https://doi.org/10.22364/lviz.123.11
pp. 165–169

LATVIJAS VĒSTURES
INSTITŪTA ŽURNĀLS

1 (123) 2025

Geoffrey Swain

Kamil Ruszała, ed. *Refugees and Population Transfer Management in Europe, 1914–1920s*. New York and London: Routledge, 2025
(Routledge Studies in Modern European History)
337 pp. ISBN 978-1-032-75162-7; 978-1-003-47274-2

Poļu vēsturnieka Kamila Rušala sastādītā rakstu krājuma "Refugees and Population Transfer Management in Europe, 1914–1920s" centrā ir sociālie pārkārtojumi Eiropā, ko izsauca bēgļu plūsmas Pirmā pasaules kara rezultātā. Publicētās esejas vieno atziņa, ka pasaule, kas tapa pēc kara, bija tikpat lielā mērā bēgošo kā karojošo radīta. Esejas aplūko gan bēgļiem sniegto atbalstu, gan bēgļu izsaukto paniku un bailes; vairākas no tām uzrunā jautājumus par to cilvēku likteņiem, kuri nokļuva gūstekņu nometnēs vai bija spiesti iekārtoties dzīvei valstī, ar kuru karoja, kā arī par sociālajiem mehānismiem, kas tika radīti bēgļu asimilācijai. Latvijas Universitātes vēsturnieku Ērika Jēkabsona un Kristīnes Beķeres raksti veltīti matemātiska rakstura neskaidrībām. Jēkabsona raksts pievēršas iedzīvotāju skaita izmaiņām Latvijas teritorijā laika posmā no 1914. līdz 1920. gadam. Īpaši tam, kādēļ dati vēsta par 850 000 iedzīvotāju došanos bēgļu gaitās no mūsdienu Latvijas teritorijas uz Krievijas impērijas iekšzemi, kaut gan kara laikā kā bēgļi reģistrēti tikai 300 000. Kā iemesli šai nesakritībai norādīta ebreju un vācbaltiešu gan iekļaušana, gan neiekļaušana šajās aplēsēs, evakuēto rūpnīcu darbinieku nereģistrēšana bēgļu statusā, jo tie saņēma algas. Papildus grūtības aprēķinu skaidrībai rada mūsdienu Latvijas teritorijas nokļūšana pilnīgā vācu kontrolē 1918. gadā. Jēkabsons secina, ka 1925. gadā Latvijas iedzīvotāju skaits Pirmā pasaules kara ietekmē bija samazinājies par 27%. Kristīnes Beķeres raksta centrā ir latviešu diasporas atbalsts tautiešiem, kuri gribēja atgriezties mājās pēc kara. Atgriešanās un integrēšanās process bija dārgs, tas ietvēra medicīniskās pārbaudes, naudas pabalstu pirmās nepieciešamības izdevumiem, apģērbu, izmaksas bērniem, atbalstu, iekārtojoties darbā vai uzmeklējot radiniekus. Šīm vajadzībām izdevās saziedot ap 8 miljoniem Latvijas rubļu. Lielākā daļa šīs naudas tika saziedota Latvijā, vien 22% nāca no latviešu ārzemju diasporas, galvenokārt no Amerikas Savienotajās Valstīs dzīvojošajiem.

This is an important collection of essays on the population movements prompted by the outbreak and aftermath of the First World War. All the essays are based on archival research and represent the current 'state of the art' in refugee studies. Peter Gatrell, one of the pioneers in this area, sets the tone in an authoritative over-view which sums up the present state of migration studies for these years. He notes that "notwithstanding the magnitude of mass population displacement during the Great War, refugees are missing from official assessments of the conflict" (p. 15). This is all the more surprising since the population politics practiced during the Great War "were reproduced throughout the twentieth century" (p. 17). The population movements of 1914 to the mid-1920s helped form the world as it is today, and the case studies brought together in this volume go a long way to helping us understand the complex nature of these events. The new world established in 1918 was dogged by the legacy of those fleeing the fighting as much as it was by those engaged in the fighting.

Two essays focus on what might be called bystander powers. Kieran Taylor considers the warm welcome given by Glasgow City Council to Belgian refugees at the start of the war, with the city's senior magistrates forming a guard of honour to welcome the refugees as they disembarked at Central Station throughout October 1914. Eirik Brazier and Nik Brandal consider the flows of refugees and political activists through neutral Norway, resulting in a degree of panic and the passing of the 1914 Spy Act and the Aliens Acts of 1915 and 1917. Three essays touch on the link between refugee status and the growth of nationalism within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Iryna Orlevych and Natalia Kolb consider the Gmünd refugee camp in southern Austria, inhabited or passed through by hundreds of thousands of Galician Ukrainians. Here the self-organisation of the camp developed from purely administrative matters to the launching of a strong cultural programme which very soon had a strong nationalist agenda. Kamil Ruszala describes the fate of Polish refugees from Galicia who were taken over eight hundred kilometres to a camp in Salzburg: so far from home, they were seen as alien and possible Russian agents, until local philanthropists took up their cause; by April 1915 a "Polish Exile Parliament" had been established. The inhabitants of the future state of Slovenia also had to accommodate refugees from Galicia, however, when Italy joined the war in May 1915, they in turn became refugees. Again, the authorities encouraged "self-help" organisations to take charge, which in the Slovenian case took on a distinct nationalist tinge; yet there were still tensions with the local population even when it, too, was Slovenian.

Moving to post-war concerns, Aleksandar Miletić writes about the way, after 1918, the newly established states of Central and Eastern Europe sought to register and regulate their new minority communities. For Poland, he considers

the government's strict immigration policies, in particular how the authorities dealt with those, often Jews, who "bypassed" the immigration system by moving to the United States, obtaining citizenship there and then trying to emigrate to Poland. For Yugoslavia, he considers the impact of labour legislation on restricting the traditional work habits of Austrian citizens, while for Bulgaria his concern is the fluctuating policy taken towards Turkish migrant labour. Tsvetelina Tsvetkova considers Bulgaria in more detail, as the country attempted to accommodate the nearly 300,000 ethnic Bulgarians leaving Greece, Romania, and Yugoslavia to "return" to their Bulgarian home. The 1920 Law on the Settlement of Refugees tried to juggle the needs of these incomers at a time when land reform was being carried out throughout the country; how much land could those without land have? Unsurprisingly these returnees became the target of both communist and nationalist politicians.

Anna Mashi also considers the fate of incomers, including those Germans forced to leave Alsace-Lorraine and return to Weimar Germany. Although they were catered for, it was in a miserly way: had, for example, an ethnic German who became a French civil servant sacrificed the right to have German citizenship restored? Her other concern is the numerous Russian refugees who arrived in the Weimar Republic: their fate was at first delegated to the White Russian leaders of the exile community, but once the Soviet Government had deprived all Russian emigrants of their citizenship in 1921, that changed, and by 1923, the German government had adopted a variety of *ad hoc* restrictions. Finally, Victoria Abrahamyan considers perhaps the most intractable post-war issue – the fate of the Armenian refugee camps established in the part of the Ottoman Empire that would become Syria and Lebanon. Armenian survivors of the wartime deportations carried out by Turkish authorities had settled in 'Syria', where between 3000–4000 were still living when Allied forces entered the region in October 1918, acting as a magnate, the number had swollen to 80,000 by 1919. After the failure of its initial mass resettlement scheme, the French mandate authority eventually joined with the League of Nations in trying first to regularise the camps and then to resettle their inhabitants. The contribution by Bartosz Ogólek is a bit of an outlier, focusing on Poland's internal migration from countryside to town, exploring his belief that the rural population of Poland was not as immobile and isolated as other historians have argued.

Of most interest to readers of this journal will be the contributions by Ēriks Jēkabsons and Kristīne Beķere. Strangely for two such well-known historians, both essays address mathematical conundrums. Jēkabsons sets out to understand the population changes in Latvia from 1914 to 1920, and in particular, the gap between the estimate of 850,000 residents of Latvia who left for the Russian

interior after 1915 and the total number of refugees registered in Russia during the war, a figure of just under 300,000. A variety of explanations are explored. The figure of 850,000 dates back to the immediate post-war years and includes a statistical error by its author. The 60,000 Jews and Baltic Germans forcibly removed from the combat zone sometimes got counted as refugees but sometimes did not. The workforces of the many factories evacuated to the Russian interior during the war were not registered as refugees since they did not receive benefits but continued to be paid their wages. Similarly, the families of soldiers fighting in the Russian Army were not considered refugees since they received soldiers' benefits not refugee benefits. On top of that, it turns out that many Latvians did not move as far east as Russia but remained on the eastern territories of Latvia; sometimes this was because, having been refused permission to settle in Petrograd or Moscow, they preferred not to travel further east. Then there is the issue of return. As the German front-line advanced in 1917, many refugees found themselves in German-controlled territory making further life as a refugee pointless; this was even more the case in 1918 with the annexation of all Latvian territory. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk had a repatriation clause, and that repatriation process was accelerated when the Armistice was declared in November 1918, prompting the return of up to 12,000 Latvian PoWs. Once peace with Soviet Russia had been established by the treaty of 11 August 1920, nearly 225,000 Latvians returned from the Russian interior by 1927. Summing up all these additions and subtractions, Jēkabsons reaches his important conclusion: in 1925, Latvia had just under 1,850,000 inhabitants, a loss of 700,000 since 1914, or 27% of the population – "more than any other European country".

Kristīne Beķere has a rather different mathematical puzzle to solve. The August 1920 peace treaty with Soviet Russia enabled refugees to return and all who did so were given support. That support came from voluntary donations, both from Latvians at home but also from the Latvian diaspora. Beķere wants to uncover how significant this contribution from the Latvian diaspora was. First, she gives a clear and succinct summary of how the repatriation of refugees took place. It was on 7 July 1920 that the first train-load of 1200 refugees arrived in Rēzekne, and by the autumn of that year, 5000 were returning per week; by 1924, the majority of those who intended to return had done so. From 1920 to 1923, a Re-evacuation Commission of the Latvian Government was based in Moscow, but in Latvia itself most of the work to accomplish this feat was carried out by the Refugee Evacuation Society, established in March 1920 and led by those who had previously worked in the Colonies, Refugees and PoW Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The society's role was to quarantine and health check those who returned; issue them with cash grants on arrival, linked to their

number of dependants; provide immediate clothing and offer help with the educational needs of children – it also endeavoured to help refugees find work and, where possible, to reunite families. All this required money, and nearly eight million Latvian roubles was raised: some 25% came from donations collected via the regional branches established in Liepāja, Jelgava, Talsi, Saldus, Bauska, and Ventspils; a further 42% was raised through the very successful lottery run by the society; and the two shops run by the society also made a small profit. But what of foreign donations? Beķere juggles with the currency fluctuations of those hectic years, and grapples with the financial worth of gifts in kind like food parcels to decide that 22% of donations to the society came from the Latvian diaspora abroad, mostly from the United States.

© 2025 Geoffrey Swain, Latvijas Universitāte
Raksts publicēts brīvpieejā saskaņā ar Creative Commons
Attiecinājuma-Nekomerciāls 4.0 Starptautisko licenci (CC BY-NC 4.0)
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)