results of the operation, to carry it out according to the requirements of contemporary civilization and humanitarianism. The extent to which this was possible, considering the period in which the greatest migrations took place, is a different matter.

Those who oppose mass dislocations, even when they are accomplished under the auspices of international organizations, advance the thesis that their cause lies in the consecration of the principle of national states by the treaty of Versailles which fostered nationalist tendencies and heightened conflicts. The question is whether the "blame" for the realization of the principle of national states should be placed on the politicians from Versailles; more and more often historians see in it the consequences of profound social changes which took place in the 19th century.

The severity of the problem of minorities in the twenties and thirties of century as well as the historical bankruptcy of the idea of the preservation of their rights<sup>20</sup> have influenced, together with other factors, the new approach to these problems after World War II, have dictated a wider application of transfer.

Despite the unjustified and superficial statements which are sometimes published, this concept of solving some of the worst national conflicts, especially in mid-eastern Europe, has had a widely spread and numerous group of supporters. It is known that in 1942 Benes suggested the transfer of the Sudeten Germans,<sup>21</sup> that Roosevelt supported the annexation of Eastern Prussia to Poland while foreseeing that the German population would be transferred to Germany,<sup>22</sup> that at a time

<sup>19</sup> Pierre, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>20</sup> H. Truhart, *Völkerbund und Minderheit Petitionen. Ein Beitrag zum Studium des Nationalitäten Problems*, Wien 1931; J. Leyburn, *World Minority Problems*, New York 1947, p. 10; D. Taft, K. Robins, op. cit., p. 160; J. A. Laponce, *The Protection of Minorities*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1960, p. 25.

<sup>21</sup> E. Benes, *The Organisation of Post-War Europe*, "Foreign Affairs," January 1942, p. 328; E. Benes, *Memoirs, from Munich to New War and New Victory*, London 1954, pp: 195, 206, 242.

<sup>22</sup> R. E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, New York 1948, p. 710; cf., H. Feis, *Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin. The War They Waged, and the Peace They Sought*, Princeton 1957, p. 287,

Churchill had proposed similar solutions.<sup>23</sup> The problems were reflected in the press; a number of outstanding politicians and scientists expressed their views. Among the supporters of such a solution to European problems were: Herbert Hoover, Harold Butler, and some other American politicians, as well as Warren S. Thompson and Ferencz Imre, both important representatives of the sciences. After the war, in a discussion with representatives of the catholic intellectuals, Simone de Beauvoir and "Les Temps Moderne", spoke in defence of the idea of transfer.

Among those who opposed transfer we might mention Alfred Sauvy, who spoke with irony about the gentlemen from Harvard and Oxford making decisions about mass dislocations while knowing little about the problems of demography;<sup>24</sup> similar were the points of view of American demographers, Notestein, Taft, and others, who could, however, accept transfer as necessary evil, possible in exceptional situations.<sup>25</sup>

Transfers of population which took place after the war were greater in numbers and encompassed a larger area than the pre-war and wartime migrations. Mid-eastern Europe and Asia were the sight of displacement of the largest numbers of people. Sauvy compares this process with the great movements of peoples in the early Middle Ages; he points out its westward direction and poses the question whether this is a mere accident or the effect of profound economic and social reasons which were the basis of the migrations.<sup>26</sup>

The displacement of population in mid-eastern Europe consisted largely of the transfer, or what was most often termed as the "repatriation" of the Polish and Jewish population from the territories annexed to the western republics of the U.S.S.R., similar transfer of Czechs and Slovaks from Sub-Carpathian Ukraine, the departure of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and Byelorussians from the Polish territory, of Ukrainians from Czechoslovakia, and finally the departure of the German population from the territories which became part of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Some writers on the subject, notably Schechtman, consider all migratory movements in this part of Europe as transfer; this approach is in contradiction with the accepted concept and definitions of organized, inter-state transfers based on the authority of international agreements. The problem has greater importance especially in connection with the migrations of the German population.

The calculation of the number of people involved in the transfer movements in this part of Europe would call for a very complicated procedure.<sup>27</sup> The reasons

<sup>23</sup> R. Wagner, *Die Entstehung der Oder - Neisse Linie in den diplomatischen Verhandlungen während des Zweiten Weltkrieges*, Stuttgart 1953, pp. 87, 95.

<sup>24</sup> A. Sauvy, *Europe et sa population*, Paris 1955, p. 48, also *Théorie...*, vol. II, p. 352.

<sup>25</sup> F. W. Notestein, *International Population Readjustments*, 1945, p. 102; Ginesy, op. cit., p. 5; Taft, Robbins, op. cit., p. 168.

<sup>26</sup> A. Sauvy, *Europe et sa population...*, p. 39.

<sup>27</sup> I wrote on this subject in connection with the migration of Germans from West Pomerania: *The Transfer of German Population from Poland in 1945 - 1947 (on the example of West Pomerania)*, "Acta Poloniae Historica," vol. X, 1964, p. 36 ff.



are both in method and in methodology. On the one hand there is a lack of statistical data of sufficient reliability, which is understandable if we consider the conditions under which the migrations took place, on the other, the act that the criteria which are the basis of estimates are not well defined results in great discrepancies between the numbers cited in the professional literature, not even to mention popular literature on the subject.

An analysis of the process of population transfer in Poland, in the direction from East to West, ought to start with the exchange of population between Poland and the Soviet Union. The number of people who came to Poland from West Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Lithuania was as follows: in 1944 - 1947 — about 1,400,000, and after 1956 about 200,000 from territories which were annexed to the Soviet Union.<sup>28</sup> On the basis of the same exchange 518,000 people left Poland; most of them were Ukrainian.<sup>29</sup> These were the figures given in Polish official statistics prepared by the State Repatriation Bureau and by the Bureau of the Government Representative for Repatriation. They have become accepted in the literature of the subject outside of Poland via the works of Schechtman, Kulischer, and others.<sup>30</sup> We can consider them as reliable despite certain departures from reality; it would be impossible to include in a statistics the whole of the first, spontaneous migrations which started immediately after the 1944 agreements were signed.<sup>31</sup> As we have mentioned before, there is also a problem of methodology. The figures cited include only those who migrated in effect of the transfer agreements, not all those who before 1939 inhabited the eastern territories of Poland and who after 1945 settled within the new borders. We should certainly add to them some tens of thousands of soldiers who were mobilized by the Polish Army in that territory and were not included in the statistics, while their families, who came to Poland individually or in organized transports, were registered. The situation is similar in the case of the soldiers of the Home Army who were not included in the statistics because, having first been interned, they

<sup>28</sup> "Rocznik Statystyczny," 1958, p. 28.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 29. There is no data according to nationality. In "International Migrations," p. 63, we find the figures: 50,000 Lithuanians, 30,000 Byelorussians, and 420,000 Ukrainians. There are great differences in the data quoted by various statistics: according to the data supplied by the representative of the Polish government for the evacuation of the Ukrainian population, the transfer was to include 515,430 Ukrainians, according to the Ukrainian representative the number was 461,469. Of these by March 1, 1946 348,257 (349,357) supposedly reported, and 325,997 (327,774) left. Archiwum Akt Nowych [The Archives of New Documents, abbr. AAN], General Representative for Repatriation [abbr. Rep.], 10 not numbered pages. The data is not complete, which merely points to the fact that the statistics of the time have to be treated sceptically.

<sup>30</sup> E. Kulischer, *Europe on the Move...*, p. 291; J. W. Schechtman, *Post-War Migration...*, p. 63.

<sup>31</sup> AAN, Polski Komitet Wyzwolenia Narodowego [Polish Committee for National Liberation, abbr. PKWN], I, The report of the State Bureau of Repatriation, 1944. Also E. Osóbka-Morawski, *Wspomnienia* [Memoirs], (Library of the Military Historical Institute).

returned much later. The same was true about other deportees. Does the general concept of transfer, though, include also those Poles who inhabited the old eastern territories, who in 1939 and 1940 were deported further east, and who returned to Poland in 1946 - 1947 on the basis of repatriation agreements signed with the government of the U.S.S.R., or those who found themselves in Germany and England (for instance soldiers, refugees) and were repatriated.<sup>32</sup> If we are to estimate the numbers involved in dislocation, we cannot disregard this whole group, and yet it is a matter of discussion whether it ought to be considered as part of the transfer movement.

The organized departure of the German population from Poland was based primarily on the well known 12th chapter of the Potsdam Treaty. It was not, therefore, *sensu stricto* an agreement between the two interested partners, which is considered a prerequisite of an exchange of population. Germany was represented by the occupation powers. Nevertheless the majority of scientists tend to qualify the process as transfer of population. Taking into account its goals and character, which are analogous to the classical bilateral exchange, Dollot introduced the apt term *transferts unilateraux*.<sup>33</sup>

There are two ways of looking upon the dislocation of the German population in effect of World War II: generally, as changes in the geographic location of the population, (we should then consider all dislocations regardless of the character of migrations), or from the point of view of the different stages of the process. Thus, while the exchange of population between Poland and Ukraine, Lithuania, and Byelorussia was almost clearly a transfer situation, with other elements playing only a minor part, in the dislocation of the German population transfer was only one of the stages; quite independently of non-scientific consideration, this fact might have caused a tendency to qualify the process differently.

The above mentioned general approach is dominant in scientific writing and in journalism. The German, and often also American and French publications

<sup>32</sup> This element is noted by G. Frumkin, *Population Changes in Europe*, New York 1951, p. 120. For the last group he cites the figure of 400 - 500 thousand persons. The agreement with the U.S.S.R. concerning the repatriation of Poles was signed on July 6, 1945, AAN Rep., 1, f. 16 - 18. Copy of *Umowa między Tymczasowym Rządem Jedności Narodowej PR i Rządem Z.S.R.R. o prawie zmiany obywatelstwa radzieckiego osób narodowości polskiej i żydowskiej mieszkających w Z.S.R.R. i ich ewakuacji do Polski i o prawie zmiany obywatelstwa polskiego osób narodowości rosyjskiej, ukraińskiej, białoruskiej i litewskiej mieszkających na terytorium Polski i o ich ewakuacji do Z.S.R.R.* [*Agreement between the Provisional Government of National Unity of the Polish Republic and the Government of the U.S.S.R. on the Right of Persons of Polish and Jewish Nationality Living in the U.S.S.R. to a Change of Citizenship and to Evacuation to Poland, and on the Right of Persons of Russian Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and Lithuanian Nationality to a Change of Citizenship and to Evacuation to the U.S.S.R.*]. The agreement was signed by A. Wyszyński and Z. Modzelewski; see also the minutes of the agreement. Cf., AAN, Rep. 30, the proposal to be presented to the Council of Ministers, and Rep. 66, report of the mixed, Polish and Soviet Committee for evacuation, of December 17, 1945.

<sup>33</sup> L. Chevalier, op. cit., p. 439; L. Dollot, op. cit., p. 91.

include all migrations of Germans into the category of expulsions (*Vertreibung*).<sup>34</sup> In Poland they are generally treated as repatriation, and more rarely as transfer. It is obvious that a general evaluation of the demographic dislocations in the post-war period has to be based on the final outcome of all forms of migrations but the statement about the expulsion or repatriation of the millions people from Poland and Czechoslovakia does not correspond with reality. The process of dislocation consisted of at least three, different in character, stages of migration: escape and evacuation at the end of the war, expulsion in June and July of 1945, and finally the transfer of population based on the Potsdam decisions. We also have to take into account the voluntary and spontaneous departure of German families in which the Polish authorities had no part.<sup>35</sup>

Despite the different estimates of various authors and the fact that final figures cannot be arrived at, 50% of the population of the Western Territories was either evacuated or escaped; the figure goes almost up to 90% for the German minority which inhabited Poland before the war and the Germans who settled in the Polish territory during the war.

During the second stage, the expulsions conducted by the army, a little over a million people left the border poviats; some of them, though we do not know how many exacte, have later returned across the border which was not well guarded. Again, an accurate calculation is impossible, and Polish scientists have different views of this question. The final stage of demographic dislocations was the transfer of population which executed the decisions of the Potsdam Conference and of the Interallied Control Council. In Poland it started in February 1946. The plan of transfer for all countries in which it was to take place was accepted on November 20, 1945. According to this plan the German population which was leaving Poland was to settle in the occupation zones: 2 million in the Soviet zone, and 1.5 million in the British zone. There have been statements that these figures represented the whole of the German population which was to leave the country. It seems obvious, though, that the decisions spoke only of the population of the recovered territory at the moment when the decisions were made and

---

<sup>34</sup> According to Ginesy, for example, 9 milion Germans were deported from Poland (op. cit., p. 53); Vernant wrote of 5 - 6 millions of "expelled" Germans instead of the 3.5 millions mentioned in the decision of the Allied Control Council (op. cit., p. 95). Frings in *Das internationale Fluchtlingsproblem 1919 - 1950*, (Frankfurt am Mein 1951, p. 132) estimated that migration included the total of 5 million persons; G. Frumkin (op. cit., p. 129) and Proudfoot (op. cit., p. 371) spoke of 4 millions in 1945 alone, and Zieliński in *Population Changes in Poland 1939 - 1950*, (Munich 1954) mentions the figure of 2.5 milion Germans who, according to his terminology, were repatriated from the territory annexed by Poland.

<sup>35</sup> *Die Deutsche Vertreibungsverluste, Bevölkerungsbilanzen für die Deutschevertreibungsgebiete 1939 - 1950*, Wiesbaden 1958, p. 33; also G. Reichling, *Die Heimatvertriebenen im Spiegel der Statistik der Bundesrepublik Deutschlands*, vol. CXIV. *Die Vertriebenen und Flüchtlinge in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in Jh. 1946 - 1953; Statistisches Taschenbuch über die Heimatvertriebenen*, Wiesbaden 1953.

the size of the transfer determined. There seems to be no basis to believe that only part of the German population was to be subjected to transfer; this would contradict the accepted general assumptions which dictated mass transfer.

In effect, despite the statements of Vernant and Schechtman, organized transfer never reached the numbers quoted in the decision of the Interallied Control Council. The transfer statistics give the total number of 2.5 million.<sup>36</sup>

The exchange of population between Poland and the Soviet Union was, regardless of certain similarities, quite different from the organized transfer of the German population from Poland. The greatest difference was in the degree of compulsion.

Analyzing the voluntary and compulsory aspects of transfer migrations, the French authors use the term "obligation" and speak of three of its elements: the mass character (the whole minority group is included), the definitiveness (no possibility of return), and the fact that there is no choice of the place of settlement.<sup>37</sup> From this point of view they classify all transfer agreements in four categories: those with an overt condition of obligation, e.g. the 1923 agreement between Greece and Turkey, those with a covert obligation resulting from the interpretation of the agreement, those in which the obligation results from the character of the agreement, and finally those which leave a free choice of migrating or remaining, based on option.

In this respect the combination of various elements, which was so characteristic for transfer migrations in Poland, was also symptomatic. It is known that the transfer of Germans bore the character of direct compulsion, or — as Dollot puts it — obligation; he thus introduces a certain gradation between compulsion and obligation.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, the transfer of Poles and Jews from the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Lithuania was voluntary, though its realization was not the same in all of the republics. Poland wanted to include in the transfer all Poles who inhabited the territory. The agreements stated clearly that persons of Polish and Jewish nationality have the right, not the duty, to emigrate to Poland.<sup>39</sup>

It was in the interests of the Lithuanian and Byelorussian authorities that a possibly biggest number of the population — particularly that living in the country — remained in the place of their habitation; the reasons for this

<sup>36</sup> Kersten, *The Transfer...*, pp. 36 ff.

<sup>37</sup> *Les Transferts internationaux...*, pp. 47 ff.

<sup>38</sup> Dollot, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

<sup>39</sup> AAN, PKWN, minutes of meetings, pp. 99 - 100, 9 IX 1944 concerning Byelorussia; f. 122 - 126, 21 IX 1944, concerning Lithuania; also AAN, Rep. 19, copy of the agreement between the P.K.W.N. and the Lithuanian Republic; also Rep. 1, texts of instructions and additional agreements. The texts of the agreements were never published as a whole. The evacuation is to include those who express their will to leave and who receive the permission of both governments,

were partly economic.<sup>40</sup> The situation was made particularly difficult since a great number of people could not supply any documents which would certify to their national identity.

The transfer of the Ukrainian population from Poland, though based on the same agreements, took a different course. In effect of the intentions of both sides, the concept of "obligation" was fully applied.

In all of these processes the criterion of nationality was of basic importance. Transfer migrations were, *ex definitione*, linked with the complicated problems of national minorities.

From the very beginning the legal, formal criteria were not applied in relation to those inhabiting the Western Territories, but the sociological criteria were not specified.<sup>41</sup> Different concepts were voiced in the discussion of the subject.<sup>42</sup> The problem was studied further by the Scientific Council for the Problems of the Western Territories which was called into existence by the Ministry of Public Administration.<sup>43</sup> Note was taken of the complexity of the situation, of the existence of both conscious Poles and conscious Germans, and of people whose national feelings were described as dualistic.<sup>44</sup> Their point of view was expressed

---

<sup>40</sup> AAN, Rep. 19, 22, 23 not numbered pages. Reports of the Polish representatives in Vilnius 1945, 1946, 1947. Also notes on the Lithuanian stand, the memoranda of the Polish population, especially that inhabiting the so called Kowno Lithuania. The government of the Lituanian Republic wanted to conclude the action as soon as possible. There is a great deal of correspondence on the subject.

<sup>41</sup> The difficulties in determining the actual nationality of sections of the population inhabiting the Western Territories were discussed also by: O. S. Popiołek, *Stan i potrzeby badań nad dziejami ruchu polskiego na terenie b. rejencji Opolskiej* [The State and Need for Studies of the Polish Movement in the Opole County], Katowice 1961, p. 16; H. Zieliński, *Polacy i polskość ziemi zlotowskiej w latach 1918 - 1939* [Poles and the Polish Character of the County of Zlotów in the Years 1918 - 1939], Poznań 1949, p. 8; K. Kolańczyk, W. Rusiński, *Introduction to Polacy na Ziemi Lubuskiej i na Łużycach przed 1939 r.* [Poles in the Lubuska Territory and in Łużyce], Poznań 1946, p. 21.

<sup>42</sup> Z. Izdebski, *Rewizja pojęcia narodowości* [The Concept of Nationality Revised], Katowice 1947; also the not published report at the 5th Session of the Scientific Council for the Problems of the Western Territories (AAN MZO Bureau for Settlement and Deportation Studies, abbr. BSOP). It accepts the behaviorist concept which states that behavior defines nationality. R. Buławski, *Problem Niemców pochodzenia polskiego* [The Problem of Germans of Polish Origin], dans: *I Sesja Rady Naukowej dla Zagadnień Ziem Odzyskanych* [I Session of the Scientific Council for the Problems of the Western Territories], Kraków 1945, vol. III.

<sup>43</sup> During the V Session of the Scientific Council for the Problems of Western Territories Izdebski's report was criticized heavily. The possibility of a circumstantial approach among the candidates for verification was emphasized. (AAN MZO BSOP). The stand of the representatives of the state authorities on verification was different. "The verification is to be a long range policy aimed at the children and grandchildren." (P. Dubiel). The discussion and the report were not published.

<sup>44</sup> K. Dobrowolski, report at a Session of the Scientific Council for the problems of the Western Territories. (AAN BSOP).

in the statements that those who work well can live well in Germany and in Poland, and those who do not work, will not be happy anywhere.<sup>45</sup>

The stand taken by the state authorities on the problems of nationalities in the Western Territories was not the effect of theoretical concepts. The first decrees called for national self-determination based on a written declaration of loyalty to the Polish nation and state.<sup>46</sup> Thus the subjective criterion of nationality determined by the individual will, was accepted. In the existing political situation this criterion proved insufficient; it was difficult to regard the declaration as an expression of the sense of true national identity.

Soon Polish nationality was granted only to those who could prove Polish origin or a tie with the Polish nation.<sup>47</sup> This represented a partial acceptance of objective standards, such as language and origin, and of the behaviorist concept, the criterion of individual behavior. Verifying Committees which made the final decisions concerning national membership, became very important. The process of verification showed how complicated the matter actually was; it also showed the resistance and the number of differing opinions which persisted both among those who were verified and those who decided about their future.<sup>48</sup> Neither postulates nor assumptions could prevent serious mistakes which resulted in an increase of the number of people included in the transfer.

The objective criterion was also applied in relation to the Polish population in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Lithuania; not only a declaration, but documents proving Polish origin were required.<sup>49</sup> For reasons of state and to counteract attempts at narrowing the group which was subject to transfer, a similar criterion was applied in relation to the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and Lithuanian population of Poland. At first only those who expressed a wish to emigrate were registered, but later, in the stage of compulsory deportations, the basis was the nationality written into the identity cards; during the German occupation the Ukrainians had different *Kennkarten* than the Poles. In cases which were doubtful the

---

<sup>45</sup> CAW III-2-251, f. 155 n.: report of second lieutenant B. Zylberg from a tour of the Opole region in Silesia, 20 - 29 IV 1945; *ibidem* p. 164, report of T. Ladenberger, second participant of the tour.

<sup>46</sup> Decree of the Minister of Public Administration of 23 VI 1945. The decree spoke of provisional certificates for the autochthons issued on the basis of written declarations of loyalty to the Polish nation and state. The declarations were accepted until 1 XI 1945.

<sup>47</sup> The decree of the Minister of Western Territories of 6 IV 1946 concerning the determination of the Polish nationality of the inhabitants of the Western Territories (abbr. Dz. U. MZO) No. 26, which was confirmed by the Bill of 28 IV 1946 concerning Polish citizenship of persons of Polish nationality living in the Western Territories, *Dziennik Ustaw R. P.* [Journal of Law of the Polish Republic], No. 15, point 106.

<sup>48</sup> Dz. U. MZO 1947, No. 6. point 107, Circular of MZO of 5 VI 1947 concerning the attitude to the problems of the citizenship of persons settled in the Western Territories.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. K. Kersten, *Międzypaństwowe przesiedlenia ludności w XX wieku* [The International Transfer of People in the 20th Century], "Kwartalnik Historyczny," 1966, No. 1, pp. 24 ff.

decision rested in the hands of the Government.<sup>50</sup> The government representative for the repatriation of the Ukrainian population had requested the Polish Academy of Sciences to define the nationality of the Łemkowie.<sup>51</sup> The Germans had attempted to create of the Łemkowie a separate nationality, and not succeeding, considered them all as Ukrainians.

The above problems related to those national minorities which, because their home territories became part of a different state, were given the right or the obligation to migrate; an exception to this was a small group of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and Byelorussians. The situation is even more complex if we take into account another type of transfer, not related directly to the change of borders.

The loss of population during the war and the perspective of Polonizing the Western Territories caused discussions of the possible return of the so called, old émigrés.<sup>52</sup> The Sejm appealed to them to return,<sup>53</sup> but mass migration never took place. On the one hand, it was the effect of reservations on the part of state authorities, on the other, as those who were more realistic had foreseen, the Polish émigrés in America, Brazil, and other countries, who have become assimilated, have achieved a deep, conscious tie with their new environment, could not be expected to return to the country which their ancestors had left in search for jobs, could not be expected to be led by Polish patriotism alone.<sup>54</sup> Such migrations took place only in certain specific cases. They were inadequately described as repatriation or reemigration. The transfer of Poles from Yugoslavia, Thuringia, and Westphalia was preceded by international agreements, was organized, and completely voluntary, without any elements of compulsion resulting from the situation.

Despite the nomenclature which is used in Poland, these migrations are recognized as the transfer of population because of their similarity with the transfer of the German minority from the Balkans, the Baltic states, and the U.S.S.R. In science it does not seem possible to accept different terms for analogous pheno-

<sup>50</sup> AAN, Rep. 23, note the Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the repatriation of Poles, ex-citizens of Lithuania. (Representative for Repatriation in Vilnius to W. Wolski, 22 IX 1945). The note on criteria for nationality cites the circular of the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs of 14 VIII 1926 concerning the false statements of nationality written into identification cards. The registration in Kowno Lithuania lasted 2 - 3 weeks, until 1 IV 1945 and included 16,000 people (*ibidem*, note for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the repatriation of Poles, ex-citizens of Lithuania). Cf., Rep. 9, 19, 22, 23, 96, W. Wolski to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 28 III 1946.

<sup>51</sup> AAN, Rep. 9, W. Gomułka to W. Wolski, 19 IV 1946 (original); *ibidem*, the petition of the inhabitants of Szczawno, 19 II 1946. Also the memorandum directed to the Marshal of Poland, the Minister of Justice, the voivode of Rzeszów, and the head of the Sanok powiat by the inhabitant of Komańcza, 18 II 1946.

<sup>52</sup> AAN, Rep. 10, the correspondence between J. Bednarz and W. Wolski, April 1946.

<sup>53</sup> AAN, Rep. 147, the memorandum of the Polish Western Union, August 1946; the Archives of the State Council, the minutes of the meetings of the National People's Council, 22 V 1945.

<sup>54</sup> The Sejm stenographs, column 78, the first session of the legislative Sejm, 8 II 1947, also column 47, 22 II 1947.

mena, only because of local traditions. We are again confronted with the problem of defining the concept of a national minority, but in this context it is necessary to take into account the sense of belonging to a nation and the time spent in the new environment. We cannot speak of repatriation in relation to people whose ancestors have lived in the country for a number of centuries just as we cannot apply the term "transfer" to those who left the country a few years or even some decades ago. In reality such distinctions are not always possible; agreements and organized actions have often included both categories. The character of the movements is determined by the majority group.

The so called repatriation, or reemigration, from Yugoslavia concerned a group of 30,000 Poles whose ancestors emigrated in the beginning of the 20th century; in the autumn of 1945 they asked the Polish government for permission to come to Poland and to settle in the Western Territories.<sup>55</sup> The decision was made by the Congress of Poles in Yugoslavia even before the Potsdam conference and was an expression of belief in the stability of changes which took place in 1944. A delegation chosen by the Congress came to Poland and selected as the place of settlement the poviats of Bolesławiec and Lwówek in Lower Silesia. The agreement between the Polish and the Yugoslav government was signed in January 1946, and in February the Transfer Committee was already active.<sup>56</sup> The actual size of transfer was much smaller than expected; less than 3,500 people came to Poland.

Among the Polish colony in Westphalia, Thuringia, and Saxony, which was made up of émigrés of the period between the wars and of descendants of the pre-World War I emigration, there was a strong tendency to return to Poland.<sup>57</sup> All sorts of complications slowed that process and also limited its dimensions.<sup>58</sup> The Polish colonies in Thuringia, Saxony, and Brandenburg were large; there were close to 44,000 people.<sup>59</sup> The colonies in Saxony and Thuringia appealed for a precipitation of their departure for Poland; the Soviet occupation authorities were in favor of it. Finally 21,000 persons immigrated.

---

<sup>55</sup> Znaniecki, op. cit., p. 130; cf., AAN, Rep. 116, Report of a meeting of the Reemigration Committee of the Scientific Council for the Problems of the Western Territories, 20 V 1946, B. Olszewski's report. He was the speaker at the December, 1945 session of the Council, the subject was the reemigration of the Polish population.

<sup>56</sup> AAN, Rep. 97, The project of a resolution by the Council of Ministers concerning the repatriation and settlement of Poles from Yugoslavia, 25 X 1945.

<sup>57</sup> AAN, Rep. 116, Report of the Polish-Yugoslav Emigration Committee, 8 VII 1946.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem*, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Government Representative for Repatriation, W. Wolski, 28 VI 1946 and his answer.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem*, the Consular Section of the Military Mission in Berlin to the Consular Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 18 VII 1946. There was a tendency to limit the right to a return to Poland only to those who had been Polish citizens before. Also a letter of the Section to the Bureau of 5 VII 1946.



Starting from the above assumption, the reemigration of miners and farmers from France cannot be considered as a transfer migration because the majority of them were first generation émigrés who had left the country in the period between the Wars and were truly reemigrating. We can see elements of transfer, though, in all organized mass migrations of Polish colonies which inhabited a given country for generations.

\*

Repatriation was the second in size and importance type of migration characteristic for the post-war period. It was the return of Polish citizens who, because of the war, had left the country temporarily in the years 1939 - 1944. Unlike in France or Belgium, the problem has not been studied in Poland. The repatriation of Poles was only one of the elements of the repatriation processes which included tens of millions of citizens from all countries in Europe and Asia; but being a specific element, it had an important place in the activities of the international institutions which directed these processes.

Repatriation was the final stage of the migrations which took place in the years 1939 - 1945, but a study of the life of Poles during the war, outside the country, is beyond the scope of the present remarks. The connection is important in an analysis of the character of repatriation movements; they cannot always be classified as demographic migrations, which assume a permanent displacement of whole families. Without taking account of these connections it would be difficult to present the course of post-war repatriation. Unfortunately also this subject has not been studied in Poland. We can base our remarks only upon the I.L.O. studies summarized by Kulischer and Schechtman, on the S.H.A.E.F. materials which were used by Proudfoot, and on fragmentary monographs. Best known are the deportations for forced labor which were the subject of study of a German scientist.<sup>60</sup> It would be much more difficult to describe, even statistically, the movements of refugees or the evacuation. These migrations are connected with a number of complex problems.

On the contrary, the structure of the movement of repatriation is comparatively simple. It is voluntary, despite certain tendencies to make it compulsory, and can be either spontaneous or organized by appropriate institutions. Spontaneous repatriation was greatest in numbers immediately after the liberation, and even while the war still lasted; organized repatriation started in March 1945. There are very few source materials concerning the spontaneous movements.

In the historical analysis of the repatriation of Poles another division, based on organization, seems to be necessary. It is not the result of differences in form, but of the course of migration and the political problems are related to it. The distinction between the repatriation from the U.S.S.R. and the "West": from the western occupation zones and from other European and non-European coun-

---

<sup>60</sup> AAN, Rep. 116, the Repatriation Mission in Berlin to general Sokolowski, 30 XI 1945.

tries will continue to be used. A new category of repatriation from the countries of the Eastern block is beginning to be used.

The so called repatriation from the West included a number of groups. First chronologically, and undoubtedly the most important was the group of Poles returning from occupied Germany.<sup>61</sup> Some of them, about 800,000, primarily from the Soviet occupation zone, returned voluntarily immediately after liberation; a good number stayed in Germany for many months. Winter of 1945/1946 spent in Germany hampered further repatriation.<sup>62</sup> Those difficulties were the combined effect of the organizational consolidation of the Polish emigration groups in Germany, of the growing strength of the new system's political opponents, of the propaganda concerning the conditions in the country, and finally of the demoralizing effect of camp life. The idea of an extended stay outside the country was beginning to be accepted, and perspectives other than repatriation were sought. Anti-repatriation propaganda was reinforced by the lack of information coming out of Poland.

The most accurate statistical data on the repatriation of Poles from Germany until the middle of 1947 can be found in the records of the U.N.R.R.A.; wherever comparison is possible, the Polish sources support their reliability. Knowing the existing conditions and the value of most statistics, the similarities are quite surprising. The data show the uneven tempo of repatriation; the autumn of 1946 was the last period of intensified repatriation. It was the result of an action by U.N.R.R.A. and the occupation military authorities (cf. the table). 80% of the Poles who were in Germany in the autumn of 1945 were repatriated by the middle of 1947. After U.N.R.R.A. had ceased its activities and was replaced by the new organization, the I.R.O., an additional few tens of thousands were repatriated. Finally only a small percentage, those who decided on permanent emigration, remained under the care of the I.R.O.

"Repatriation from the West" included not only those who were in occupied Germany, but also all Polish refugees in the rest of Europe, in Asia, Africa, and America. The statistics show large scale migrations of this group in the first months following the liberation of the country. Not all of them, though, led directly to Poland. In September 1945 about 200,000 of Poles were still registered as "homeless". Polish sources show that their repatriation was even slower than that from Germany.

Still different was the problem of the Polish soldiers who fought in the armies

<sup>61</sup> E. Seeber, *Zwangsarbeit in der Faschistischen Kriegswirtschaft, Die Deportation und Ausbeutung polnischer Bürger unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Lage der Arbeiter aus dem sogenannten Generalgouvernement (1939 - 1945)*, Berlin 1960.

<sup>62</sup> A detailed analysis in K. Kersten *Repatriacja Polaków z Niemiec po II wojnie światowej* [*Repatriation of Poles from Germany after World War II*], part I, "Polska Ludowa," vol. VI, 1967, pp. 3 - 34; part II, vol. VII, 1968, pp. 3—44.

of the Western allies. Though everything was done to prevent their repatriation, a number of them decided against permanent emigration.

According to the above division, we should outline the major problems related to the repatriation of Poles from the Soviet Union, but they are not sufficiently known. 250,000 persons were repatriated. A broader study of the whole process can be written only on the basis of an inquiry into the source materials which can be found in the archives.

\*

Both "transfer" and repatriation proper were demographic movements which included millions of people. The other migration groups, i.e., reemigration and emigration, included at the most some tens of thousands. Their importance in the post-war demography of the country was, therefore, rather limited. The problems of reemigration were studied after the war from the point of view of the chances of return of the Poles who left the country because of agrarian overpopulation or unemployment. They were offered land and job opportunities; it was hoped that at least some of them would return. Efforts directed at organizing repatriation brought poor results; at most 100,000 persons returned, the majority were miners from France.

To give a more complete picture of the classification, we should mention the emigration of the Jewish population from Poland. From the demographic point of view it was not a large movement, it included only 150,000, but in comparison with the total number of those who survived the war it had a certain amount of significance. The emigration of almost 50% of those who survived the war was the result of the wartime experiences of this group.

In summarizing the results of post-war migrations in Poland we should note that one of their consequences was the displacement westward of over 1.5 million Poles who, in a process which lasted a number of centuries, had settled in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Lithuania; the other was the escape, evacuation, transfer and individual migration of millions of Germans from the territory which after World War II became part of Poland. This displacement of population was accompanied by migrations within the country, and by the process of settling the territories annexed in 1945 by the population from middle, eastern, and southern Poland; the results of these movements were varied and long lasting.

While the transfer of population was the result of the changes of Polish borders, the other migration movements were genetically related to the war and its consequences; they were the migrations back to the country, primarily the repatriation which included 2 million persons and the reemigration of some tens of thousands. The migrations out of Poland were of two kinds: the direct, which was the emigration of Jews, and the indirect, which was the decision of

those who, as a result of the war, found themselves outside of Poland, and who, for personal or political reasons, decided to settle in another country. The majority had the help of international organizations. This process ended in the creation of new colonies of Polish émigrés in Europe, both Americas, Australia, and in Africa.

*(Translated by Maxim Lieber)*