THE CATEGORISATION OF MIGRANTS FROM THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN ARGENTINE IMMIGRATION STATISTICS, 1880-1914

Dzianis Limarau

Asociación de la Comunidad Rusohablante, asociación civil
Buenos Aires, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22183912
Licensed under CC BY 4.0

GRNTI 03.81.35, 05.11.27, 05.21.21; UNESCO 5204.03, 5204.05, 5203.02; OECD FOS 6.01 History and Archaeology

Recommended citation: Limarau, D. (2026). The Categorisation of Migrants from the Russian Empire in Argentine Immigration Statistics, 1880-1914. Preprint. Asociación de la Comunidad Rusohablante. DOI 10.5281/zenodo.22183912

Contents

Contents 2
Objective of the Study 2
Intended Readership 3
Executive Summary 3
1. Introduction 4
2. Conceptual Framework: The Category as a Historical Fact 5
    2.1. Two Principles of Classification 5
    2.2. Defining “ruso” and “Migration from the Russian Empire” 5
    2.3. A Reply to an Objection 5
    2.4. Why the Flow Became Invisible: Two Faces of One Word 6
3. Methodology 6
    3.1. General Design 6
    3.2. The “Record Set / Attribute” Matrix 6
    3.3. Choice of the Empirical Cross-Section 7
    3.4. Sources 7
    3.5. Limitations of the Method 8
4. How Argentina Counted 8
    4.1. Law 817 and the Structure of the Department 8
    4.2. The Form of Entry at the Hotel de Inmigrantes 8
    4.3. Three Censuses, Three Different Questions 8
5. The Recount: Who Stood Behind the Word “ruso” on 10 May 1895 9
    5.1. The Official Picture 9
    5.2. Reconstruction from the Census Schedules 10
    5.3. How Many “rusos” Were Jews 11
    5.4. The Remainder: Who Else 11
    5.5. The Weser, 1889-1895: What Remained of the First Contingent 12
6. Systematic Biases 12
    6.1. Galician Jews as “austríacos” 12
    6.2. Volga Germans and Mennonites as “alemanes” 13
    6.3. Coding in Place of Questioning 13
    6.4. First Class and Return Migration 13
7. How the Error Entered the Historiography 14
8. Proposal: The Analytical Category “Migration from the Russian Empire” 15
9. Conclusion: The Recount 16
    9.1. The Argument in Summary 16
    9.2. The Result of the Recount 16
    9.3. Limitations 16
    9.4. Programme of Further Work 17
Appendix. Summary Matrix of Sources 18
Sources 18
Further Reading 20

Objective of the Study

The study seeks to establish how Argentine immigration statistics of 1880 to 1914 constructed the category “ruso”, who in fact stood behind that category on a measurable date, and to propose an analytical instrument that returns the flow from the Russian Empire to the historiography as a single object.

For the purposes of the study, the category “ruso” means the entry in the “nacionalidad” column of the registers of the Dirección General de Inmigración and of the census schedules, made according to subjecthood or to country of birth within the borders as they stood at the moment of the interview. Migration from the Russian Empire means the analytical category defined in Section 8; the term is used as a general one, since the sources designate the corresponding group by various words or do not distinguish it at all.

Three tasks serve this objective:

1. To describe the procedure of registration, namely Law 817 of 1876, the organisation of the Dirección General de Inmigración, the form of entry at the Hotel de Inmigrantes and the questions of the censuses of 1869, 1895 and 1914, and to show what circumstances the entry “ruso” depended on.
2. To recount the composition of the category “ruso” at the census date of 10 May 1895, setting the official results against the reconstruction from the original census schedules and against the community lists, and to measure the direction and the size of the systematic biases.
3. To examine the three established historiographical narratives, to formulate the analytical category “migration from the Russian Empire” with operational criteria of assignment, and to set out a programme for a full reconstruction of the years 1880 to 1914.

Intended Readership

The study is addressed first of all to historians of migration in Argentina and Latin America, and in particular to readers of Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos, as well as to researchers working within the three established narratives, Jewish, Volga German and Ukrainian: the category proposed here competes with none of them.

To the custodians of the primary record sets, the Centro de Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos (CEMLA), the Museo de la Inmigración (MUNTREF), the Archivo General de la Nación, the Staatsarchiv Hamburg and the archive of the Jewish Colonization Association, it offers a method designed for joint work with their holdings.

The comparative material and the appendix are meant to be usable on their own by researchers and organisations working on the history of migration.

Executive Summary

Between 1880 and 1914 the Argentine state registered immigrants by subjecthood rather than by language, religion or self-identification. Official classification brought migrants from the Russian Empire together, for the most part, under a single heading, “ruso”, although some of them fell into other columns. Within the heading: Ashkenazi Jews of the Pale of Settlement, Volga Germans, Ukrainians, Poles of the

Kingdom of Poland, Lithuanians, Latvians, Bessarabians, Black Sea Mennonites, Old Believers, Finns. Outside it: the Jews of Galicia, recorded as “austríacos”, and those who left through Hamburg and Bremen, often entered as “alemanes”. Hence the opening thesis of the study: the category “ruso” did not describe an existing group; it was an administrative classification that later acquired everyday meanings at variance with its original content.

Argentine historiography then performed the reverse division: a single migratory flow was broken up into unconnected Jewish, German and Ukrainian histories, and the flow itself disappeared from the account. There is virtually no continuous study of migration from one state to one country across the same thirty years.

Methodology. The study combines quantitative reconstruction from cross-referenced sources with the history of the concept as applied to the word “ruso”. The empirical cross-section is the second national census of 10 May 1895, the only date in the period for which the official results by country of birth and by religion can be set against an independent reconstruction from the original census schedules, carried out by Yaacov Rubel for the Jewish population, and against the community lists of the Jewish Colonization Association. The official “ruso” column is checked against these record sets as a control measurement.

Principal findings. On 10 May 1895 the census counted 15,047 people born in the Russian Empire. Between 6,800 and 7,100 of them (45 to 47 per cent) were Jews; the remaining 7,900 to 8,300 were Volga Germans, Slavic peasants and other subjects of the empire. The official record of religion missed at least a quarter of the country’s Jewish population (6,085 against 8,265 in the census schedules, that is 26 per cent of the number established from the schedules) and left out almost every child born in Argentina. Of the 818 passengers of the steamer Weser, which opened Jewish colonisation in 1889, no more than 473 could be traced in the colonies six years later. Three of the four systematic biases of the category can be given a numerical estimate on this cross-section; the fourth, the one that governs the width of the interval, the recording of Volga Germans as “alemanes”, is bounded from above by a remainder of 8,300 people.

Proposal. The study introduces the analytical category “migration from the Russian Empire” with three operational criteria: departure (last place of residence within the borders of the empire, whatever the passport and the port), corroboration (agreement of at least two independent record sets, with onomastics excluded as a criterion in its own right) and description (language, religion and province of departure as three independent axes). The recount is stated as an interval accompanied by a list of the sources of error rather than as a single figure.

1. Introduction

On 14 August 1889 the steamer Weser arrived in Buenos Aires from Bremen with a party of 818 people from the province of Podolia, the first organised contingent of Jews from the Russian Empire [DAIA 1939; Avni 1983]. In the register of the Departamento General de Inmigración, the “nacionalidad” column against their names holds a single word: ruso. The entry matched their passports. Yet neither Russian statistics nor the name the arrivals used for themselves contained any such category: it arose where an imperial document met an Argentine form of registration. Over the following decades the word would mean a Jew in Buenos Aires, a fair-haired peasant in the provincial colonies, an anarchist in the language of the police. This study is about whom the entry actually covered and how it parted company with its original content.

By the census of 1914 almost 30 per cent of the inhabitants of Argentina had been born abroad; no country in the world took in a flow of that size relative to its own population in that era. The state classified arrivals by a single attribute, "nacionalidad", understood in practice as the state that had issued the travel document, or as the country of birth within the borders as they stood at the moment of the interview. For the unitary states of Western Europe the principle worked tolerably well. For the multinational empires of Eastern Europe it produced a systematic distortion, and the Russian Empire is the largest and the most telling case.

The usual response of a historian to such a category is to declare it an error and break it down into its "real" components. This study proceeds from the opposite premise: the category "ruso" is a historical fact calling for explanation rather than correction. It existed in departmental returns, census schedules, police records and everyday speech; it shaped how the state saw a newcomer and what his neighbours called him. In Argentine Spanish the word "ruso" meant, for most of the twentieth century, above all a Jew [Gobello 1990], and the connection between that meaning and the statistical procedure is one of the hypotheses the study puts forward.

Argentine historiography of migration is worked out in detail for Italians and Spaniards [Devoto 2003; Baily 1999; Moya 1998]. Migrants from the Russian Empire are studied separately along confessional and ethnic lines: Jewish studies apart [Avni 1983; Lewin 1974; Mirelman 1988; Rubel 2013, 2017], the Volga Germans apart [Popp y Dening 1977; Weyne 1986], the Ukrainians of Misiones apart [Wasylyk 1981; Snihur 1997]. A study that runs across the flow as a whole, defined by departure from a single state, is all but absent. That is the gap this study and the series it opens are directed at.

2. Conceptual Framework: The Category as a Historical Fact

2.1. Two Principles of Classification

Argentine statistics and Argentine historiography classify the same people by different criteria: the first by membership of a state, without regard to nationality; the second by membership of a people, without regard to the state. The difference between the two principles would raise no difficulty if each of them kept its object whole. Statistics preserves the flow as a whole but does not disclose its internal composition; historiography recovers that composition but divides the flow into parts that are then examined independently of one another.

2.2. Defining "ruso" and "Migration from the Russian Empire"

The category "ruso" is defined here strictly as an entry in a source: in the "nacionalidad" column of the register of the Hotel de Inmigrantes, in the country-of-birth column of a census schedule, in the departmental Memorias. It is a property of a document, not of a person. The core of the set of "rusos" consists of subjects of the Russian Empire holding a Russian foreign passport. Its periphery consists of people recorded as "ruso" in error, Romanian or Galician Jews taken as such by appearance, for instance, and, in mirror image, of subjects of the empire recorded under other labels.

The category "migration from the Russian Empire" is defined as an analytical one: the set of persons whose last permanent place of residence before emigration lay within the borders of the empire on the date of departure, irrespective of the subjecthood shown in their papers, of the port of embarkation and of the entry made on arrival. The category is indifferent to motive: an economic migrant from Volhynia and

a refugee from the pogrom in Kishinev belong to it on equal terms. It is equally indifferent to what came afterwards: a re-emigrant to the United States and a third-generation colonist both belong to it by virtue of having left. Nor is it an ethnonym or a claim about self-identification: a man from Berdychiv who spoke Yiddish and read Russian is described by three coordinates and not by one word.

2.3. A Reply to an Objection

One objection suggests itself. Is the proposed category anything more than a return to the same imperial principle of classification that historiography rejected with good reason, and is "migration from the Russian Empire" simply "ruso" rewritten in academic language?

The category "ruso" belonged to the receiving state and was produced on disembarkation from a document; the proposed category is produced by the historian from the place of departure, recovered from independent sources. The two coincide at the core and diverge at the periphery, and the divergence is what is being measured. The new category also leaves ethnic and confessional descriptions in place and is built above them: within it, composition is described along three axes and is not reduced to one word. Its justification is research utility rather than ontology. Questions that do not arise inside the ethnic narratives can be asked within it, about who travelled on the same ship, settled in the same province and passed through the same procedure of registration, and the answers can be tested on record sets common to every layer. The boundaries of historiographical categories are a product of research choice, and the choice here favours the one that corresponds to the organisation of the sources themselves.

2.4. Why the Flow Became Invisible: Two Faces of One Word

Why the flow from the Russian Empire as a whole never became the object of systematic analysis remains to be explained. The sources keep it whole: in the register a JCA colonist and a Volga German are entered on adjacent lines of the same voyage; in the census of 1895 both stand in the same "rusos" row. The separation happened on the reader's side. Jewish, German and Ukrainian archives and community historians read their own people in the sources; for each of them the other passengers of the same ship were noise. A circle of invisibility follows: the more fully each narrative describes its own part of the flow, the less apparent it is that the parts belong to one whole, and the better founded the conclusion seems that there is no whole.

The separation took place outside the study as well, in everyday speech. José Gobello's dictionary of lunfardo glosses "ruso" as a designation for a Jew [Gobello 1990]. In the city the word came loose from the passport and attached itself to the layer of the flow that a city dweller saw every day. Alberto Gerchunoff, born in Tulchyn, reacted tellingly: the book he wrote for the centenary of the May Revolution he called "Los gauchos judíos" and not "Los gauchos rusos", separating the group's own name from the administrative one.

In the provinces with German and Slavic colonies the word referred, on the evidence of memoir literature, to a different person: the fair-haired peasant on the land. The "Diccionario de americanismos" marks the Argentine sense "persona de religión judía" as obsolete [ASALE 2010]; the current press links the word to appearance rather than to origin and cites as examples people who carry the nickname and bear Polish surnames [Infocielo 2024]. These pieces of evidence are of unequal status and do not allow the shift to be dated; they record only that it occurred.

The hypothesis they suggest is this: the word travelled from subjecthood (the entry in a passport) to people (the person seen close at hand) and on to appearance (the person who looks like a "ruso"), and the two incompatible images, the urban Jew and the fair-haired colonist in the countryside, are the trace of two layers of one flow that went their separate ways to city and to village. Testing this hypothesis against dictionaries, nicknames and literary texts is the task of a separate article in the series (Section 9.4). For the present article it is enough to note that none of the meanings of the word recorded by dictionaries coincides with the original administrative category.

The present study attempts to break the circle of invisibility by reading the sources in the unit of their own organisation: the census row, where all the layers of the flow still stand together.

3. Methodology

3.1. General Design

The study belongs to the genre of quantitative reconstruction from cross-referenced sources, supplemented by the history of concepts. It is neither an archival monograph nor a review of the literature. Its subject lies at the intersection of two traditions, the demographic history of migration and the history of statistical categories [Otero 1997-1998], which work with different conceptual apparatus. A structured comparison on a single matrix is therefore used, and this secures reproducibility: any researcher applying the same matrix to the same record sets will arrive at comparable results.

3.2. The "Record Set / Attribute" Matrix

The unit of analysis is the census date: the moment at which the state records at once every native of the empire present in the country, by the single attribute of country of birth. For that date four record sets are compared, each of which registers the same people for a different purpose and with a different degree of independence from the state classification. Every record set is assessed on five attributes: whether it gives a name (the key for matching), whether it records subjecthood or country of birth, whether it records religion, by whom and when the entry was made, and how far it is independent of the official coding.

Table 1. Record sets and attributes of the analytical matrix

Record set (rows)	Key	Subjecthood / country of birth	Religion	By whom and when recorded	Independence from coding
Official census results, 1895 (Tomo II)	none (aggregate)	yes	yes (non-Catholics only)	census coders, 1895-1898	none: the coding itself
Original census schedules, 1895 (Rubel's reconstruction)	name, age	yes (self-declared)	yes, with corrections	colony enumerators, 10.05.1895	high: prior to coding
JCA and DAIA lists (Weser, Grodno party)	name, family composition	yes (province)	implied	community, 1889-1895; published 1939	complete

DGI Memorias and registers	name (registers), aggregate (Memorias)	yes (nacionalidad)	yes	inspector on disembarkation	none: the source of the category

Beyond comparability on a single date, the matrix provides a test of the study's main thesis: if the official "rusos" row and the independent record sets yield sets that cannot be reconciled, the bias of the category is measurable; if the sets coincide, the thesis of a directed distortion has to be revised.

3.3. Choice of the Empirical Cross-Section

A full reconstruction of the flow of 1880 to 1914 by ship voyage requires archival work out of proportion to the format of a preprint (Section 9.4). The empirical part rests on a single cross-section, the census of 10 May 1895. The choice follows from the state of the sources. This is the only date in the period for which an independent reconstruction from the original census schedules exists: Yaacov Rubel examined the schedules of all the JCA colonies, of the city of Buenos Aires and of dozens of provincial towns, and published the results broken down by country of birth [Rubel 2013, 2017]. For the same date there are lists by name of the first contingent (the Weser, DAIA 1939) and of the Grodno party (JCA, 1894), together with the official results by country of birth and by religion (Segundo Censo, Tomo II). Where four record sets intersect on one date, the bias can be measured and not merely estimated as an order of magnitude.

3.4. Sources

The analysis draws on four types of source: the official publications of the 1895 census (Tomo II, the tables by country of birth and by religion); reconstructions from the original census schedules [Rubel 2013, 2017]; community lists and memoirs [DAIA 1939; Cociovich 1987; Alpersohn 1992]; and the secondary literature of the three national narratives and of the general history of Argentine migration. For statements about the composition of the flow, priority goes to the comparison of the first two types; where no reconstruction from the schedules exists, as for the Volga Germans and the Slavic peasantry, the study uses the bounds that follow from the arithmetic of the census itself, with a note on what kind of bounds these are.

3.5. Limitations of the Method

Reconstruction from the census schedules exists only for the Jewish population; for the Volga Germans and the Slavic peasantry the composition of the category "ruso" is estimated as a remainder and not directly. For the city of Buenos Aires the share of those born in Russia among Jews is known only as an interval: Rubel established the total number, 50.3 per cent above the official one, but his breakdown by country of birth for the capital was not available to this study. The 1895 cross-section is not representative of the flow as a whole: the mass departure of the Slavic peasantry of the western provinces began after 1897, and the results do not carry over to the years 1900 to 1914 without separate verification. Departmental series and the census, finally, cover different sets: Law 817 excluded first-class passengers from the count of immigrants, so the educated minority of the flow never entered the departmental record sets, whereas the census counted everyone, and its cross-section is fuller than any series of arrivals.

4. How Argentina Counted

4.1. Law 817 and the Structure of the Department

Article 25 of the Constitution of 1853 obliged the federal government to encourage European immigration and forbade it to restrict the entry of foreigners coming to work the land, develop industry and teach the sciences and arts. Law 817 on immigration and colonisation, of 19 October 1876 (the Avellaneda Law), created the Departamento General de Inmigración, later the Dirección General de Inmigración, and defined who counted as an immigrant: a foreigner arriving in second or third class with the intention of settling. The department published annual Memorias with tables of arrivals by "nacionalidad", sex, age, marital status, religion and occupation. Juan A. Alsina, its director for many years (1890-1910), brought the series together in "La inmigración en el primer siglo de la independencia" [Alsina 1910]. Every later summary figure, including the widely quoted "about 160,000 rusos for 1881 to 1914", goes back to those tables, and none of them can be more accurate than the procedure of registration that produced them.

4.2. The Form of Entry at the Hotel de Inmigrantes

The procedure ran as follows. The ship's manifest, drawn up by the shipping company at the port of departure, was handed to the inspector on disembarkation. The inspector transferred the data to the register; where the papers disagreed or were missing he wrote down what he was told, usually through an interpreter. The "nacionalidad" column was filled in from the passport, and in its absence from the manifest. There was no separate column for place of birth, mother tongue or ethnic affiliation; religion was recorded, but, as census practice shows, without systematic verification.

The entry "ruso" thus depended above all on a document: a subject of the empire with a Russian passport received it whatever his language and religion. Two further links, however, stood between the passport and the register. The HAPAG or Norddeutscher Lloyd manifest was drawn up by a German clerk, for whom embarkation at Hamburg and German speech from a passenger out of the Volga were reason enough to write "Deutscher"; the inspector and the interpreter on disembarkation could in their turn set a name, a surname and an appearance above the document. That entries made on disembarkation were physically lost is documented: the list of the Grodno party, which left Libau on 11 November 1894 and reached Buenos Aires on 27 December, has been found neither in the Archivo General de la Nación nor in the CEMLA database [Rubel 2017].

4.3. Three Censuses, Three Different Questions

The censuses of 1869, 1895 and 1914 produced results that cannot be compared, because they asked different questions. The census of 1869 asked about nacionalidad without further specification. The census of 1895 added religion, but the instruction to enumerators ran: since almost the whole population is Catholic, ask about religion only where there is reason to think the respondent is not a Catholic, and record it in one word; if the respondent is a Catholic, leave the line blank [Segundo Censo, vol. II, p. CXXI]. The coders did not treat the answers "judío" and "hebreo" as equivalent to "israelita". The census of 1914 kept the questions on religion and country of birth but did not ask about language. None of the three censuses allows Russians to be separated from non-Russian natives of the empire; the 93,634 people "born in Russia" in the census of 1914 are an upper bound on a set about whose internal composition the census says nothing.

Hernán Otero has shown that the Argentine census categories of 1869 to 1914 were an instrument for constructing the nation rather than for describing the population [Otero 1997-1998]. The category “ruso” is a particular case: it served the state to divide foreigners among counterpart states, not to understand who had actually arrived. Somoza and Lattes, who analysed samples of the schedules of 1869 and 1895, concluded that the published results are unfit for modern demographic analysis [Somoza y Lattes 1967].

Table 2. The three censuses from the standpoint of the category “ruso”

Census	Question on origin	Question on religion	What it establishes
1869	nacionalidad	none	subjecthood only
10.05.1895	country of birth	yes, where Catholicism was in doubt	country of birth; religion with a systematic undercount
1.06.1914	country of birth	yes	country of birth and religion; language and nationality not established

5. The Recount: Who Stood Behind the Word “ruso” on 10 May 1895

5.1. The Official Picture

The second national census counted 3,954,911 inhabitants, of whom 1,004,527 were foreigners. Natives of the Russian Empire numbered 15,047, the tenth largest group of foreigners and 0.38 per cent of the population. For comparison: natives of Germany numbered 17,143, of Austria-Hungary 12,803, of Romania 119, of the Ottoman Empire 876 [Segundo Censo, vol. II]. In the table of religions the census counted 6,085 “israelitas”: 753 in the capital and 5,332 in the provinces, of whom 3,880 were in Entre Ríos, 721 in Santa Fe, 670 in the province of Buenos Aires, 47 in Córdoba and 14 elsewhere [Segundo Censo, vol. II, cuadro XIX b, p. CLXXIX].

The census recorded country of birth and not subjecthood. This is a different variable from the “nacionalidad” of the registers: it does not change on naturalisation, but neither does it cover children born in Argentina, so that the sets produced by the two procedures coincide at the core and diverge at the edges. From here on, statements about the category “ruso” on the 1895 cross-section refer to the row of natives of the Russian Empire, and every quantitative claim in this section concerns that row rather than the departmental “nacionalidad” column. The two official figures, 15,047 natives of Russia and 6,085 Jews, are nowhere related to each other in the census itself: no cross-tabulation of country of birth by religion was published. How many “rusos” were Jews, and how many Jews were “rusos”, cannot be established from the official results. It is precisely this connection that the reconstruction from the original schedules restores.

Table 3. The census of 10 May 1895: rows relevant to the category “ruso”

Indicator	Value	Source
Population (indigenous population excluded)	3,954,911	Segundo Censo, vol. II
Foreigners	1,004,527	ibid.
Born in the Russian Empire (“rusos”)	15,047	ibid.

Born in Germany (“alemanes”)	17,143	ibid.
Born in Austria-Hungary	12,803	ibid.
Born in Romania	119	ibid.
“Israelitas”, official, whole country	6,085	ibid., cuadro XIX b
of these, the capital	753	ibid.
of these, Entre Ríos / Santa Fe / prov. of Buenos Aires	3,880 / 721 / 670	ibid.

5.2. Reconstruction from the Census Schedules

Yaacov Rubel examined the original 1895 census schedules held in the Archivo General de la Nación and digitised by FamilySearch, first for the city of Buenos Aires [Rubel 2013] and then for the provinces [Rubel 2017]. His method was identification by name of persons recorded as “israelita”, “judío” or “hebreo”, or with the religion column blank alongside unmistakably Jewish names, followed by verification against the JCA and DAIA lists. The results for the provinces are gathered in Table 4.

Table 4. The Jewish population of the provinces and colonies according to the 1895 census schedules [Rubel 2017]

Unit	Official “israelitas”	From the schedules, total	Of these born in Russia	Share born in Russia
Moisés Ville - Palacios (Santa Fe)	721 (whole province)	877	738	84.1%
Colonia Mauricio (prov. of Buenos Aires)	670 (whole province)	1,174	964	82.1%
JCA colonies in Entre Ríos	3,880 (whole province)	4,607	4,335	94.1%
Marcos Juárez (Córdoba)	47 (whole province)	41	≈ 41	almost all
Ashkenazim in provincial towns	-	256	127	65.1% of those born abroad
Moroccan Jews in the provinces	-	226	0	0%
Provinces, total	5,332	7,133	≈ 6,205	≈ 87%
Capital	753	≈ 1,132 (+50.3% on the official result)	interval: 566-906	50-80% (assumption)
Whole country, total	6,085	≈ 8,265	6,771-7,111	82-86%

For the present study the value of this reconstruction lies above all in the fact that in the JCA colonies the enumerators were the colonists themselves: they filled in the schedules in Yiddish and entered religion automatically, without asking, so that country of birth in these schedules is the community’s own

declaration and not an inspector's entry. The same reconstruction shows what happened to the schedules afterwards. The official coders discarded them systematically: in Mauricio, of the 1,174 Jews counted in the schedules, 670 entered the results for the whole province, so that at least 504 people, 43 per cent, were excluded at the processing stage; in Entre Ríos the discrepancy came to 727 of 4,607 (15.8 per cent), in Moisés Ville to 156 of 877 (17.8 per cent). Children born in Argentina to Jewish parents were almost never counted as Jews by the coders: 2 against 119 in Moisés Ville, 3 against 191 in Mauricio, 94 against 243 in Entre Ríos. The procedure that turned a Podolian Jew into a "ruso" on the quayside turned his Argentine son into a Catholic by default in the census.

Rubel also recorded the reverse case of the category being produced: respondents who answered the question on nationality with "israelita" or "judío" were coded as born in Palestine, although everything points to Russia [Rubel 2017]. Faced with a self-designation absent from his nomenclature, the coder assigned it a territory.

5.3. How Many "rusos" Were Jews

Comparing Tables 3 and 4 gives the first quantitative result. On 10 May 1895 the number of Jews born in the Russian Empire lay between 6,771 and 7,111: 6,037 in the three colonisation groups, about 41 in Marcos Juárez, 127 in the provincial towns and between 566 and 906 in the capital (the interval rests on the assumption that the share of natives of the empire among the Jews of Buenos Aires lay between 50 and 80 per cent; the community of the capital in 1895 was mixed, with Western European and Moroccan layers). That is 45 to 47 per cent of the row of natives of the empire. The remaining 7,936 to 8,276 people in that row, 53 to 55 per cent, were not Jews.

Table 5. The official category "ruso" broken down, 10 May 1895

Component	Number	Basis
Officially born in the Russian Empire	15,047	Segundo Censo, vol. II
of these Jews, JCA colonies (three groups)	6,037	Rubel 2017, cuadros 4, 6, 9
of these Jews, Marcos Juárez and provincial towns	≈ 168	Rubel 2017, cuadro 11
of these Jews, the capital	566-906	Rubel 2013; assumption of 50-80%
Jews, total	6,771-7,111 (45-47%)	sum
Remainder: non-Jews born in the empire	7,936-8,276 (53-55%)	difference

5.4. The Remainder: Who Else

The remainder of 7,900 to 8,300 people consists of Germans of the Volga and of the Black Sea region, Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, Finns and Russians proper, recorded by country of birth as natives of the empire. No reconstruction from the census schedules exists for these groups, and their proportions cannot be derived from the census. The census does, however, set a firm upper bound for the largest of them. Volga Germans had been arriving since January 1878; the first two contingents of that year numbered more than two thousand people, and over the years 1878 to 1913 some twenty thousand passed through the port of Buenos Aires by the count of community historiography [Popp y Dening 1977]. By 1895, after seventeen years of arrivals and a high birth rate in the aldeas, the number of natives of the empire among them must have run into the thousands. All of them, if they were recorded by

country of birth, entered the remainder; and the whole remainder, Slavs and Russians included, does not exceed 8,300 people. Natives of the Volga beyond that ceiling cannot have stood inside the "ruso" row; the most likely heading under which they were counted is "alemanes" (17,143), where they would have appeared alongside natives of the German Empire, though coding errors and omission from the relevant record set are also possible. Only the schedules can distinguish these alternatives.

On 10 May 1895, then, the row of natives of the Russian Empire was a set of which slightly less than half were Jews of the Pale of Settlement and slightly more than half German-speaking and Slavic peasants, with part of the German-speaking natives of the empire not entering it at all. Jews, the only layer measured directly, were not the majority; the census does not disclose the proportions within the remainder; and no layer coincided with the word.

5.5. The Weser, 1889-1895: What Remained of the First Contingent

The list of Weser passengers by name, published by DAIA for the fiftieth anniversary of colonisation, contains 818 names [DAIA 1939]. Rubel matched it against the census schedules of Moisés Ville - Palacios: on 10 May 1895, 223 people from that list were living in the area of the first colony; over six years 67 children had been born there to Weser families, and together they made up 33.1 per cent of the colony's Jewish population. Another 250 or so people from the Weser party were transferred to Entre Ríos by decision of Colonel Goldsmid, chiefly to Colonia Clara, and are found in the schedules there [Rubel 2017; Avni 1983]. In all, no more than 473 of the 818 (58 per cent) could be located in the colonies six years later. The remaining 345 do not appear in the colonial schedules examined; the possible reasons include movement to the cities, re-emigration to the empire, departure for third countries and mortality, but the contribution of each cannot be established from these sources.

The figure matters for the reading of any departmental series: the 818 entries of "ruso" in the register of 1889 and the 223 natives of Russia in the colony in 1895 are the same people, counted by two state procedures six years apart, and after six years only part of the original contingent is recorded in the colony in question. The category "ruso" in the Memorias measures entry, the census measures what remained; the movement between them is described by neither.

6. Systematic Biases

The biases of the category "ruso" have a direction set by the procedure of registration itself. Four of them can be distinguished at the level of procedure; for three the 1895 cross-section yields a numerical estimate, and for the fourth a bound.

6.1. Galician Jews as "austríacos"

The Jews of Galicia, subjects of Austria-Hungary, travelled by the same routes, settled in the same colonies and city districts and were called the same "rusos" in everyday speech, yet in the returns they fell into the "austríaco" column. By the criterion of departure (Section 8) they do not belong to the category "migration from the Russian Empire", and this bias does not distort it; it matters for the adjacent category "migration from Galicia" and for the history of the word "ruso" itself, which in everyday use covered both groups. The 1895 cross-section shows that for the first wave of colonisation the size of the bias is negligible: among the 4,607 Jews of the Entre Ríos colonies, 29 (0.6 per cent) had been born outside Russia and Argentina, in Mauricio 19 (1.6 per cent), in Moisés Ville 20 (2.3 per cent); among the 195

Ashkenazim of provincial towns born abroad, 5 were natives of Austria [Rubel 2017]. The Galician flow is a phenomenon of the years after 1900.

6.2. Volga Germans and Mennonites as “alemanes”

This is the principal bias governing the interval, and it works in the opposite direction: it understates “ruso” and inflates “alemán”. A German-speaking subject of the empire who boarded a Norddeutscher Lloyd vessel at Bremen could be entered in the manifest as “Deutscher”, and an Argentine inspector who heard German speech had no reason to correct it; the enumerator of 1895, asking about country of birth in Spanish of a peasant who answered in German, could write the same. The cross-section yields no direct measurement, but it does yield a bound: all the Volga Germans who entered the row of natives of the empire fit inside the remainder of 7,936 to 8,276 people, together with the Slavs and the Russians (Section 5.4). If by 1895 the number of natives of the empire among the Volga Germans exceeded that remainder net of the Slavs, the difference was counted outside the “ruso” row; where exactly it was assigned is not visible from the census. Direct measurement calls for a reconstruction from the census schedules of the German colonies of Entre Ríos and Olavarría by the method Rubel applied to the Jewish ones (Section 9.4).

6.3. Coding in Place of Questioning

The third bias operates not on disembarkation but in processing. The instruction of 1895 required enumerators to ask about religion only where Catholicism was in doubt; the coders did not treat “judío” as equivalent to “israelita”, discarded part of the colony schedules and hardly ever counted children born in the country as Jews. Rubel has measured the size of the effect; the shares here are taken against the numbers established from the schedules and not against the official result: the undercount of Jews was 25.2 per cent in the provinces (5,332 officially against 7,133 in the schedules), 33.5 per cent in the capital (753 against roughly 1,132) and 26.4 per cent for the country (6,085 against roughly 8,265); the undercount of the Argentine-born children of Jewish parents in the colonies was fivefold and more [Rubel 2013, 2017]. For the category “ruso” this means that even where the census held an attribute capable of refining its composition, processing stripped the result of its value.

6.4. First Class and Return Migration

Two further biases have nothing to do with the ethnonym but distort any estimate of numbers. First class, excluded from the immigrant count by Law 817, left the educated minority of the flow outside the departmental record sets; the census, unlike the department, counted everyone. The scale of return migration and internal mobility is indicated by the case of the Weser: of 818 people, no more than 473 were located in the colonies six years later (Section 5.5). For departmental series of arrivals this sets the order of the correction: at least two fifths of the first contingent were absent from the colonies by 1895, and no series of arrivals reflects that.

Table 6. Systematic biases of the category “ruso” on the 1895 cross-section

Bias	Direction	Source of measurement	Estimate
Galician Jews as “austríaco”	does not distort “ruso”; understates the adjacent category	colony schedules: those born in third countries	0.6-2.3% of colonists; 5 of 195 town dwellers

Volga Germans and Mennonites as “alemán”	understates “ruso”, inflates “alemán”	arithmetic of the census: the remainder	all non-Jewish “rusos” ≤ 8,276; natives of the Volga beyond that counted outside the “ruso” row
Coding in place of questioning	understates the religion attribute within “ruso”	schedules against published results	-25.2% in the provinces, -33.5% in the capital (shares of the numbers from the schedules); children fivefold and more
First class; re-emigration and mobility	gap between the series of arrivals and the resident population	Weser list against the 1895 schedules	no more than 58% located after six years

7. How the Error Entered the Historiography

The state joined under one word people who did not consider themselves one nation. Historiography did the reverse: it divided them by attributes the state never asked about. Both moves are explicable, and both lose part of the reality.

The works of the Jewish narrative examined here do not raise the question that Jewish colonisation was one current of the same emigration from the same state; that the JCA colonists travelled on the same ships as the Volga Germans and settled in the same provinces; that in the census of 1895 they made up less than half of the row into which they fell. Nor does this literature raise the question of how the word “ruso” was taken up by those it named (Section 9.4). It is telling that even Rubel’s reconstruction, the most exact work on the sources of 1895, asks how many Jews there were and not who the other 8,000 people in the same row were.

In the German narrative the century and a half in the Russian Empire remains a background, although those years made the Volga Germans subjects of that state in more than a formal sense: they left precisely because of the reform of 1874, that is, because of Russian and not German policy; their “ruso” entries in the Argentine registers reflected a real legal tie and not a clerk’s error. The same approach explains the absence of any reconstruction from the census schedules of the German colonies: the community literature used here does not ask how many of its people the census took for “rusos” and how many for “alemanes”.

In the Ukrainian narrative, which counts from Galicia, the Russian flow from Volhynia and Podolia, running in parallel but under a different category, goes unexamined in the works considered here and therefore drops out of the “history of the Ukrainians of Argentina”, although by language and religion it belongs to it just as much.

The word “ruso” also had a political register, in which distinctions inside the category counted for nothing. In January 1919, during the Tragic Week, the Jewish quarters of Buenos Aires, Once above all, became the object of attacks by the police and by armed civilian groups. In the language of the repression the labels “ruso”, “judío”, “maximalista” and “bolchevique” partly overlapped: a supposed “Russian” revolutionary conspiracy turned the Jewish population into one of the principal targets of persecution [Koppmann y Asquini 2020]. A category created for counting worked here as a category for striking, and

it united those whom the three narratives describe apart; a systematic treatment of this register of the word is reserved for a separate article in the series (Section 9.4).

The result common to the three narratives is that in the literature examined the flow from the Russian Empire is not described as a single object, while its size, the familiar “about 160,000”, circulates through reference works without a source and without any estimate of error.

Table 7. The three narratives: what each sees and does not see

Narrative	Point of departure	What it sees	What it does not see
Jewish	the Pale of Settlement, the pogroms, the JCA	colonisation, community institutions, Yiddish culture; the composition of its own group from the 1895 schedules	the shared voyage and the shared census row with other layers; the adoption and reworking of the category “ruso” by the migrants themselves
Volga German	Rhine - Volga - La Plata	rural life, parishes, dialects	Russian subjecthood as a real tie; its own distribution between “ruso” and “alemán”
Ukrainian	Galicia, Apóstoles 1897	the colonisation of Misiones, the Prosvita	the Russian flow from Volhynia and Podolia under the category “ruso”

8. Proposal: The Analytical Category “Migration from the Russian Empire”

The study proposes to build over the statistical “ruso” and over the ethnic labels of historiography a single analytical category with three operational criteria of assignment, each of them resting on sources already used in Section 5.

The criterion of departure is set by the definition of the category itself: the last permanent place of residence before emigration lies within the borders of the Russian Empire on the date of departure, whatever the passport said, wherever the embarkation took place and whatever the inspector wrote. This takes in those who left through Germany and were recorded as “alemán”, and it excludes Galicians, for whom the adjacent category “migration from Galicia” is introduced, comparable in method.

The criterion of corroboration: an assignment is made only where at least two independent record sets agree, a census schedule and a JCA entry, say, or a register and a parish record. Onomastics, the surname and the given name, is not used as a criterion in its own right, since it was precisely onomastics that generated the errors of inspectors and coders; Rubel used it only to fill blank columns where other attributes were present.

The criterion of description: within the category, composition is described along three axes, the language of everyday communication, religion and the province of departure, without reduction to a single ethnonym. The 1895 cross-section shows why this is needed: the 15,047 “rusos” fall apart into at least Yiddish-speaking Jews (45 to 47 per cent) and German-speaking Christians and Slavs (53 to 55 per cent), while the “alemanes” row contains part of the same flow.

The category abolishes neither Jewish nor German nor Ukrainian history; it restores the common denominator that those histories had in the sources and lost in the telling. The question of language it leaves open: for most participants in the flow of 1880 to 1914 Russian was not a mother tongue, and the proposed category gives no ground for calling this flow “Russian-speaking”. The relation between departure from one state and a common language is a matter for a separate study.

9. Conclusion: The Recount

9.1. The Argument in Summary

The study began with a question: whom did Argentine statistics count when they wrote “ruso”, and whom did historiography lose when it abandoned that word? The answer comes in three parts.

The category “ruso” was a property of a document and not of a person. It depended on the passport, the shipping company, the inspector and the coder, and it was produced by the state for its own purposes. It described no existing group; it created an administrative category that later acquired meanings in Argentine usage which coincide neither with its original content nor with one another.

The composition of that category on a measurable date has been established. On 10 May 1895, of the 15,047 natives of the Russian Empire between 6,771 and 7,111 were Jews, that is 45 to 47 per cent; the remaining 53 to 55 per cent were German-speaking and Slavic peasants and other subjects. Jews, the only layer measured directly, were not the majority. The upper bound for all non-Jews inside the row is 8,276 people, and, judging by the arithmetic of the census, part of the German-speaking natives of the empire did not enter that row.

The three narratives of the historiography, having divided the flow by attributes the state never asked about, lost what the state preserved: the unity of departure. Any recount that comes without an interval and a list of biases reproduces the same error as the category it is trying to correct.

9.2. The Result of the Recount

The result of the recount reads as follows. Officially, “ruso” in the census of 10 May 1895 is 15,047. Jews inside that figure number 6,771 to 7,111. Non-Jews inside it number 7,936 to 8,276. Subjects of the empire outside it, counted under other headings, are a quantity that has not been measured; measuring it calls for a reconstruction from the census schedules of the German colonies. The official record of religion missed 26.4 per cent of the country’s Jewish population as established from the schedules. As regards country of birth, the data admit the hypothesis that migration from the Russian Empire was understated, but neither its size nor the systematic transfer of natives of the Volga to other headings is directly shown, and both remain tasks for the next stage.

Sources of error: the interval of 50 to 80 per cent for the share of natives of the empire among the Jews of the capital, which contributes 340 people to the width of the range; possible overlaps between Rubel’s record sets, of the order of tens; the incompleteness of the examination of the schedules of provincial towns, which the author of the reconstruction himself described as continuing; and the absence of an independent reconstruction for the German and Slavic colonies.

9.3. Limitations

Of the limitations set out in Section 3.5, three bear directly on the boundaries of the conclusions. The 1895 cross-section is not representative of the flow as a whole and does not permit extrapolation to the years 1900 to 1914, when the composition of the category “ruso” changed with the arrival of the Slavic peasantry. The breakdown of the category is measured directly only for the Jewish layer; the other layers are estimated as a remainder. The share of natives of the empire among the Jews of the capital is assumed as an interval and not established.

9.4. Programme of Further Work

The study opens a series, and further verification runs along several lines.

The immediate step is a reconstruction from the 1895 census schedules for the German colonies of Entre Ríos and Olavarría by the method Rubel applied to the Jewish ones: it will close the principal unmeasured bias and give a direct rather than a residual breakdown of the category “ruso”. The schedules are digitised by FamilySearch and accessible without a visit to the archive.

After the cross-section should come the flow: a cross-reading of the registers of the Hotel de Inmigrantes (the CEMLA database) against the Hamburg and Bremen passenger lists, taking the ship voyage as the unit, for 1889 to 1895. The Hamburg lists preserve the last place of residence, which the Argentine register loses; a discrepancy in the “nacionalidad” column for a single voyage is a direct measurement of the bias introduced on disembarkation. The case of the Grodno party, which sailed from Libau, shows that part of the voyages came from Russian ports and are absent from the German lists.

The same method applies to the census of 1914, where the 93,634 natives of the empire have to be broken down with an allowance for the Slavic peasantry of the western provinces, which left in large numbers after 1897.

The Russian record sets, the files on the issue of foreign passports (RGIA) and the consular dispatches from Buenos Aires (AVPRI), are needed to estimate the share of legal departures and to check the Argentine entries from the Russian side.

A separate article is required for the history of the concept “ruso” in its three registers, departmental, census and colloquial, including the political meaning of the word after Law 4144 (1902), the Radowitzky case (1909) and the Tragic Week (1919), and a comparison with the categories “turco” and “austríaco”, built on the same principle of subjecthood.

Appendix. Summary Matrix of Sources

Table A1. Primary record sets for the 1895 cross-section and for later stages: availability and coverage

Record set	Custodian	Coverage	Form of access	Limitations
Segundo Censo Nacional, Tomo II (1898)	Biblioteca Nacional; Dirección Provincial de Estadística (Buenos Aires), PDF	10.05.1895	publication, online	aggregates; no cross-tabulation of country of birth by religion
Census schedules, 1895	Archivo General de la Nación; FamilySearch	whole country	digitised, searchable by name	reconstruction carried out for Jews only
Rubel's reconstructions	Judaica Latinoamericana VII, VIII (AMILAT)	capital; provinces and colonies	publication, online	no breakdown by country of birth for the capital
Weser passenger list	DAIA, "50 años de colonización judía" (1939)	one voyage, 818 names	publication	reconstruction 50 years later
JCA records	Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem	from 1891, retrospectively 1889	on request	colonists only; town dwellers not covered
Registers of the Hotel de Inmigrantes; CEMLA database	MUNTREF; CEMLA	1882-1960	reading room; export on request	losses (the list of the Grodno party has not been found); nacionalidad without place of birth
Hamburger Passagierlisten; Bremen lists	Staatsarchiv Hamburg; Die Maus	complete / fragmentary	digitised / online	voyages from German ports only
DGI Memorias, 1880-1914	Biblioteca del Museo de la Inmigración (DNM)	1889, 1890 and 1892 missing	reading room, copying	aggregates by nacionalidad

Sources

The sources are grouped by section of the study. Ranges of pages and years are given with a hyphen.

x|Primary record sets and departmental publications (Sections 3, 4, 5)

Segundo Censo de la República Argentina, mayo 10 de 1895. Buenos Aires: Taller Tipográfico de la Penitenciaría Nacional, 1898, vol. II (population by country of birth; cuadro XIX b, p. CLXXIX, population by religion; p. CXXI, instruction to enumerators).

Primer Censo de la República Argentina, 1869. Buenos Aires, 1872.

Tercer Censo Nacional levantado el 1 de junio de 1914. Buenos Aires, 1916-1917, vols. II-III.

Ley 817 de Inmigración y Colonización, 19 de octubre de 1876, República Argentina.

Memorias de la Dirección General de Inmigración, annual issues 1880-1914, Buenos Aires.

Alsina, Juan A. La inmigración en el primer siglo de la independencia. Buenos Aires, 1910.

Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas (DAIA). 50 años de colonización judía en Argentina. Buenos Aires, 1939 (list by name of the passengers of the steamer Weser).

Cociovich, Noé. Génesis de Moisés Ville. Buenos Aires, 1987 (Spanish translation of the memoirs published in Yiddish by IWO in 1947).

Alpersohn, Marcos. Colonia Mauricio: 30 años en la Argentina. Memorias de un colono judío. Carlos Casares: Comisión de Homenaje al Centenario de Mauricio, 1992.

Centro de Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos (CEMLA), database of arrivals at the port of Buenos Aires, 1882-1960.

Museo de la Inmigración (MUNTREF), registers of the Hotel de Inmigrantes.

Staatsarchiv Hamburg, Hamburger Passagierlisten, 1850-1934.

Jewish Colonization Association, archive (Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem).

Reconstructions from census schedules and the history of statistical categories (Sections 2, 4, 5, 6)

Rubel, Yaacov. La población judía de Buenos Aires según el Censo Nacional de 1895: el análisis de las cédulas censales originales como fuente de hallazgos que modifican los datos oficiales. In: AMILAT (coord.), Judaica Latinoamericana VII. Jerusalem, 2013, pp. 119-148.

Rubel, Yaacov. Perfil socio-demográfico y distribución geográfica de judíos en las provincias argentinas, según el Censo Nacional de 1895. In: AMILAT (coord.), Judaica Latinoamericana VIII. Jerusalem, 2017, pp. 71-109 (text available at amilat.online).

Somoza, Jorge L.; Lattes, Alfredo E. Muestras de los dos primeros Censos Nacionales de población, 1869 y 1895. Buenos Aires: Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, Centro de Investigaciones Sociales, 1967.

Otero, Hernán. Estadística censal y construcción de la Nación: el caso argentino, 1869-1914. Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana Dr. Emilio Ravignani, 3rd series, nos. 16-17, 1997-1998.

Rosenswaike, Ira. The Jewish Population in Argentina: Census and Estimate. Jewish Social Studies, 1960, vol. 22, no. 4.

Dictionaries of lunfardo and regional vocabulary (Section 2.4)

Gobello, José. Nuevo diccionario lunfardo. Buenos Aires: Corregidor, 1990, entry “ruso”.

Conde, Oscar. Diccionario etimológico del lunfardo. Buenos Aires: Taurus, 2004.

Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (ASALE). Diccionario de americanismos. Madrid: Santillana, 2010, entry “ruso, rusa” (the Argentine and Uruguayan sense marked obsol.).

Academia Porteña del Lunfardo. Todotango, Diccionario lunfardo, entry “ruso” (online).

Infocielo. El estigma argentino de ser llamado «ruso» sin ser de Rusia. Buenos Aires, 2024 (press; used as evidence of current usage).

The three narratives and the general history of migration (Sections 1, 5, 7)

Avni, Haim. Argentina y la historia de la inmigración judía (1810-1950). Buenos Aires: Milá, 1983.

Lewin, Boleslao. Cómo fue la inmigración judía a la Argentina. Buenos Aires, 1974.

Mirelman, Víctor. En búsqueda de una identidad: los inmigrantes judíos en Buenos Aires, 1890-1930. Buenos Aires: Milá, 1988.

Feierstein, Ricardo. Historia de los judíos argentinos. Buenos Aires: Planeta, 1993.

Koppmann, Walter L.; Asquini, Sabrina E. Espías, rusos y maximalistas en el verano de 1919. La Semana Trágica revisitada desde las fuentes diplomáticas y periodísticas. Estudios, no. 44, 2020, pp. 165-183. DOI: 10.31050/re.vi44.28069.

Popp, Víctor P.; Dening, Nicolás. Los alemanes del Volga: tras largo peregrinar por Europa hallaron patria definitiva en América. Buenos Aires, 1977.

Weyne, Olga. El último puerto: del Rhin al Volga y del Volga al Plata. Buenos Aires, 1986.

Wasylyk, Miguel. Inmigración ucrania en la República Argentina. Buenos Aires, 1981.

Snihur, Esteban. De Ucrania a Misiones. Apóstoles, 1997.

Devoto, Fernando. Historia de la inmigración en la Argentina. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2003.

Gerchunoff, Alberto. Los gauchos judíos. La Plata, 1910.

Further Reading

Baily, Samuel L. Immigrants in the Lands of Promise: Italians in Buenos Aires and New York City, 1870-1914. Ithaca, 1999.

Moya, José C. Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930. Berkeley, 1998.

Brubaker, Rogers. Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. Cambridge, 1996 (chapter on categories of nationality in multinational empires).

Cadiot, Juliette. Le laboratoire impérial: Russie-URSS, 1860-1940. Paris, 2007 (the recording of nationality in Russian statistics).