

## ARE THE ARMENIANS REALLY RUSSIANS? — OR HOW THE U.S. CENSUS BUREAU CLASSIFIES AMERICA'S ETHNIC GROUPS

PAUL ROBERT MAGOCSI

Department of History,  
University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1

**Abstract** — In 1980, the U.S. Census for the first time asked the ancestry/ethnicity of Americans, regardless of place of birth or number of generations removed from the country of origin. The technique was to use an open-ended question on the so-called "long-form" sent out to an estimated sample of the U.S. population (Question 14: "What is this person's ancestry?"). This meant that there were no pre-listed categories (although religious affiliations were excluded), and respondents could write in anything they wished. As many as 83 percent of Americans reported at least one ancestry. The large number of disparate answers were then arranged by Census Bureau tabulators under 128 ancestry group classifications and published in 1983 in the *Supplementary Report* on ancestry of the 1980 Census of the Population. These 128 classifications ostensibly represented the ethnic composition of America's population. Fifty of these group classifications were of European derivation, representing 88.8 percent of the ancestry responses received. This study analyzes the manner in which the Census Bureau classified the disparate open-ended answers to ancestry given by Americans of European origin. It is argued that the open-ended question technique is appropriate and should be used again in 1990. However, the classification of the responses must be seriously reconsidered and revised, since many distinct ethnic groups were subordinated to other ancestry group classifications and therefore statistically ceased to exist. This detailed analysis, with its several appendices showing the 1980 classifications and proposed revisions for 1990, suggests that the number of ancestry group classifications for Europe should be increased from 50 to 85, although as many as 19 will probably be statistically insignificant and be subsumed under "Other," reducing the basic revised list to approximately 66. This study provides concrete suggestions for emendations regarding groups of European origin, and it is hoped that a careful review of classifications for non-European groups is undertaken by someone more qualified, so that the 1990 census will be able to more accurately reflect the ethnic composition of the United States.

### INTRODUCTION

Those who have been struggling for years with the misleading or nonexistent data on ethnicity, especially in recent U.S. censuses, looked forward to the results of the 1980

The author is particularly grateful to the following individuals who read an earlier draft of this study and offered useful criticisms and emendations: Peter Brock (University of Toronto), Joshua Fishman (Yeshiva University), Robert Harney (Multicultural History Society of Ontario), Lubomyr Luciuk (University of Toronto), Aidan McQuillan (University of Toronto), Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.), Ann Orlov (Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups), M. Mark Stolarik (Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies), and Rudolf Vecoli (Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota). The author alone is responsible for the contents of the study.

Dr. Paul R. Magocsi is a specialist in the history of nationalism and of ethnic groups in the United States. He is the author of eight books and has served as research editor, map editor, and author of nine group entries in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. He has held several academic posts at Harvard University (1971-1980) and since 1980 is professor in the Chair of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto.

census. Prior to that, records had periodically been kept on the country of origin or the mother tongue of first and second generation Americans. Now for the first time, it appeared that the census would solicit information on the ethnic background of all Americans, regardless of the number of generations removed from the country of origin. Perhaps it would finally be possible to obtain a more realistic idea of the ethnic composition of America's population.

Indeed, the value of any statistical data depends on the quality of the technique used to gather and to process the data — in this case that used by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census. For the 1980 census, respondents were not to be given a list of ethnic groups from which to choose, but would be allowed to enter whatever ethnic affiliation they wished. With this in mind, the Census Bureau attempted to prepare a list of basic ethnic groups that would bring together the many open-ended and disparate answers likely to be received. A conversation with one Census Bureau employee, however, shed light on some of the basic problems. With regard to the varying ethnicities of Eastern Europe, I was asked: "Can you tell me, are Armenians, Russians?" The Bureau's inquirer continued: "Since Armenians live in the Soviet Union, shouldn't they be classified as Russians?"

This question seemed incredulous, in particular because it came from an employee of the Census Bureau, the very same bureau that had produced, in 1900 and 1910, some of the most detailed ethnic data available anywhere [1]. So where does one begin? With the fact that the immigrant ancestors of most Americans of Armenian descent never even came from Soviet Armenia, but rather from what is today Turkey or more likely Lebanon? That in any case the Soviet Union or U.S.S.R. is a multinational state in which, according to that country's own statistics, no more than 51 percent of its inhabitants are of Russian ethnic background?

The original question did disclose, however, some of the problems census-takers face. It also suggested that the 1980 census results might be of little use to those interested in ethnicity. Such reservations were confirmed in April 1983 with the appearance of the booklet, *1980 Census of the Population: Supplementary Report — Ancestry of the Population by State* (hereafter *Census Supplementary Report*) [2]. That volume contained the finalized list of ancestries and thereby indicated how the Census Bureau classified the ancestry (ethnicity) data it had received on the 1980 census forms. In short, the *Census Supplementary Report* ostensibly revealed the ethnic composition of the population of the United States.

### THE PROBLEM

In one sense, the data compiled in the *Census Supplementary Report* is impressive and seemingly comprehensive. Based on an estimate sample of the U.S. population [3], as many as 188,302,438 persons, or 83 percent of the total of 226,545,805 Americans, reported at least one specific ancestry. As anticipated, the technique used to solicit this information did not provide prelisted categories but allowed the respondent to answer as he or she wished to question 14 on the so-called "long-form": "What is this person's ancestry?" The accompanying instructions to question 14 explained: "Ancestry (or origin or descent) may be viewed as the nationality group, the lineage, or the country in which the person or the person's parents or ancestors were born before their arrival in the United States" [4]. Considering the extent of intermarriage, multiple ancestry responses were also permitted, such as German-Irish or English-German-Swedish. The tabulators eventually included each of the answers, whether single, double, triple, etc. within its respec-

tive rubric, meaning that a given individual could be counted two or as many as three times.

Such an open-ended technique — allowing persons to identify themselves as they wish — is in the best tradition reflecting freedom of choice. Moreover, it allows for a flexible and wise approach to ethnic identity, since some persons might think of ethnicity or ancestry in terms of their own or their ancestor's country of origin, and others in terms of geographic region, culture, language, or some individualized combination of the above characteristics. There is no doubt, however, that this open-ended approach could and did result in a wide variety of responses ranging from recognizable names of countries, nationalities, and languages on the one hand, to the extremes of whole continents (Europe, Asia) or local regions, villages, or unknown places on the other. Such a wide variety of response seemingly overwhelmed the unsuspecting census tabulators.

The problem arose when it came time to classify, in some meaningful fashion, the often disparate answers found on the census forms. Namely, what should the basic ancestry (ethnicity) groups be, and how should the various regional names or languages be combined so that they could be incorporated into accepted ancestry group classifications?

While it is true that every statistical survey has its inherent problems, it is also true that the question of ethnic or ancestry classification is not as overwhelming as it might seem. The problem is in large part alleviated by the availability of many encyclopedic and comparative studies dealing with the ethnic composition of European and other homelands, which provide useful guidelines for Census Bureau tabulators who might be perplexed by what they consider ethnically complex problem areas [5]. Most relevant is the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, which the *Census Supplementary Report* singles out as a source [6], even though in practice it disregarded many of the thorny classification resolutions made in that volume. Nonetheless, the several comparative studies on ethnic groups that do exist are generally in agreement regarding the classification schemes that could be applied to the kind of data received on the open-ended ancestry question of the U.S. census. These works take into consideration the existence of legitimate ethnic groups in their respective homelands as well as those, such as the Acadians, Blacks, Pennsylvania Germans, Scotch-Irish, etc., that are unique to the United States [7].

In a sense, the classification system for ancestry (ethnicity) published in the 1980 census might be considered a useful first draft that is in need of further emendations and refinements. Since the next census is not to take place for another four years, now is the time to urge the U.S. Census Bureau to review and to revise its present classification scheme. After appropriate revisions, it should retain the ancestry question perhaps in combination with another question on the birthplace of parents [8].

Since as many as 167,512,299, or 88.8 percent, of the responses were of European origin, it is that continent with its multifarious ethnic groups that requires primary attention and will be considered here. This does not mean that the classifications used by the U.S. Census Bureau for other parts of the world are not in need of review, nor that what is proposed here should be considered the final word on groups of European origin. Rather, it is hoped that this "working paper" might provoke discussion leading to further refinements in classifying Americans of European origin as well as encouraging others more qualified to prepare a similar analysis of the Census Bureau classifications used for non-European groups.

The classification scheme used in tabulating the 1980 census consists of 128 ancestry groups. Of these, 113 may be considered specific ancestry ethnic groups while 15 are regional designations or unspecified "other" groups (see Appendix 1) [9]. Of the 128

ancestry groups, as many as 50 derive from Europe, comprising 45 ancestry (ethnic) classifications as well as four regional designations (Eastern European, European, Scandinavian, Slavic) and the unspecified "Other European, n.e.c. (not elsewhere classified)." Although of limited ethnic informational value, the four regional rubrics nonetheless reflect the generalized manner in which a significant number of Americans (885,568) decided to identify their ancestry. "Other European, n.e.c." represents 77,762 disparate ancestry/ethnic responses lumped together because no one group totalled a significant minimal number (also unspecified) to warrant a distinct ancestry group classification [10].

The method used by the Census Bureau's tabulators to arrive at these 128 ancestry group classifications is not explained in the published *Census Supplementary Report*, but must be sought in the Census Bureau's fourth revised unpublished worksheet dated 31 March 1983, and entitled: "Code List for Ancestry Entries" (hereafter "Code List"). The "Code List" is arranged according to 12 categories based largely on geographic areas (see Appendix 2). The first two categories pertain to Europe: I. Western, Northern, and Southern Europe (except Spain); and II. Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia). Americans who themselves or whose ancestors came directly from Spain are listed as Spaniards and come under the rubric, III. Spanish Categories.

Within each of these 12 categories are several ancestry group designations that carry one or more code numbers ranging from 1 to 999. Categories I and II include a total of 62 ancestry (ethnic) group designations, which together with Spaniard would make a total of 63 European group designations. Finally, within each of these ancestry group designations are often several subheadings that apparently reveal the variety of answers that appeared in the blank line following the open-ended "long-form" ancestry question 14 (see Appendix 3). It is these subheadings listed under the various ancestry/ethnic group designations that are of special interest because they reveal the manner, although not the reasoning, by which the Census Bureau classified the ancestry or ethnic composition of the population of the United States.

For example, under Category II: Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia), the possible code numbers run from 100 to 199. One of the ancestry group designations with its subheadings reads:

104-105	<i>Czechoslovakian</i>
104	Czechoslovakian
104	Czechoslovakia
104	Czech
104	Cekkh
104	Czech
104	Tczechoslovakian
104	Tczechoslovakia
105	Bohemian
105	Moravian

This suggests that the tabulators encountered on the census forms as many as nine different terms, seven of which are spelling variants of Czechoslovak, and the other two (Bohemian, Moravian) names of local provinces. The census tabulators then decided to place all of these under the ancestry group designation "Czechoslovakian."

At first glance, such a decision might seem reasonable, even though the more pedantic critics could argue that some of those Americans who answered Bohemian or Moravian may not be of Czech ancestry but rather ethnic Germans from the historically Czech and German-inhabited provinces of Bohemia and Moravia. Or, for that matter, the "Mora-

vian" answer may not refer to an east-central European area at all but rather to an Americal Protestant religious group known as Moravians. Pedantry aside, the concept "Czechoslovakian" itself raises serious problems. The term is based on joining together the names of two closely-related but nonetheless distinct Slavic peoples — Czechs and Slovaks. In theory this means that Slovaks as well as Czechs could be Czechoslovaks. In fact, the term refers to any inhabitant of Czechoslovakia, a multinational state created in 1918 that, besides Czechs and Slovaks, also includes such diverse ethnic groups as Germans, Hungarians, Carpatho-Rusyns, Poles, and Gypsies, some of whom could and did at times respond that they were (or are) Czechoslovak. Perhaps aware of that reality, the Census Bureau actually revised its "Code List" ancestry designation so that "Czechoslovakian" was changed to the ancestry group classification "Czech" in the published *Census Supplementary Report*.

While it is quite correct to give Czechs a distinct ancestry group classification, it is inappropriate to assume that all those Americans who respond Czechoslovak are of Czech ethnicity [11]. Just as the Census Bureau tabulators in 1980 wisely classified responses of Americans from Yugoslavia either according to some of that country's component ethnic groups — Croatian, Serbian, Slovene — or the all embracing term "Yugoslavian, n.e.c." so too should the responses of Americans from Czechoslovakia be treated. Therefore, the revised ancestry groups list for classifying the 1990 census returns should include a rubric "Czechoslovakian, n.e.c." for Americans of whatever ethnic background who choose to identify as Czechoslovak, as well as separate rubrics such as "Czech," "Slovak," "Carpatho-Rusyn," etc. for those immigrants and their descendants from Czechoslovakia who prefer to identify with one of that country's ethnic groups.

The foregoing brief analysis of the Census Bureau's understanding of the ancestry designation "Czechoslovakian" reveals how any classification system derived from answers to open-ended questions inevitably leads to problems such as those encountered in the prior example. In fact, the introduction to the *Census Supplementary Report* admits "that persons knowledgeable in ethnic identification sometimes have different views on some classifications since several groups may justifiably be classified in various ways" [12]. Having qualified its own classification system, it seems most appropriate at this mid-decade juncture that the Census Bureau be informed as to how its decisions seem to reflect less questions of interpretation, than a lack of sensitivity or even unawareness of the existence of certain ethnic groups.

While it is easy to criticize the ancestry group classifications arrived at by the Census Bureau [13], it is more difficult to provide concrete suggestions for emendations. Emendations, however, do seem particularly necessary for ancestries deriving from European ethnic groups which form by far the largest proportion of the American population.

Appendix 4 provides a revised list of European and Soviet Asian ancestry groups that might be used to classify the open-ended data which will appear in the 1990 census returns. The proposed additions are:

Acadian	Cornish
*Andorran	Corsican
*Azerbaijani	*Cossack
*Bosnian Muslim	Czechoslovak, n.e.c.
Breton	*Faeroe Islander
British, n.e.c.	*Finno-Ugrian, n.e.c.
Carpatho-Rusyn	Frisian
Catalan	*Friulian

*Georgian	—	*North Caucasian
German from Russia	—	*Occitan
Jewish		Pennsylvania German
*Kalmyk		Scotch-Irish
*Lapp		*Soviet Turkic groups, n.e.c.
*Liechtensteiner		Soviet Union, n.e.c.
Macedonian		*Tatar
*Monagesque		*Turkestani
*Montenegrin		*Windish

The revised list increases the number of European and Soviet Asian ancestry group classifications from 50 to 85, although the 19 of these (marked with an asterisk) are probably small enough to necessitate their inclusion under "Other European, n.e.c.," which reduces the revised list to an estimated 66 groups.

The additions are of three different types: (1) new classifications; (2) rearrangements of both existing and anticipated subheadings in the unpublished "Code List for Ancestry Entries;" and (3) classifications that in 1980 were grouped together under the rubric "Other European, n.e.c." [14]. To show how the ancestry group classifications should be constructed, a revised list of ancestry group designations together with their expected subheadings appears in Appendix 5.

Many of the suggested changes in Appendix 5 have come about following the rejection of what might be called the regional subordination syndrome. This means that names that the Census Bureau classified as being merely regional designations of some larger ethnic group (Bretons, Catalans, Macedonians, etc.) reflect, in fact, distinct ethnicities. Such an interpretation is not only supported by comparative studies about the European homeland, but more importantly, by the respondents from the areas in question, who answered the way they did because they probably consider themselves to be part of a distinct ethnic group. This fine line between regional subordination and ethnic distinctiveness will be the critical factor in justifying the revisions being proposed for the 1990 census.

In this regard, an important theoretical principle needing to be kept in mind is that the decisions arrived at here are descriptive and not prescriptive. Moreover, even though reference will frequently be made to the European homeland, the determining factor as to whether a group is subordinated to the status of a subheading or whether it becomes an ancestry group designation in its own right is ultimately based on the situation in the United States. In other words, regardless of recent historical developments in Europe, a group of people must be recognized as such in the United States if they feel themselves to be one, notwithstanding the present status or non-status of their brethren in the lands they left. Therefore, it will not be surprising to find reiterated or introduced for the first time into the Revised European Ancestry Group list in Appendix 4 groups that never existed (Acadian, Pennsylvania German, Scotch-Irish), and groups that have ceased to exist in part or entirely, or that have been absorbed by others (Carpatho-Rusyn, Cornish, Cossack, Jewish, Windish) in their respective European homelands.

#### PROPOSED REVISIONS

The following review using specific examples will show how the proposed revisions were determined and will suggest why revisions seem so necessary. Based upon the format of the Census Bureau's unpublished "Code List for Ancestry Entries," the first example is Category I: Western, Northern, and Southern Europe (except Spain). With regard to those

parts of Europe, the Census Bureau tabulators seem to have been laboring under the widespread but nonetheless anachronistic notion that nation-states like Great Britain, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, and especially France are ethnically homogeneous entities that in the course of their historic development have by the twentieth century eliminated the "problem" of national or ethnic minorities within their borders. Hence, if one lives in France or Spain, then one must be French or Spanish. Such an attitude often implies that the problem of national or ethnic divisiveness within European countries is really only a phenomenon of less developed or "backward" Eastern Europe, especially the proverbial Balkans.

Despite numerous recent studies on Western Europe's vibrant national and ethnic minorities, the antiquated view that the "national question" has been solved to the west of east-central Europe seems to be an axiom that continues to prevail in American and much European thinking [15]. Therefore, it is not surprising that the U.S. Census Bureau has more often than not adopted the regional subordination syndrome and refused to recognize the ancestral heritages of many Americans for what they are — distinct cultures, languages, and nationalities.

Reflecting its long-time interest in immigrants from the British Isles, it is perhaps with Americans whose ancestry stems from the United Kingdom that the Census Bureau deals most justly. It has rightly included "English," "Manx," "Scottish," and "Welsh" ancestry group classifications in the *Census Supplementary Report*, as well as the problematic "Northern Irish" [16]. On the other hand, it has not accorded distinct classifications for Cornish, listed simply as a subheading under English, or for the Scotch-Irish, registered as a multiple-entry under both "Scottish" and "Irish."

Despite some recent efforts at a Cornish revival in the homeland today, there is little general feeling in Cornwall of ethnic distinctiveness between Cornish and English. It is also true that some American descendants of the early Cornish immigrants who began coming in large numbers during the 1830s are still proud of their Cornish ancestry, which they perceive to be a distinct phenomenon. Therefore, Cornish Americans should be allowed the right to be recognized as such [17]. The Scotch-Irish are even more of an American phenomenon, since the concept "Scotch-Irish" is unknown in the homeland. The American Scotch-Irish are actually descendants of Protestant Scots, who were settled in historic Ulster (that included all of present-day Northern Ireland as well as three counties in the northernmost part of the Irish Republic). The Scotch-Irish subsequently emigrated from Ulster to the United States where they have remained distinct from other Americans of Protestant Scot background as well as from the Irish. Therefore, to classify them as Scots or Irish is completely unwarranted, and "Scotch-Irish" should be added as a distinct ancestry group classification [18].

Even more problematic is the designation "British" and its derivatives: British Isles, Britain, Great Britain, United Kingdom. Although the "Code List" began with a separate designation "British Isles," that term together with various subheadings (British, Britain, Great Britain, United Kingdom, etc.) was placed under "English" in the published *Census Supplementary Report*. Such a decision is unfortunate, since it means that all Americans whose ancestry derives from the British Isles (Scots, Welsh, Scotch-Irish, Manx, Cornish, as well as English — not to mention East Asians who resided for a while in the United Kingdom) who may decide to describe their ancestry with the name of the multinational country they left — are simply classified as English. Such assumptions on the part of census tabulators are hardly valid and, as with Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, etc., an ancestry group designation "British, n.e.c." needs to be added [19].

If most of the Americans with ancestry from the British Isles fare relatively well in terms

of recognition by Census Bureau statistics, those from France — another multinational country — have been relegated by the regional subordination syndrome to non-existence. The only exception are the Basques, who first were considered in the unpublished "Code List" under "French," but who (perhaps because of their unique and still unknown origins) were eventually classified in the *Census Supplementary Report* as a distinct ancestry group, even with the useful differentiation as to whether they derive from France or Spain. On the other hand, distinct languages and cultures such as Breton (in the 1970 census, for instance, as many as 32,722 Americans claimed Breton — a Celtic language — as their mother tongue) and Corsican were simply classified as "French." Both groups are so distinct that to classify them as French defies all logic other than that based on ethnically meaningless state boundaries [20].

The Census Bureau, however, has singled out the Alsatians as a distinct ancestry classification, even though in the United States they have shown little initiative in creating their own organizations and community life, preferring to associate with French or German communities. In any case, the inclusion of Lorrainers with Alsatians is inappropriate, the province of Lorraine having been Frankicized more than a century ago. Even more problematic is the category Provençal, or the more generic concept Occitan. The Occitans are descendants of a distinguished and distinct medieval culture and language (that of the troubadours and the *langue d'oc*), although by the nineteenth century assimilation to French identity throughout Occitanie (southern France or the Midi) was widespread, except perhaps in the region of Provence, where a Provençal cultural revival was underway. During the twentieth century, and especially since World War II, an Occitan national and cultural revival exists, whose adherents proclaim their ethnic distinctiveness from the French [21]. While it is also true that there seem to be no Occitan or Provençal organizations representing specific community interests in the United States, one might assume that Americans claiming Provençal and especially Occitan ancestry do so because they have a sense of distinctiveness from the French. That being the case, accommodation for an "Occitan/Provençal" ancestry group classification should be made in the 1990 census returns.

Two other special cases of distant French origin are the Acadians and French Canadians. The French Canadians rightly appear as a distinct ancestry group classification under the regional category North America. The Acadians/Cajuns, on the other hand, began with their own designation in the "Code List for Ancestry Entries" but were then eventually subordinated under "French." The particular cultural, historical, and linguistic development of Acadians in Louisiana make them, like the French Canadians (Québécois), a distinct ethnic group, albeit with distant European origins, unique to North America. Therefore, Americans who identify themselves as Acadians or Cajuns should not be lumped together with the "European" French [22].

The U.S. Census Bureau has focused particular attention on what it describes as "Spanish Categories." Therein are listed 21 distinct ancestry group designations, which reflect primarily different countries in Central and South America. Such a willingness to accept legitimate differentiation is not extended, however, to "Spanish" categories of European derivation, for which there is only one group classification — "Spaniard." As with France, Census Bureau tabulators have completely disregarded the Spanish government's own recent (under a more democratic regime) declaration that Spain is a "nation of nations." Whereas on the one hand the Basques have been accorded distinct statistical status and on the other the Galicians (Gallego) are considered only a regional identity of Spaniard [23], there seems no excuse for subordinating Catalans, with their own language, national identity, even political autonomy in the twentieth century, under the rubric

"Spaniard" [24]. Americans who identify as Catalan/Catalonian do so because they wish to indicate that they come from a centuries-old civilization distinct from Castilian Spanish.

The Census Bureau's Italian designation has the most subheadings of any Western European group, and although there may be some argument for considering potentially distinct Valle d'Aosta, Piemontese, Sicilian, and Sardinian identities, their inclusion under Italian seems reasonable [25]. On the other hand, in order to be consistent with other "Code List" designations, the Italian-speaking but independent state of San Marino should (like Catalan/Spanish speaking Andorra, German-speaking Liechtenstein, and Occitan/French speaking Monaco) have its own ancestry group designation, which more than likely would be listed in the published statistics under "Other European, n.e.c." Also, the linguistically and culturally distinct Friulians (Furlane), who have their own organizations in the United States should, together with the Ladins (incorrectly given as a subheading under "Swiss" in the "Code List"), appear as a separate ancestry group designation [26].

Turning to the Low Countries, the Frisian subordination to "Dutch" seems unwarranted. Not only do the Frisians enjoy their own cultural autonomy and use their distinct language in the Netherlands, descendants of the once strong Frisian immigration in the United States still have a few organizations that preserve the idea of Frisian distinctiveness [27]. The "Belgian," like the "Swiss" classifications, are legitimate ones, although the pronounced divisions between Flemings and Walloons in Belgium might justify subheadings as is done in the *Census Supplementary Report* for Basque, Cypriot, and Portuguese — namely, a main entry, "Belgian," with "Fleming" and "Walloon" subheadings.

Analogous to the treatment accorded to Belgium, the categories "Pennsylvania German (or Dutch)" and "Germans from Russia (including Black Sea or Volga Germans)" minimally should be distinguishable statistically from other subheadings under German if not distinct ancestry group classifications unto themselves [28]. Because of their Slavic character, the Lusatians Sorbs/Wends must be removed entirely from under "German" and given their own classification (see below page 146). Finally, the well-known Swedish cultural characteristics of the Åland Islands (politically part of Finland although with a high degree of autonomy) necessitate the transfer of the subheading "Åland Islander" to be under "Swedish" instead of "Finnish," while the subheadings Liv and Livonian should be transferred from "Finnish" to "Estonian," with whom the Livs are most closely related [29].

Category II concerns Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia). The first revision necessary is in the category title itself, which, for reasons explained below, should read: Eastern and Central Europe (including the Soviet Union). It is the very term "Russian" that seems to have caused so much difficulty for the Census Bureau's tabulators, who, in the introduction to the *Census Supplementary Report* state that "persons reporting Russian in the census may include those who identified with the specific ethnic group 'Russian' as well as those who may have reported the term in a different context" [30]. As it turns out this is not only an understatement but a euphemistic formulation that, after reviewing the "Code List for Ancestry Entries," barely camouflages the fact that the Census Bureau's designation rendered in the published data as "Russian, n.e.c." is meaningless. It corresponds neither to ethnic, linguistic, nor political criteria, but rather encompasses a hodgepodge of subheadings — as many as 65 — with which, seemingly frustrated census tabulators did not know what to do. Even if the reader were to assume the Soviet Union is territorially the direct successor state of the Russian Empire — a problematic assumption — it still must be said that most of the 2,781,432 persons listed under

"Russian, n.e.c." are not Russian in either the ethnic or tenuous Russian Empire/Soviet political or territorial sense.

From areas that are now part of the Soviet Union, the Census Bureau has correctly provided distinct ancestry group classifications for Belorussians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians. Even the Armenians have correctly been given a distinct ancestry group designation, although in the published *Census Supplementary Report* they are grouped together with North African and Middle Easterners, probably reflecting the fact that most ancestors of America's Armenians came from what is today Turkey and Lebanon and not from Armenian lands within the Soviet Union.

Less fortunate treatment was accorded several other groups who were either lumped together as subheadings under "Russian, n.e.c.," were classified under other ancestry group designations, or simply omitted altogether. Of these, three groups (Carpatho-Rusyns, Cossacks, Germans from Russia) may no longer exist as entities in their homelands but they have preserved a distinct group identity in the United States. Eight others (Azerbaijani, Finno-Ugrian, Georgian, Kalmyk, North Caucasian, n.e.c., Soviet Turkic groups, n.e.c., Tartar, Turkestani) are in terms of ethnicity, language, and culture more distinct from Russians than even the other East Slavic (Belorussians, Ukrainians) and Baltic (Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian) groups that already have their own ancestry group designations.

Carpatho-Rusyns, only part of whose homeland was acquired in 1945 by the Soviet Union (perhaps the largest number of Carpatho-Rusyn Americans derive from present-day Czechoslovakia as well as from Poland) appear in the present "Code List" either as a distinct ancestry designation "Ruthenian" (albeit with inaccurate subheadings), or as "Rusyn" (see Appendix 3). The exact number of the latter is unknown because they were placed as a subheading under the catch-all designation "Russian, n.e.c." In retrospect, even the Census Bureau tabulators seemed to have recognized their mistake, since the introduction to the *Census Supplementary Report* admits that "Rusyn, at present, is more appropriately categorized under the ancestry group 'Ruthenian'" [31]. While that principle is correct, it is preferable to use the term "Carpatho-Rusyn" instead of "Ruthenian" as the main ancestry group designation [32]. In the American context, not only is the historical term "Rusyn" (Carpatho-Rusyn) most widely accepted at present, it is also more neutral in the opinion of about half of the group's members of varying Orthodox faiths, who generally consider the term "Ruthenian" a synonym for Byzantine or Greek Rite (Uniate) Catholics. Besides the problem of varying names used to describe Carpatho-Rusyns [33], the *Census Supplementary Report* also suggests that while "some advisors still consider them as a distinct group, others feel that Ruthenians should be combined with Ukrainians" [34]. Actually, the situation is more complex. Some Americans who derive from the Carpatho-Rusyn homeland (known variously as Carpatho-Rus', Carpatho-Ukraine, Ruthenia, Subcarpathian Rus') may identify themselves simply as Slovak or Russian, as well as Ukrainian. If that is the case, they should be classified with whichever of these groups they chose to identify. However, those who use the term "Carpatho-Rusyn," or some variant thereof (Rusnak, Ruthenian, even Carpatho-Russian) as an identifier, certainly consider themselves distinct from either Slovaks, Russians, or Ukrainians; therefore, they should have the right to their own ancestry group classification, whether it be called "Rusyn," "Ruthenian," or more preferably, "Carpatho-Rusyn."

Like the Carpatho-Rusyns, some Americans of Cossack descent may consider themselves to be ethnically Russian or even Ukrainian (Cossacks from the Kuban region or those who claim some Zaporozhian ancestry), and if so they must naturally be counted

with those groups. There are, however, some Americans of Cossack descent (mostly from the lower Don River region) who understand the term "Cossack" to comprise a distinct ethnic group. Therefore, these should also be given the right to have their own ancestry group classification — "Cossack" [35].

It seems that the Census Bureau tabulators did not classify Germans from the Russian Empire under "Russian, n.e.c.," because the subheadings "Black Sea German" and "Volga German" (two regional appellations for Germans from Russia) appear under the Western Europe classification "German." Although clearly of German ethnic and linguistic origin, their experience in the former Russian Empire, where they began to settle beginning in 1763 and where they flourished in ethnically homogeneous and self-governing communities until at least the late nineteenth century, suggests that they might be classified separately from other Germans. The argument for a separate ancestry group classification is further enhanced by the fact that today in the United States the group maintains its own community and organizational life distinct from other Germans [36].

Whereas it might be argued that Carpatho-Rusyns, Cossacks, and to a certain extent, Germans from Russia derive their justification for separate ancestry group classifications from their status and self-determination in the United States, there is no question that most of the other 65 subheadings classified under "Russian, n.e.c." represent universally recognized distinct languages and cultures not even remotely related to Russian. It is also likely that the number of any one of these groups living in the United States is so small as to be statistically meaningless. Nonetheless, one must assume from the "Code List" that the Census Bureau did receive the wide variety of names appearing as subheadings under the ancestry group designation "Russian, n.e.c." That being the case, tabulators must be prepared for the possibility that some or all of these names and perhaps even others might appear in the 1990 census returns as well. Regardless of how the numbers are eventually recorded, as distinct ancestry group entries or lumped together under "Other European, n.e.c.," it is still necessary to have an understanding of how to classify them.

Below is a proposal for eight classifications, four of which are really umbrella terms bringing together a number of ethnically distinct but nonetheless culturally, linguistically, or geographically related groups. "Finno-Ugrian, n.e.c.," refers to several peoples (Komi, Udmurt/Votyak, Mordva, Mari/Cheremis) living in or near the Ural Mountains and generally classified together because of the age-old appartenance of their languages. The "n.e.c." qualifier is necessary because three other related Finno-Ugrian linguistic groups (Estonian, Finnish, and Hungarian) have their own ancestry group designations. "North Caucasian" refers to the "larger" of the innumerable ethnic groups living in the Caucasus Mountain range, that is, those other than the "largest" three, Armenians, Azerbaijanis, and Georgians, each of which should have its own ancestry group designation. Moreover, the North Caucasian grouping is not simply based on geographic proximity but also cultural affinity and self-perception; most are of the Islamic faith and many often refer to themselves as *Gortsy* or *Tavlintsy*, i.e., mountaineers [37]. Most of the respondents who claim ancestry from one of the Soviet Union's many Turkic peoples might best be classified under the designation "Turkestanian," an unofficial name often used to describe the lands inhabited by Central Asia's Turkic groups (Karakalpaks, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Tadjiks, Turkmens, Uigurs, and Uzbeks) [38]. Other non-Central Asian groups spread mostly throughout Siberia (Bashkirs, Chuvash, Tuvinians, Yakuts) can therefore be handled under the rubric, "Soviet Turkic groups, n.e.c."

With regard to the four new distinct ancestry group designations, the Azerbaijani and Tatars are linguistically Turkic, but because they are geographically and historically distinct from the rest of the Soviet Union's Turkic peoples they warrant separate

classifications. The Azerbaijanis who inhabit northwestern Iran as well as Soviet Azerbaijan are, together with Armenians and Georgians, one of the three "largest" Caucasus mountain groups. The Tatars, although geographically dispersed throughout the Soviet Union, are united by a common historical past — inheriting the remnants of Mongol rule, and as Crimean, Astrakhan, and Kazan Tatars dominating for several centuries large parts of what later became the Russian Empire [39].

The Kalmyks, of whom there are small but vibrant groups concentrated in rural New Jersey and Pennsylvania, are of Buddhist faith and of Mongolian origin, although displaced centuries ago from inner Asia to a region between the Lower Don and Volga Rivers [40]. While the Kalmyks qualify geographically as a European group from the southwestern part of the Soviet Union, the Buriats should be grouped together with the Mongolians under the ancestry group designation "Mongolian." Not only are they closely related to Mongolians, there are as many Buriats living in Mongolia as in the neighboring Buriat A.S.S.R. located in southern Soviet Siberia. The designation "Mongolian" (with a "Buriat" subheading) should appear as a distinct ancestry group among those within the Census Bureau's revised category, Asian (excluding Middle Easterner and Soviet Union), and not as a subheading under "Chinese" as was done in 1980.

Finally, among the four new ancestry groups being proposed, the Georgians actually seem to have begun in the Census Bureau "Code List" with their own code number and designation, 161—"Georgian," although they were eventually demoted to the status of a subheading under "Russian, n.e.c." Not only should their ancestry group classification be restored, but the subheading "Georgia" should be dropped. Americans of Georgian ethnic background might use the adjective Georgian or the native name of their country *Gruziia* (or *gruzinets* — a Georgian person), but they are not likely to use the Anglicized form of their homeland, Georgia, to describe themselves. Otherwise, the Caucasus Georgians might be confused with residents of the state of Georgia. In fact, that is exactly what seemed to happen in the 1980 census, since to quote the *Census Supplementary Report*, the number of Russians (the Georgians being classified as "Russians, n.e.c.") was unexpectedly high in the southern state of Georgia [41].

Having separated out the ethnically, linguistically, and culturally distinct groups from the useless designation "Russian, n.e.c.," the ancestry group designation "Russian" would need to remain. However, that term would now be used to describe simply ethnic Russian ancestry as well as to include all those Americans who, for whatever reason, chose to describe themselves as Russian with perhaps some prefix such as Great, Little, Galician, or Red [42]. Having singled out the Russians as well as other ancestry groups deriving in whole, or in part, from the Soviet Union, it is still necessary to have an ancestry group designation: "Soviet Union, n.e.c." This would include all those respondents — of whatever ethnic background — who associate their ancestry with the country name "Soviet Union" or "U.S.S.R.," or who may provide some ethnically imprecise regional name like Siberian, Kurile Islander, or Sakhalin Islander [43].

A particularly problematic area that is only in part related to the Soviet Union is the designation "Galician." In theory, this term can refer either to a person from the region of Galicia in northwestern Spain or to a person from the historic Austro-Hungarian province of Galicia, which after 1918 was part of Poland and since 1945 has been divided between Poland and the Soviet Union. In the United States, the ancestry response "Galician" generally refers to Eastern Europe, because Americans from Spanish Galicia are most likely to respond *Gallego* or simply Spaniard/Spanish when asked their identity [44]. As for historic Austrian Galicia, it was an ethnically complex area inhabited by people who identified themselves as Poles, Ukrainians, Lemkos/Rusyns, Russians, or Jews (the *Galizianer*). Galicia was also one of the leading sources of pre-World War I emigration

from the Austro-Hungarian Empire [45]. Experience suggests that Americans from Galicia of Jewish background will describe themselves simply as Jews (sometimes even as Poles or Austrians), but not as Galicians. Whereas many Slavic Galicians will describe themselves of Polish, Ukrainian, Carpatho-Rusyn (Lemko), or Russian background [46], some still use only the term "Galician." Because "Galician" is a regional designation representing potentially several ethnic affiliations, it seems best to record any such responses under the generalized ancestry group classification "Eastern European."

Analogous to Galicia are three other multiethnic regions that traditionally have included two or more groups and therefore should not be placed as subheadings under one ancestry group designation as was done in the 1980 census. These include "Bucovina/Bukovina," "Silesia," and "Transylvania," all of which, because they are not ethnically specific, should appear as subheadings under "Eastern European" [47].

With regard to other Eastern European groups outside the borders of the Soviet Union, the Census Bureau has done a relatively good job of classifying the responses it received. Besides the need to add a few subheadings and to move some existing ones under other ancestry group classifications [48], the only suggested changes are the inclusion of seven more ancestry group classifications. Three of them ("Czechoslovakian, n.e.c.," "Macedonian," "Montenegrin") are presently subheadings under other designations, four others ("Bosnian Muslim," "Jewish," "Sorbian," "Windish") are entirely new.

As for the three classifications that in 1980 were simply subheadings, the need for a Czechoslovakian ancestry group classification (as separate from Czech) was discussed above and need not be repeated here. The other two designations are related to the problem of classifying peoples from Yugoslavia. Like Americans whose ancestors derive from the Soviet Union and other multinational (multiethnic) states, those claiming ancestry from present-day Yugoslavia may indicate their ethnicity by the general term Yugoslav(ian) or by one of that country's major national/ethnic groups [49]. The Census Bureau has correctly included a "Yugoslavian" classification as well as separate Croatian, Serbian, and Slovene classifications. To complete the picture, "Montenegrin," now under "Serbian," should have a distinct ancestry group classification as well. Although they are ethnically similar and use the same literary language as the Serbians (as for that matter do the Croatians), the Montenegrins, who had an independent state and autocephalous Orthodox Church from the late eighteenth century to 1918, and who since 1945 have their own republic in federated Yugoslavia, are considered a distinct nationality. Therefore, while some Americans of Montenegrin descent may respond that their ancestry is Yugoslav(ian) or Serbian and should be classified as such, those who respond simply Montenegrin probably do so because they feel that they are of that distinct ancestry and not Serbian [50].

Somewhat analogous is the subheading "Macedonian," which is classified under "Bulgarian." While it is true that there are some Americans (mostly pre-World War I immigrants and their descendants) whose ancestors came from present-day Yugoslav Macedonia and who identify with Bulgarians, they often describe themselves as Bulgaro-Macedonians, a subheading that should be added under "Bulgarian" [51]. However, for those who simply answer Macedonian, they should be recorded under a distinct ancestry group classification. Like Montenegro, Macedonia has its own constituent republic and is recognized as a distinct nationality in Yugoslavia. Moreover, it has its own Macedonian literary language, standardized as recently as the 1940s. There are also Macedonian minorities in western Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia) and northern Greece, where they are known as Slavophones, a subheading that should appear as well under the "Macedonian" ancestry group designation [52].

In order to complete the Yugoslav picture, two ancestry group classifications need to be

added — “Bosnian Muslim” and “Windish.” The Serbo-Croatian speaking Bosnian Muslims, who call themselves Bosnjaks (*Bosanci* or *Bošnjaci*), had like the Serbs and Croats based their distinctiveness from their linguistic brethren initially on religious grounds. Subsequently, that distinctiveness from Catholic Croats and Orthodox Serbs in their midst was based not solely on religion but on their whole way of life, so that even after living close to a century in Islamic Turkey the Bosnian Muslims continue to preserve a distinct identity. As in the homeland, the Bosnian Muslims in the United States speak Serbo-Croatian, but the vast majority do not identify with either the Serbs or the Croats, and have maintained their own organizations and publications especially in the Chicago area [53].

The Windish refer to descendants of pre-World War I immigrants who came from a small region (the Prekmurje, beyond the Mur River) in what is today the very northeastern corner of Yugoslavia. Before 1918, when most of the Windish emigrated, their homeland had for centuries been part of the Hungarian Kingdom, in contrast to other Slovene lands that were under Austrian rule. Although the inhabitants of Hungarian Prekmurje spoke dialects closely related to Slovene, they described themselves as Windish and maintained an identity distinct from Slovenes. Whereas the Windish today have acquired a Slovene identity in their homeland, in the United States the original immigrants and their descendants who concentrated in Bethlehem and other Lehigh Valley communities in eastern Pennsylvania have continued to identify themselves, their Lutheran and Catholic churches, and their secular organizations as distinctly Windish, thereby warranting a separate ancestry group classification in the 1990 census [54].

If the Windish have disappeared in Europe as a separate ethnic group, the Slavic ethnicity of another people with a similar name continues to flourish (some would say that they are artificially kept alive) within the boundaries of East Germany where their Lusatian homeland is located. These are the Lusatian Sorbs (*Srbi* in their own language), also known as Wends, a term derived from the German word to describe them (*Wenden*). Despite the fact that the original Sorbian immigrants arrived as long ago as the 1840s, their descendants who settled in or near the rural community of Serbin, Texas continue to preserve and promote their distinct Wendish (Sorbian) identity and culture [55]. Although many of the early immigrants knew German as well as their native Sorbian, there is no justification for including this Slavic group with its several subheadings (“Lusatian Sorb,” “Sorb,” “Wend,” “Wendish”) under the ancestry group classification “German” as was done in the 1980 census.

Finally, the last of the newly proposed groups to be discussed, and one whose origins are not limited to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, is the Jews [56]. Their suggested inclusion as an ancestry group designation may provoke the most disagreement among reviewers of the Census Bureau’s classification scheme. At present, Jews do not exist because, according to the Census Bureau, Title 13 of the *United States Code* supposedly “forbids the collection of information on religion in a mandatory census” [57]. Based on that supposition, the explanations on the census form accompanying ancestry question 14 include the proviso: “A religious group should not be reported as a person’s ancestry” [58].

That religion is an individual’s own affair not open to government scrutiny is an American principle that must continue to be upheld. After all, the very first permanent European immigrants and many who arrived in the United States after them came precisely because their homeland governments interfered with, or persecuted them for, their religious affiliation. On the other hand, if an American when asked about ancestry or ethnicity voluntarily declares him or herself to be Jewish, are not that person’s rights being violated if a United States governmental body, in this case the Census Bureau, refuses to accept that self-designation? In that regard, it should be noted that Title 13 of the *United States Code*

specifies that "no person shall be *compelled* to disclose information relative to his religious beliefs" [59]. Such a formulation, it would seem, does not imply that information *voluntarily* offered must for some reason be refused.

Moreover, the view that Jewish is exclusively a religious designation is questionable. Many European countries from where Jews emigrated classified them — using the terms Jewish or Hebrew — as a distinct nationality or ethnic group, and from 1898 to 1943 the United States Office of Immigration (despite opposition from some Jewish-American groups) used the term "Hebrew" as well, in order to denote Jews from whatever country they migrated. Such distinctions seemed appropriate because being Jewish in the European homeland and to a large extent in America has always meant more than just religion. Jewishness reflects a cultural framework that in the old country even included one's own literary language, whether Sephardic or the widely used Yiddish among the Ashkenazim. Yiddish, in particular, flourished among Eastern European Jews in the United States, where today there are still remnants of a once-thriving press, literature, theater, and Yeshiva school system [60]. Therefore, to quote one of the many commentators on this subject: "In the United States, the notions of the Jewish people as a 'national group,' or as a 'people with a common history or culture' are both acceptable" [61].

The refusal by the Census Bureau to accept "Jewish" as an ancestry designation begs the further question. What are Americans of Jewish background to do, indicate the country or nationality whence their parents or grandparents came, such as German, or Polish, or Russian? Whereas it is true that some Jewish Americans may desire to associate their ancestry with the dominant culture of a particular European country [62], anyone even slightly familiar with events in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries knows that large numbers of Jews often emigrated to America in desperation from countries like the Russian Empire and Germany in order to save life and limb.

One wonders just how many of the 1,762,587 responses classified in the 1980 census under "Other" (that is, "responses indicating religious groups or unclassifiable responses") were actually Jewish or perhaps Yiddish. If Americans of Jewish ancestry wish to describe themselves as Jews, they should certainly have the right to do so. Therefore, on moral as well as scholarly grounds, Jews should be recognized in the 1990 census as a distinct ethnic group with their own ancestry classification.

## CONCLUSIONS

Earlier in this investigation it was asked not only what revisions should be made in the Census Bureau's ancestry classification scheme, but why they seem so necessary. The above discussion already suggested that revisions are necessary in order to uphold the principle of free choice and/or to maintain ethnic distinctions that respond to American social and historical reality as well as to generally accepted scholarly criteria.

In 1980, the U.S. Census Bureau began a wise process. It solicited ancestry data from the American population without any "prelisted categories" and it allowed self-identification based on free choice. Unfortunately, the free choice that was offered was subsequently taken away in the tabulation process, so that in the final published *Census Supplementary Report* many legitimate groups simply ceased to exist. This "working paper" may, after further refinement, help provide the basis for the restoration of the statistical existence of several groups who inhabit the rich American demographic mosaic.

Therefore, one may hope that in the 1990 census not only will the Armenians be distinguished from the Russians, but that the Bretons, the Catalans, the Carpatho-Rusyns, the

Macedonians, and the many others discussed above also will be given the opportunity to identify freely with their own ancestry/ethnic group. Having often been denied the opportunity to that in their homelands, it is the least that can be expected in the United States.

### NOTES

1. The U.S. census statistics for 1900 and 1910, in particular, reveal an understanding of the ethnic complexity of countries in Europe, the vast majority of which at the time (and still today) are made up of different nationalities or ethnic groups. Using the 1910 census, for instance, it is easy to learn about first and second generation Americans (referred to as "foreign white stock"), what country they came from, and what was their mother tongue. The range of detail was astounding. For instance, not only did the census report 1,707,640 speakers of Polish, it also indicated 35 countries from which Polish speakers came, the largest being 655,733 from Russia, the smallest being 2 each from Wales, Luxembourg, Spain, and Montenegro.
2. *The Census Supplementary Report* was prepared by Edward W. Fernandez and Nancy S. Sweet of the Census Bureau's Ethnic and Spanish Statistics branch and was published in April 1983 by the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
3. The sampling and estimation procedures are described in the *Census Supplementary Report*, pp. 77-82.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
5. Among the basic tools covering Europe and the Soviet Union are: Guy Héraud, *L'Europe des ethnies* (Paris: Presses d'Europe, 1963) and his *Peuples et langues d'Europe* (Paris: Denoël, 1966); Manfred Straka, ed., *Handbuch des europäischen Volksgruppen* (Vienna: Wm. Braumüller, 1970); Meic Stephens, *Linguistic Minorities in Western Europe* (Llandysul, Wales: Gomer Press, 1976); Jochen Blaschke, ed., *Handbuch der westeuropäischen Regionalbewegungen* (Frankfurt am Main: Berliner Institut für vergleichende Sozialforschung, 1980); Walter Kolarz, *Russia and Her Colonies* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1952); Richard V. Weekes, ed., *Muslim Peoples: A World Ethnographic Survey*, 2 vols., 2nd rev. ed. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984); Bernie Comrie, *The Languages of the Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Shirin Akiner, *Islamic Peoples of the Soviet Union* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1983).
6. Stephen Thernstrom, Oscar Handlin, and Ann Orlov, eds., *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980).
7. For instance, among the distinct ethnic groups deriving from Europe and described in many of the encyclopedic works mentioned in note 5 and/or in the *Harvard Encyclopedia* but left out of the Census Bureau's published statistics are: Acadians, Azerbaijanis, Bosnian Muslims, Bretons, Carpatho-Rusyns, Catalans, Cornish, Corsicans, Cossacks, Frisians, Georgians, Germans from Russia, Jews, Kalmyks, Lapps, Macedonians, Montenegrins, Occitans, Pennsylvania Germans, Rhaeto-Romansch, Sorbians, Tatars, Turkestanis.
8. One Census Bureau official has recently reported that his office is presently reviewing specific questions related to the 1990 census, and that one area of discussion is: "should the 1980 ancestry question be replaced by, or combined with, questions on place of birth of parents or number of foreign-born parents?" As my analysis amply demonstrates here, to ask simply the place of birth (i.e., country) of one's parents will tell us little if anything about the ethnic composition of America's population. Therefore, if the Census Bureau wants to know "which set of questions would provide the most useful information on ethnicity," it must retain the open-ended ancestry question. Cf. Peter A. Bounpane, "Looking Toward 1990: Planning the Next United States Census of Population and Housing," *Government Publications Review* (March-April, 1985): 124.
9. The ethnically non-descript classifications are: Eastern European; European; Scandinavian; Slavic; Other European, n.e.c.; Arab/Arabian; Other North African or Middle Easterner, n.e.c.; African; Other Sub Sahara African, n.e.c.; Other Asian (excluding Middle Easterner), n.e.c.; Other West Indian, or Central or South American (excluding Spanish), n.e.c.; Spanish/Hispanic; Other Spanish, n.e.c.; Other Pacific, n.e.c.; Other North American, n.e.c.
10. It is not clear from the *Census Supplementary Report* what is the minimum number of responses required to warrant a distinct ancestry group classification. It seems that minimum number might be 5,000, since the smallest ancestry groups listed in the 1980 *Census Supplementary Report* are Dominica Islanders (5,659) and Saudi Arabians (5,491). If the threshold is indeed 5,000, and if that number is to be maintained, then it would still be exceedingly useful to provide a footnote for "Other European, n.e.c.," in which the names of these smaller groups and the number of responses for each is indicated.
11. For instance, the self-designation Czechoslovak is used by two groups of Slovak Americans: those of Lutheran religious background with strong attachment to the Czech Reformation, and those who have been long-time members of the Czech National Sokols, an organization committed to the idea of Czechoslovak unity. In addition, the designation is also used by many Americans of Rusyn/Carpatho-Rusyn background. *Census Supplementary Report*, p. 7.
12. See the generally sweeping edictment by M. Mark Stolarik in a letter to the Census Bureau, published in the Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies publication, *New Dimensions* 6 (Spring, 1984): 5-6 and excerpted under the

- title "Roots Disputes" in the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *AAASS Newsletter* (January, 1985): 4-5; as well as the words of praise in William A. Douglass, "Ethnic Categorization in the 1980 U.S. Census: The Basque Example," *Government Publications Review* 12 (July-August, 1985): 289-96.
14. Comparing Appendices 1 and 3, it is clear that the census tabulators provided code list categories for the following groups, which subsequently were included under "Other European, n.e.c.," because they were less than the 5,000 (?) minimum: Andorran, Faeroe Islander, Lapp, Liechtensteiner, Monagesque. It is suggested that provision for calculating these and other proposed additions be made again in the 1990 census, and even if their eventual numbers do not attain the Census Bureau's minimum — ostensibly 5,000 (see note 10) — that they be listed in a footnote with the number of responses received.
  15. On Western Europe's national minorities during the last decades, see the encyclopedic studies by Héraud, Straka, Stephens, and Blaschke in note 5, and more specifically the essays in Milton J. Esman, ed., *Ethnic Conflict in the Western World* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 1977); Charles R. Foster, ed., *Nations Without a State: Ethnic Minorities in Western Europe* (New York: Praeger, 1980); Colin H. Williams, ed., *National Separatism* (Vancouver and London: University of British Columbia Press, 1982), as well as the seminal study by Walker Conner, "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?," *World Politics* 24 (April, 1972): 332-355.
  16. The various subheadings that appeared under "Northern Irelander" in the 1980 census code list and which are maintained in the revised code list for 1990 (Anerim, Armagh, Derry/Londonderry, Down, Fermanagh, Tyrone, Ulster/Ulsterite) are religiously and culturally indeterminate and are based on the historic region of Ulster with all but three of its component counties. The only exception is the subheading "Orangeman," which clearly identifies with a Protestant religious and political persuasion. The three counties of historic Ulster that today are outside Northern Ireland and within the Republic of Ireland are not included as subheadings because it is highly unlikely that Americans identifying themselves as "Ulsterites/Ulstermen" would have come from those three counties.
  17. See the Cornish entry in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 243-245.
  18. The Census Bureau actually promises that another subject report (PC 80-2) is expected to indicate the number of persons who reported themselves as "Scotch-Irish." To the disclaimer that "it will never be possible to determine whether respondents intended to report a single Scotch-Irish response or a multiple ancestry response" (*Census Supplementary Report*, p. 6), one might ask if it would be possible for the 1990 "long-form" to have more than one line under the ancestry question, therefore making graphic provision for single or multiple entries, which in the case at hand might result in Scotch-Irish entered on one line if the respondent is giving a single ancestry or Scotch and Irish entered on two lines if the respondent is giving a multiple ancestry.
  19. In that regard, the subheadings Channel Islander/Guernsey Islander/Jersey Islander should be transferred from "English," and Alderney Islander and Sark Islander should be added under "British, n.e.c." Although it is true that an estimated 14,000 Channel Islanders are knowledgeable of either the Jersey (*Jèrri*), Guernsey (*Guernesey*), or Sark (*Sercq*) dialects of old Normand French and that they might be expected to preserve a distinct Jersey/Guernsey/Sark ethnic identity, in actuality, more than three-quarters of the four island's present 125,000 inhabitants were born in Britain, so that the number of potential Americans claiming a distinct Channel Island/Jersey/Guernsey ethnic identity is probably miniscule to non-existent. By the same token, the 1980 Census "Code List" which gives a distinct ancestry designation "Gibraltar" seems unjustified, since the region's 30,000 inhabitants have no ethnically distinct characteristics (the Spanish speakers use a dialect of Andalusian Spanish called *yanito*) and Gibraltar exists as a separate entity solely because it is a British colony. Therefore, Gibraltar should be a subheading under "British, n.e.c." On the Channel Islanders, see Stephens, *Linguistic Minorities*, pp. 221-32; on the Gibraltars, see Johannes Kramer, "Bevölkerung und Sprachen Gibraltar," *Europa Ethnica* 42 (1985): 88-96.
  20. Bretons and Corsicans maintain their own organizations in the United States. Yet despite their distinct origins and community life in America, neither group was given its own entry, mentioned in the French entry, or identified anywhere in the otherwise ethnically sensitive *Harvard Encyclopedia*.
  21. On the Occitans, see the entry in Stephens, *Linguistic Minorities*, pp. 297-308, and the major historical survey of the region and its identity down to the present in André Armengaud, Robert Lafont et al., *L'histoire de l'Occitanie* (Paris: Hachette, 1979).
  22. The subheading French Creole (originally referring to Louisianans of French descent, today mostly to French-speaking Louisianans of color) should, because of the group's uniquely American evolution, not appear under "French." Although Creoles are different, they are related geographically and linguistically to the Acadians/Cajuns and might appear as a subheading under that designation. See the entries "Acadians" and "Creole" in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 1-3 and 247.
  23. It seems that inadvertently the subheadings Euskalduna and Vasco (the native and Spanish names for Basque) were left under "Spaniard." They should be transferred as subheadings under "Basque." With regard to the Galicians, although there have been recent efforts in Spain on the part of local leaders to stress their political and cultural distinctiveness — the language of the Galicians is basically a dialect of Portuguese, not Spanish — there seems to be no strong sense of Galician-Spaniard opposition in terms of self-identity. Cf. Straka, *Handbuch*, pp. 129-33 and Stephens, *Linguistic Minorities*, pp. 665-74. On the other hand, in the United States, Galicians (Gallago) have, like other Spanish regional groups the Asturians and Andalusians, tended to congregate in their own associations and communities, maintaining little interac-

- tion with fellow Spaniards. A trend in recent years toward cooperation with other Spaniards has been marked, although the Casa Galicia organization still exists. On the terminological problem of distinguishing western from eastern European Galicians, see below, pp. 143-144.
24. A Catalan Republic — recognized by Spain — existed from 1932 to 1934 and a limited autonomy for Catalonia has been restored since 1979. For an introduction to the centuries-old Catalan culture, see Jan Read, *The Catalans* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1978).
  25. Several observers of Italian Americans readily admit that most immigrants arriving from Italy initially described themselves not as Italians but as Genoese, Venetians, Neapolitans, Calabrians, Sicilians, and other regional names. Moreover, the general distinction between "northerners" and "southerners," that is between people from the "two Italies," is still profoundly felt among some Italian Americans. However, a superficial observation of the literature on Italian Americans suggests that while there was in the early years and there is still today among some immigrants a strong sense of pride in their regional identities, this has not resulted — even in the case of the immigrants from insular Sicily — in the development of distinct groups who deny their belonging to the larger Italian heritage and ethnicity. Nevertheless, as with Basque, Belgian, Cypriot, and Portuguese, it might be useful to have subheadings under Italian that indicate the number of Americans who call themselves Sardinians (whose speech is classified as a separate Romance language) and Sicilians (who maintain a distinct and often high-profile identity within the Italian family in the European homeland as well as in the United States). On regional distinctions, especially between "northerners" and "southerners," see Joseph Lopreato, *Italian Americans* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 101-109 and Leonard Covello, *The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), pp. 15-33.
  26. Based on purely linguistic criteria, the Friulians of northeastern Italy (Friulia) and the Ladins of the Dolomite region in northcentral Italy together with the Romansch (Rhaetians) of eastern Switzerland form one language group, often referred to as Rhaeto-Romansch. However, Swiss political/national identity among the Romansch supersedes any ethnolinguistic affinity with the Friulians and Ladins in Italy, so that it seems appropriate to separate the "Swiss" from the "Italian" Rhaeto-Romansch groups. Strictly speaking, the Ladins are distinct from the Friulians, but their small numbers and geographic as well as ethnolinguistic relation to the Friulians make it reasonable to have them appear as a subheading under "Friulian." On the three Rhaeto-Romansch peoples, see Stephens, *Linguistic Minorities*, pp. 496-507, 727-36; Straka, *Handbuch*, pp. 180-209; and Robert Henry Billigmeier, *A Crisis in Swiss Pluralism: The Romanasch and their Relations with the German and Italian Swiss* (The Hague: Mouton, 1979).
  27. Besides the Netherlands (West Friesland), Frisians have come to the United States also from North Friesland (from islands off the coast of Germany near the Danish border) and in the past and present have had North Frisian societies. See the entry on Frisians in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 401-403.
  28. The *Harvard Encyclopedia* entry on Pennsylvania Germans, pp. 770-72, together with other extensive literature seems to provide convincing evidence that this particularly American ethnic group, with its distinctive material culture and even standardized Pennsylvania German language, is deserving of its own ancestry group classification. On the Germans from Russia, see p. 143.
  29. The "Liv/Livonian" identifiers which ostensibly appeared in the 1980 census returns are problematic. Although the Livs are a Balto-Finnic people living in the northwestern tip of the Latvian S.S.R. whose language is closest to Estonian, there have been in the twentieth century no more than a few thousand of them (today perhaps a maximum of 500 Liv speakers survive). Considering their miniscule size, it is likely that those Americans who in 1980 declared themselves of Liv or Livonian ancestry did so because they associate with the German-ruled and partially German-inhabited historic province of Livonia which covered large parts of Estonia as well as Latvia (the Latvians are a Baltic, not Finnic people). If that is the case, then the Liv/Livonian Americans could be classified as either Estonians, Latvians, or Germans (i.e., from the Baltic).
  30. *Census Supplementary Report*, p. 7.
  31. *Census Supplementary Report*, p. 7.
  32. "Carpatho-Rusyn" is preferable to simply "Rusyn" because it is more geographically precise and helps to avoid potential confusion, and because, as the Census Bureau correctly points out, the term Rusyn "originally applied to all Eastern Slavs" (Ukrainians, Belorussians, and Russians as well as Carpatho-Rusyns). *Ibid.*, p. 7. Carpatho-Rusyn is also the term used for the *Harvard Encyclopedia* entry on the group, pp. 200-210.
  33. Among those names that may appear in the 1990 census returns are Byzantine and Lemko, which should be listed as subheadings under Carpatho-Rusyn. Byzantine is used by some Carpatho-Rusyns who believe it is an ethnic as well as religious designation. Although there are Byzantine Catholics of Croatian, Hungarian, or Slovak background, they are more likely to give one of those ethnic terms as their ancestry. Lemko is a regional name used by Carpatho-Rusyns from the Lemko Land (also described as Carpatho-Rus') in southern Galicia. There are also some Americans of Lemko ancestry who identify as Ukrainians; they more than likely would respond Ukrainian to the ancestry question.
  34. *Census Supplementary Report*, p. 7. With the exception of a small group of Rusyns who emigrated to Yugoslavia (Vojvodina/Bačka) where they are officially recognized as a distinct nationality, the vast majority in the Carpathian homeland (that is, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union — the Lemkos in Poland were removed from their villages in 1946-47) have since World War II adopted a Ukrainian or Slovak identity. In

- contrast, the vast majority of American immigrants and their descendants have maintained the older Carpatho-Rusyn identity. See Paul Robert Magocsi, *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and Their Descendants in North America* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1984).
35. In the homeland, Cossack distinctiveness was based primarily on the group's way of life as a military service class for the Russian imperial army. After the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, this way of life and subsequently a separate Cossack identity ceased to exist. It has been maintained as a distinct ancestral identity among some Cossack Americans; see the entry on Cossacks in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 245-46.
  36. See the entry on Germans from Russia in *ibid.*, pp. 425-30. It should be mentioned that German distinctiveness in the Russian homeland was maintained even after the Bolshevik revolution, especially in the Volga German Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and in many German national regions (*raions*) in other Soviet republics. These ceased to exist with the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, when resident Germans, suspected by Soviet authorities of treason, were deported eastward. Eventually, some of the remaining Germans from Russia living in Siberia and other eastern regions of the Soviet Union made their way to West Germany, especially since the 1960s.
  37. Admittedly the term "North Caucasian" for these peoples is not geographically precise because a few (Abkhazians, Adzharians, Ossetians) live in whole or in part on the southern side of the mountain crests. However, while the general "Caucasian" might be more accurate as an umbrella term for these variegated groups, it might be confused with the racial designation Caucasian. See the "North Caucasian" entry in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 749-50; "Caucasian languages" in Comrie, *Languages of the Soviet Union*, pp. 196-237; "Ibero-Caucasian" in Weekes, *Muslim Peoples*, pp. 174-81; "Northern Caucasus," in Akiner, *Islamic Peoples*, pp. 105-265; and Bernard Geiger et al., *Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus* (The Hague: Mouton, 1959).
  38. Besides their geographic proximity, Turkestani are also related by religion (all are Muslims) and language (all but the Tadzhiks speak Turkic languages). The small number in the United States are also joined together in a Turkestani association. See the Turkestani entry in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 991-92; and the entries under each group in Weekes, *Muslim Peoples*.
  39. Whereas the Kazan or Volga Tatars have their own autonomous republic, the Tatar A.S.S.R. located within the Russian S.F.S.R., that same status previously enjoyed by the Crimean Tatars was revoked during World War II, after which they were deported from their homeland to eastern regions of the Soviet Union. A Crimean Tatar identity has been maintained both in the Soviet Union as well as in countries of previous emigration — Turkey, Romania, and the United States. Whereas since the early nineteenth century the Crimea has been inhabited by an increasing number of Russians and Ukrainians, the term Crimean would not likely be used by members of those ethnic groups; therefore, the Census Bureau subheading "Crimean" should be placed under "Tatar," not "Russian, n.e.c.," as it now is.
  40. In the "Code List" for the 1980 Census, the Kalmyks were inexplicably placed as a subheading under "Chinese." On the Kalmyks in the United States, see Paula Rubel, *The Kalmyk Mongols: A Study in Continuity and Change* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Publications, 1967) and the entry in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 599-600.
  41. *Census Supplementary Report*, p. 4.
  42. Actually, the terms Little (or Malo) Russian and Red (or Galician) Russian have been replaced in modern terminology by Ukrainian. However, in keeping with the principle of free choice, if a person desires to call him or herself Russian — with or without any prefix — he/she should not be classified with Ukrainian (in many cases the choice of the term Russian reflects an active rejection of Ukrainian). On the other hand, the publications of those Americans who describe themselves as Carpatho-Russian clearly suggest a sense of differentiation from ethnic Russians and affiliation with a distinct ethnic group which, as suggested above, should be called Carpatho-Rusyn.
  43. Since the contemporary country name Soviet Union should be used instead of the antiquated and ethnically confusing Russia, the "Code List" Category II will have to be changed to read more properly: Eastern and Central Europe (including the Soviet Union). Analogously, the geographic regional headings in the published *Census Supplementary Report* will have to be changed to read: European (excluding Spaniard, including Soviet Asia) and Asian (excluding Middle Easterner and Soviet Asian).
  44. The "Code List" for the 1980 census simply placed all responses "Galician" under Spaniard. Cf. above, note 23.
  45. On the ethnic complexity of historic Austrian Galicia, see Paul Robert Magocsi, *Galicia: A Historical and Bibliographic Guide* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), esp. pp. 224-55.
  46. In that context, the potential appearance of the hyphenated terms Galician-Ukrainian or Galician-Russian would be classified respectively with Ukrainian or Russian.
  47. According to the 1980 classification, "Bucovina/Bukovina" was placed under "Rumanian," even though the number of Germans, Jews, and Ukrainians living in that historic Austrian province — today equally divided between Romania and the Ukrainian S.S.R. — exceeded the number of Romanians living there. "Silesia" was placed under "Polish," although the historic province, divided before World War I between Germany and Austria and today between Poland and Czechoslovakia, included numerous Germans and Czechs as well as Poles. "Transylvania" was placed under "Rumanian" (perhaps because it is today in Romania), but that region from medieval times until the present includes large numbers of Germans and Hungarians (some of whom are known locally as Szeklers/Székely) as well as Romanians, so that a Transylvanian response, like a Bukovinian or Silesian response, can in no way be considered ethnically specific.

48. Italo-Albanian (or Arberesh in their own language) and Kosovo should be added under "Albanian" to accommodate potential responses by Albanians from Italy and Yugoslavia. Bulgaro-Macedonian needs to be added under "Bulgarian" (see p. 145). Slavonian should be transferred from "Slav" to "Croatian," since it is not a general designation for Slavs but the name of a Yugoslav region inhabited primarily by Croats. Gitanos, Manouche, Romnichals, and Xoraxaya should be added under "Gypsy" (see below, note 56). Gorale, a regional name for mountaineers in southcentral Poland, should be added under "Polish," as should Slovjince (actually a regional name for Kashubians, who themselves identify generally with Poles). On the other hand, Pomeranian and its German form Pommern should be moved as a subheading from "Polish" to "German" because a Pole from the predominantly German-inhabited region of Pomerania (part of Poland only since 1945) would hardly use the German or even anglicized version of this province name to describe his or her ancestry. Slovjak should be added under "Slovak"; it is the older term of self-designation for Slovaks from Eastern Slovakia, the region that sent the largest percentage of Slovak immigrants to the United States.
49. The best description in English of Yugoslavia's multiethnic composition is by Michael B. Petrovich, "Population Structure," in Klaus-Detlev Grothusen, ed., *Jugoslawien-Yugoslavia* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 322-44. See also the entries on Bosnian Muslims, Croats, Macedonians, Serbs, and Slovenes in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 184-86, 247-56, 690-95, 916-26, and 934-42.
50. For a good description of the fine line between Montenegrin separatism and regional subordination to Serbdom, see Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell University Press, 1984), pp. 270-91.
51. The Bulgaro-Macedonians are similar to the Galician Russians in that they have preserved in the United States an historic identity that is no longer recognized in the homeland where Bulgarian has been replaced by Macedonian in western (Yugoslav) Macedonia as has Russian by Ukrainian in eastern (Soviet) Galicia. It is interesting to note, however, that the Bulgarian government has since the 1950s adopted a Bulgaro-Macedonian position, not recognizing the existence of Macedonians as a separate nationality, and this has caused continual tension between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. On the Bulgaro-Macedonian problem, see Robert R. King, *Minorities Under Communism: Nationalities as a Source of Tension Among Balkan Communist States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 187-219; and the articles on Bulgarians and Macedonians in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 186-89 and 690-94.
52. The Greek government recognizes neither a Macedonian nor Bulgarian ethnic affiliation for the population living in its northern province of Makedonia. At best it concedes that there are "Slavophone Greeks" living there. In the United States, however, many of these "Slavophone Greeks" consider themselves to be part of a distinct Macedonian ethnic group.
53. On the specificity of Bosnian Muslim culture, see William G. Lockwood, *European Moslems: Economy and Ethnicity in Western Bosnia* (New York: Academic Press, 1975); and the entry by the same author on the group in the *Harvard Encyclopedia*, pp. 184-86. On the other hand, the subheading "Bosnian" and for that matter "Hercegovinian," classified in the 1980 census as subheadings under "Serbian," are not ethnically specific. In the past and still today Bosnia and Hercegovia are inhabited by Croats and Bosnian Muslims as well as Serbians. Therefore, it would seem preferable to place these Yugoslav multiethnic regional designations under "Yugoslavian, n.e.c."
54. Although in the *Harvard Encyclopedia* the Windish are discussed within the entry on Slovenes (pp. 934-42), the author of the entry and specialist on Slovene Americans, Rudolph M. Susel, admits that the group members prefer to use the term Windish to describe themselves, that they have avoided interaction with Slovene Americans, and that before turning in recent decades to English they used their own Prekmurje dialect (distinct from Slovene by its orthography as well as structure) in their publications. On the statistical treatment of the Windish in the United States, see Matjaž Klemencić, "Slovenci v ameriški statistiki," *Zvon* 2 (September, 1984): 29.
55. It would be interesting to know — and the 1990 census could be helpful — if there are Wends/Sorbs in places other than Texas. Census tabulators should be careful, however, not to confuse in their tabulation the names Windish/Wind/Vind, which refer to the South Slavic group based mainly in eastern Pennsylvania, with the West Slavic Wends/Sorbs. On the Wends in Texas, see the *Harvard Encyclopedia* entry, pp. 1017-1020. The best description of the homeland, where the approximately 80,000 Sorbs have their own cultural organizations, publications, and two distinct West Slavic literary languages (Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian), is found in Gerald Stone, *The Smallest Slavonic Nation: The Sorbs Of Lusatia* (London: Athlone Press, 1972).
56. Like the Jews, the Gypsies also come from all parts of Europe, and while they are correctly given their own ancestry group classification "Gypsy, Rom" in the *Census Supplementary Report*, they are listed under Category II: Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia) in the "Code List for Ancestry Entries." More problematic is the absence of the following subheadings: Gitanos (Spanish Gypsies), Manouche (French Gypsies), and Romnichals (British Gypsies). The Romnichals are among the largest group of Gypsies in the United States, and all the above names, including Xoraxaya (even though these are Turkish Gypsies), should be included as subheadings under "Gypsy, Rom" in the revised "Code List."
57. *Census Supplementary Report*, pp. 6-7.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

59. *United States Code 1982 Edition*, Vol. 5, Title 13, Section 221(c) (Washington, D.C.: Government Publications Office, 1983), p. 24.
60. For an introduction to the rich literature in and about Yiddish in America, see the now classic: Irving Howe, *World of Our Fathers: The Journey of the East European Jews to America and the Life They Found and Made* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976), esp. pp. 417-551.
61. Sanford Goldner, *Perspectives in American Jewish Life* (Los Angeles: Ward Ritchie Press, 1959), p. 71. Chapter 7 in Goldner's study, entitled "Definition of the Jewish People," provides a useful introduction to the various views on the problem of Jews as a distinct cultural/ethnic/national group in the United States. The *Harvard Encyclopedia* also rightly accords Jews a major entry, pp. 571-98.
62. On the question of American Jews who identify as Russians, or how the census category "persons of Russian stock or origin" includes perhaps as many as two-thirds Jews, see Erich Rosenthal, "The Equivalence of United States Census Data for Persons of Russian Stock or Descent with American Jews: An Evaluation," *Demography*, 12, 2 (May, 1975): 275-90.

### Appendix I

#### Ancestry Groups in the 1980 Census of Population Supplementary Report

<i>European</i> (excluding Spaniard)	Polish	<i>Subsahara African</i>
Albanian	Portuguese	African*
Alsatian	Azorean	Afro-American
Austrian	Madeiran	Cape Verdean
Basque	Portuguese, n.e.c.	Ethiopian
Basque, French	Rumanian	Ghanaian
Basque, Spanish	Russian, n.e.c. <sup>3</sup>	Nigerian
Basque, n.e.c.	Ruthenian	South African*
Belgian	Scandinavian*	Other Subsahara African, n.e.c.
Belorussian	Scottish	
Bulgarian	Serbian	<i>Asian</i> (excluding Middle Easterner)
Croatian	Slavic*	Asian Indian
Cypriot	Slovak	Cambodian
Cypriot, Greek	Slovene	Chinese
Cypriot, Turk	Swedish	Filipino
Cypriot, n.e.c.	Swiss	Indonesian
Czech	Ukrainian	Japanese
Danish	Welsh	Korean
Dutch	Yugoslavian*	Laotian
Eastern European*	Other European, n.e.c.	Pakistani
English		Taiwanese
Estonian	<i>North African and Middle Easterner</i>	Thai
European*	Arab/Arabian*	Vietnamese
Finnish	Armenian	Other Asian
French <sup>2</sup>	Assyrian	(excluding Middle Easterner), n.e.c.
German	Egyptian	
Greek	Iraqi	<i>Non-Spanish Caribbean, Central and South American</i>
Gypsy, Rom	Iranian	Bahamian
Hungarian	Israeli	Barbadian
Icelander	Jordanian	Bermudan
Irish	Lebanese	Brazilian
Italian	Moroccan	Dominica Islander
Latvian	Palestinian	Dutch West Indian
Lithuanian	Saudi Arabian	Guyanese
Luxembourger	Syrian	Haitian
Maltese	Turkish	
Manx	Other North African or Middle Easterner, n.e.c.	
Northern Irelander		
Norwegian		

Jamaican	Mexican	<i>North American</i>
Trinidadian and Tobagonian	Nicaraguan	Aleut and Eskimo
Virgin Islander (U.S.)	Panamanian	American Indian
British West Indian, n.e.c.	Peruvian	Canadian
Other West Indian, or Central or South American (excluding Spanish), n.e.c.	Puerto Rican	French Canadian
<i>Spanish</i>	Salvadoran	Other North American, n.e.c.
Argentinean	Spaniard <sup>2</sup>	
Bolivian	Spanish/Hispanic*	
Chilean	Uruguayan	
Colombian	Venezuelan	
Costa Rican	Other Spanish, n.e.c.	
Cuban	<i>Pacific</i>	
Dominican	Australian	
Ecuadoran	Guamanian/Chamorro	
Guatemalan	Hawaiian	
Honduran	Other Pacific, n.e.c.	

\*This category represents a general type of response, which may encompass several ancestry groups.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers and percents by ancestry group do not add to totals because persons reporting a multiple ancestry are included in more than one group (see note above).

<sup>2</sup>Excludes French Basque.

<sup>3</sup>Includes persons who reported as "Russian," "Great Russian," "Georgian," and other related European or Asian groups; see "Definitions and Explanations" for more details.

<sup>4</sup>The majority of persons in this category reported "West Indian."

<sup>5</sup>Excludes Spanish Basque.

## Appendix 2

### Code List for Ancestry Entries in the 1980 Census — Basic Categories

	<u>Codes</u>
I. Western, Northern, and Southern Europe (except Spain)	1-99
II. Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia)	100-199
III. Spanish Categories	200-299
IV. Caribbean, Central, and South American (except Spanish Categories)	300-399
V. North Africa and Southwest Asia	400-499
VI. Subsaharan Africa	500-599
VII. Other Asia	600-799
VIII. Pacific	800-899
IX. North America (except Spanish Categories)	900-919
X. Unique Three-Origin Multiple Ancestry Categories	920-936
XI. Residual Categories and No Response	937-999
XII. Code Ranges for Common Ancestry	1-911

**Appendix 3**

## Code List for Ancestry Entries Used to Classify the 1980 Census Returns — European Ancestry Group Designations with Subheadings\*

---

I. Western, Northern, and Southern Europe (Except Spain)

Acadia <sup>1</sup>	Greek-Cypriote
Acadian <sup>1</sup>	Cypriote-Turk
Cajun <sup>1</sup>	Turkish-Cypriote
<i>Alsatian</i>	<i>Danish</i>
Alsatian	Danish
Alsace-Lorraine	Dane
Lorraine	Denmark
Lorrainian	
	<i>Dutch</i>
<i>Andorran</i>	Dutch
Andorran	Dutchman
Andorra	Hollander
	Holland
<i>Austrian</i>	Netherlander
Austrian	Netherlandic
Austria	Netherlandian
Tirol	Netherlands
Tirolean	Amsterdam
Tirolese	Frisian
Tyrolean	Frisian
Tyrolese	Friesland
Tyrol	Friesian Islands
<i>Basque</i>	<i>English</i>
Basque	English
	England
<i>Belgian</i>	Anglican
Belgian	Mayflower
Belgium	Channel Islander
Flamand	Guernsey Islander
Flanders	Jersey Islander
Flemish	Cornish
Vlamand	Cornwall
Walloon	
	<i>Faeroe Islander</i>
British Isles <sup>2</sup>	Faeroe Islander
British <sup>2</sup>	Faeroes
Briton <sup>2</sup>	Faeroe Islands
Britain <sup>2</sup>	Faroe Islands
Great Britain <sup>2</sup>	
United Kingdom <sup>2</sup>	<i>Finnish</i>
G.B. <sup>2</sup>	Finnish
U.K. <sup>2</sup>	Finn
	Finland
<i>Cypriot</i>	Livonian
Cypriot	Liv
Cyprian	Karelian
Cypriote	Aland Islander
Cyprus	
Cypriote-Greek	

<i>French</i>	Cycladic Islander
French	Dodecanese Islander
France	Peloponnesian
Franco	
French Creole	<i>Icelander</i>
Gascon	Icelander
Provençal	Icelandic
Provence	Iceland
Norman	
Normandy	<i>Irish</i>
Breton	Irish
Brittany	Ireland
Corse	Black Irish
Corsican	Celt
Corsica	Celtic
French Basque	Celtish
Basque (French)	Dubliner
	Dublin
	Eire
<i>German</i>	Irish Free State
German	Clare
Germany	Cork
East German	Donegal
West German	Galway
Pennsylvania Dutch	Kerry
Pennsylvania German	Kildare
Bavarian	Kilkenny
Bavaria	Laoighis
Berlin	Leitrim
Black Sea German	Leix
Volga	Limerick
Hamburg	Longford
Hannover	Louth
Hanover	Mayo
Hessian	Meath
Lubecker	Monaghan
Lusatian Sorb	Offaly
Sorb	Roscommon
Wend	Sligo
Wendish	Tipperary
Prussian	Waterford
Sachsen	Westmeath
Saxon	Wexford
Saxony	Wicklow
Westphalian	
Westfalen	
Sudeten	<i>Italian</i>
Sudetenlander	Italian
Sudetes	Italy
	Italo
<i>Gibraltar</i>	San Marino
Gibraltar	Trieste
Gibraltar	Abruzzi
	Apulian
<i>Greek</i>	Apulia
Greek	Basilicata
Greece	Lucania
Cretan	Calabrian
Crete	Calabria
Cyclades	Amalfian

Amalfitani	<i>Manx</i>
Amalfi	Manx
Campanian	Manx Islander
Campania	Isle of Man
Emilia-Romagna	
Friulian	<i>Monagasque</i>
Friulia	Monagasque
Lazio	Monacan
Vatican City	Monaco
Rome	
Ligurian	<i>Northern Ireland</i>
Liguria	Northern Ireland
Lombard	Ulsterite
Lombardian	Ulsterman
Lombardy	Ulster
Marche	Orangeman
Marches	Antrim
Molise	Armagh
Piedmontese	Down
Piedmont	Fermanagh
Puglia	Derry
Sardinian	Londonderry
Sardegna	Tyrone
Sicilian	
Sicily	<i>Norwegian</i>
Toscana	Norwegian
Tuscan	Norse
Tuscany	Norsk
Trentino	Norway
Umbrian	Jan Meyen Islander
Umbria	Spitsbergen
Valle D'Aosta	Svalbard Islander
Venetian	
Veneto	<i>Portuguese</i>
Venezia	Portuguese
	Lusitanian
<i>Lapp</i>	Lusitania
Lapp	Luso
Lappish	Portugal
Lapland	Azorean
Laplander	Azorian
Samelat	Azores Islander
	Madeiran
<i>Liechtensteiner</i>	Madeira Islander
Liechtensteiner	
Liechtenstein	<i>Scottish</i>
	Scottish
<i>Luxemburger</i>	Scot
Luxemburger	Scotch
Luxemburg	Scotland
Luxembourgeois	Scots
Luxembourger	Scottie
Luxembourg	Orkney Islander
	Pict
<i>Maltese</i>	Pictish
Maltese	Pictish
Malta	Shetland
Gozo	Shetland Island

<i>Swedish</i>	Welch
Swedish	Wales
Swede	
Sweden	<i>Scandinavian</i>
	Scandinavian
<i>Swiss</i>	Scandinavia
Swiss	Nordic
Switzerland	
Schweiz	<i>European</i>
Suisse	Europe
Switzer	
Ladin	<i>Western European</i>
Romansch	West Europe
Romansh	
Ticino	<i>Northern European</i>
Suisse-Romane	North Europe
<i>Welsh</i>	<i>Southern European</i>
Welsh	South Europe

## II. Eastern and Central Europe (including Russia)

<i>Albanian</i>	<b>Chekh</b>
Albanian	<b>Czech</b>
Albania	<b>Tczecoslovakian</b>
Geg	<b>Tczecoslovakia</b>
Gheg	<b>Bohemian</b>
Tosc	<b>Moravian</b>
Tosk	
	<i>Estonian</i>
<i>Armenian</i>	<b>Estonian</b>
Armenian	<b>Estonia</b>
Armenia	
	<i>Georgian</i>
<i>Belorussian</i>	<b>Georgian</b>
Belorussian	<b>Georgia</b>
Byelorussian	
White Russian	<i>Gypsy</i>
	<b>Gypsy</b>
<i>Bulgarian</i>	<b>Rom</b>
Bulgarian	<b>Romani</b>
Bulgar	<b>Rommany</b>
Bulgaria	<b>Romany</b>
Eastern Rumelian	<b>Boyash</b>
Macedonian	<b>Cali</b>
	<b>Dom</b>
<i>Croatian</i>	<b>Kalderash</b>
Croatian	<b>Luri</b>
Croat	<b>Nat</b>
Croatia	<b>Senti</b>
Dalmatian	
Zadar	<i>Hungarian</i>
Zara	<b>Hungarian</b>
	<b>Hungary</b>
<i>Czechoslovakian</i>	<b>Magyar</b>
Czechoslovakian	
Czechoslovakia	<i>Latvian</i>
Czech	<b>Latvian</b>

Latvia	Siberian
Latvi	Buriat
Lett	Buryat
Lettish	Balkar
	Dagestan
<i>Lithuanian</i>	Daghestan
Lithuanian	Komi
Lithuania	Mari
Jmoud	Tuva
	Tuvinian
<i>Polish</i>	Soviet Central Asia
Polish	Azerbaidzhan
Pole	Adjerbajjani
Poland	Azerbaijani
Polonia	Azeris
Polska	Bashkir
Masurian	Chevash
Pomeranian	Chuvash
Pommern	Yakut
Silesian	Kazak
Kashube	Kazakh
Kashubian	Cossack
	Kirghiz
<i>Rumanian</i>	Kirgiz
Rumanian	Mordovian
Romanian	Mordva
Roumanian	Ossetian
Romania	Tadjik
Bessarabian	Tadzhik
Bucovina	Tajik
Bukovina	Tartar
Dobruja	Tatar
Moldavian	Turcoman
Transylvanian	Turkmen
Vlach	Turkmenian
Wallachian	Turkmenistan
	Turestani
<i>Russian</i>	Turkoman
Russian	Turkuman
Russia	Turkomen
Rossiya	Udmurt
Rusyn	Usbeg
Soviet Union	Usbek
U.S.S.R.	Uzbek
Union of the Soviet Socialist Repubics	Uzbek
Black Russian	Votyak
Great Russian	
Muscovite	<i>Ruthenian</i>
Moscow	Ruthenian
Moskva	Ruthenia
Crimean	Little Russian
Kuril Islander	Malo-Russian
Kurile Islander	Red Russian
Kurilian	Carpathian
Sakhalin Islander	Carpatho
Saghalien	
Siber	<i>Serbian</i>
	Serbian

Serb	<i>Yugoslavian</i>
Bosnian	Yugoslavian
Herzegovinian	Yugoslaviav
Montenegrin	Yugoslavia
	Jugoslavia
<i>Slovak</i>	Venezia Giulia
Slovak	
Slovakian	<i>Eastern European</i>
	East Europe
<i>Slovene</i>	
Slovene	<i>Central European</i>
Slovenian	Central Europe
<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Slavic</i>
Ukrainian	Slavic
Ukraine	Slav
	Slavish
	Slavonic
	Slavonian

## III. Spanish Categories — Europe only

<i>Spaniard</i>	Canario(a)
Spaniard	Canary Islander
Spain	Majorcan
Españolo(a)	Majorca
Espana	Mallorcan
Castilian	Mallorquino(a)
Castillian	Mallorca
Castellano(a)	Basque (Spanish)
Castile	Spanish Basque
ibero	Vasco(a)
Iberian	Euskalduna
Valenciano(a)	Catalan(a)
Valencian	Catalonian
Balearic islander	Gallego(a)
Canarian	Gallician

<sup>1</sup>The Census Bureau Code List actually has arranged the ancestry entries according to geographic region. For comparative purposes, they are arranged here in alphabetical order. The subheadings, however, are left in their original order.

<sup>2</sup>Tabulated with French.

<sup>3</sup>Tabulated with English.

## Appendix 4

Revised European Ancestry Groups Proposed to Classify the 1990  
Census Returns

<i>European</i> (excluding Spain)	Italian
Acadian	Italian, n.e.c.
Albanian	Sardinian
Alsatian	Sicilian
Andorran	Jewish
Austrian	Kalmyk
Azerbaijani	Lapp
Basque	Latvian
Basque, French	Liechtensteiner
Basque, Spanish	Lithuanian
Basque, n.e.c.	Luxemburger
Belgian	Macedonian
Fleming	Maltese
Walloon	Manx
Belgian, n.e.c.	Monagasque
Belorussian	Montenegrin
Bosnian Muslim	North Caucasian
Breton	Northern Irish
British, n.e.c.	Norwegian
Bulgarian	Occitan
Carpatho-Rusyn	Pennsylvania German
Cornish	Polish
Corsican	Portuguese
Cossack	Azorean
Croatian	Madeiran
Cypriot	Portuguese, n.e.c.
Cypriot, Greek	Rumanian
Cypriot, Turk	Russian
Cypriot, n.e.c.	San Marino
Czech	Scandinavian
Czechoslovakian, n.e.c.	Scotch-Irish
Danish	Scottish
Dutch	Serbian
Eastern European	Slavic
English	Slovak
Estonian	Slovene
European	Sorbian/Wend
Faeroe Islander	Soviet Turkic groups, n.e.c.
Finnish	Soviet Union, n.e.c.
Finno-Ugrian, n.e.c.	Swedish
French	Swiss
Frisian	Tatar
Friulian	Turkestani
Georgian	Ukrainian
German	Welsh
German from Russia	Windish
Greek	Yugoslavian, n.e.c.
Gypsy/Rom	Other European, n.e.c.
Hungarian	
Icelander	<i>Spanish</i> —Europe only
Irish	Catalan
	Spaniard

## Appendix 5

Revised Code List for European Ancestry Entries Proposed to  
Classify the 1990 Census Returns

## I. Western, Northern, and Southern Europe (except Spain)

<i>Acadian</i>	Briton
Acadian	Channel Islander
Acadia	Gibraltar
Cajun	Gibraltar
French Creole	Great Britain
	G.B.
<i>Asatian</i>	Guernsey Islander
Asatian	Jersey Islander
Alsace-Lorraine	United Kingdom
	U.K.
<i>Andorran</i>	
Andorran	<i>Cornish</i>
Andorra	Cornish
	Cornishman
	Cornwall
<i>Austrian</i>	
Austrian	<i>Corsican</i>
Austria	Corsican
Tirol	Corse
Tirolean	Corsica
Tirolese	Corsu
Tyrol	
Tyrolean	<i>Cypriot</i>
Tyrolese	Cypriot
	Cyprian
<i>Basque</i>	Cypriote
Basque	Cypriote-Greek
Euskalduna	Cypriote-Turk
Euzkadi	Cyprus
French Basque	Greek-Cypriote
Spanish Basque	Turkish-Cypriote
Vasco	
<i>Belgian</i>	<i>Danish</i>
Belgian	Danish
Belgium	Dane
Flamand	Denmark
Flanders	
Fleming	<i>Dutch</i>
Flemish	Dutch
Vlamand	Amsterdam
Walloon	Dutchman
	Holland
<i>Breton</i>	Hollander
Breton	Netherlander
Breizh	Netherlandian
Bretagne	Netherlandic
Brittany	Netherlands
<i>British, n.e.c.</i>	<i>English</i>
British	English
Britain	Anglican
British Isles	England
	Mayflower

<i>Faeroe Islander</i>	Westfalen
Faeroe Islander	West Germany
Faeroe Island	Westphalian
Faeroes	
Faroe Islands	<i>Greek</i>
	Greek
<i>Finnish</i>	Cretan
Finnish	Crete
Finland	Cyclades
Finn	Cycladic Islander
Karelian	Dodecanese Islander
	Greece
<i>French</i>	Peloponnesian
French	
France	<i>Icelander</i>
Franco	Icelander
Gascon	Iceland
Lorraine	Icelandic
Lorrainian	
Norman	<i>Irish</i>
Normandy	Irish
	Black Irish
<i>Frisian</i>	Celt
Frisian	Celtic
Friesian	Celtish
Friesian Islands	Clare
Friesland	Cork
North Friesland	Donegal
	Dublin
<i>Friulian</i>	Dubliner
Friulian	Eire
Friulan	Galway
Friuli	Ireland
Furlan	Irish Free State
Furlane	Kerry
Ladin	Kildare
Ladini	Kilkenny
	Laoighis
<i>German</i>	Leitrim
German	Leix
Bavaria	Limerick
Bavarian	Longford
Berlin	Louth
East German	Mayo
Germany	Meath
Hamburg	Monaghan
Hannover	Offaly
Hanover	Roscommon
Hessian	Sligo
Lubecker	Tipperary
Pomeranian	Waterford
Pommern	Westmeath
Prussian	Wexford
Sachsen	Wicklow
Saxon	
Saxony	<i>Italian</i>
Sudeten	Italian
Sudetenlander	Abruzzi
Sudetes	Amalfi

Amalfian	<i>Maltese</i>
Amalfitani	Maltese
Apulia	Gozo
Apulian	Malta
Basilicata	
Calabria	<i>Manx</i>
Calabrian	Manx
Campania	Isle of Man
Campanian	Manx Islander
Emilia-Romagna	
Italo	<i>Monegasque</i>
Italy	Monegasque
Lazio	Monacan
Liguria	Monaco
Ligurian	
Lombard	<i>Northern Irishlander</i>
Lombardian	Northern Irishlander
Lombardy	Antrim
Lucania	Armagh
Marche	Derry
Marches	Down
Molise	Fermanagh
Piedmont	Londonderry
Piedmontese	Northern Ireland
Puglia	Orangeman
Rome	Tyrone
Sardegna	Ulster
Sardinian	Ulsterite
Sicilian	Ulsterman
Sicily	
Toscana	<i>Norwegian</i>
Trentino	Norwegian
Fuscan	Jan Meven Islander
Fuscany	Norse
Umbria	Norsk
Umbrian	Norway
Valle D'Aosta	Spitsbergen
Vatican City	Svalbard Islander
Venetian	
Veneto	<i>Occitan</i>
Venezia	Occitan
	Occitanie
<i>Lapp</i>	Provencal
Lapp	Provence
Lapland	
Laplander	<i>Pennsylvania German</i>
Lappish	Pennsylvania German
Samelat	Amish
	Pennsylvania Dutch
<i>Liechtensteiner</i>	
Liechtenstein	<i>Portuguese</i>
Liechtenstein	Portuguese
	Azorean
<i>Luxemburger</i>	Azores Islander
Luxemburger	Azorian
Luxembourg	Lusitania
Luxembourgeois	Lusitanian
Luxembourger	Luso
Luxemburg	Madeira Islander

Madreran	—	Romansh
Portugal	—	Schweiz
		Suisse
<i>San Marino</i>		Suisse-Romane
San Marino		Switzer
		Switzerland
<i>Scotch-Irish</i>		Ticino
Scotch-Irish		
		<i>Welsh</i>
<i>Scottish</i>		Welsh
Scottish		Wales
Orkney Islander		Welch
Piet		
Pietish		<i>European</i>
Scot		European
Scotch		Central Europe
Scotland		Central European
Scots		Europe
Scottie		North Europe
Shetland		Northern European
Shetland Island		South Europe
		Southern European
<i>Swedish</i>		West Europe
Swedish		Western European
Aland Islander		
Swede		<i>Scandinavian</i>
Sweden		Scandinavian
		Nordic
<i>Swiss</i>		Scandinavia
Swiss		
Romansch		

II. Eastern and Central Europe (including the Soviet Union)

<i>Albanian</i>	<i>Bosnian Muslim</i>
Albanian	Bosnian Muslim
Albania	Bosanci
Arberesh	Bosnjaci
Geg	Bosnjak
Gheg	Muslim Croat
Italo-Albanian	Muslim Serb
Kossovo	
Tosc	<i>Bulgarian</i>
Tosk	Bulgarian
	Bulgar
<i>Azerbaijani</i>	Bulgaria
Azerbaijani	Bulgaro-Macedonian
Adzerbaijani	Eastern Rmelian
Azeri	
	<i>Carpatho-Rusyn</i>
<i>Belorussian</i>	Carpatho-Rusyn
Belorussian	Byzantine
Byelorussian	Carpathian
White Russian	Carpatho-Rus
White Ruthenian	Carpatho-Russian

Carpatho-Ruthenian	—	<i>German from Russia</i>
Lemko	—	German from Russia
Rus		Black Sea German
Rusin		Russian German
Rusnak		Volga German
Rusyn		Volhynian German
Ruthenian		
		<i>Gypsy/Rom</i>
<i>Cossack</i>		Gypsy
Cossack		Boyash
Don Cossack		Cali
Orenburg Cossack		Dom
Terek Cossack		Gitanos
Ural Cossack		Kalderash
		Luri
<i>Croatian</i>		Manouche
Croatian		Nat
Croat		Rom
Croatia		Romani
Dalmatian		Romany
Slavonian		Rommany
Zadar		Romnichal
Zara		Senti
		Xoraxaya
<i>Czech</i>		
Czech		<i>Hungarian</i>
Bohemian		Hungarian
Chech		Hungary
Chekh		Magyar
Moravian		Szekler
<i>Czechoslovakian, n.e.c.</i>		<i>Jewish</i>
Czechoslovakian		Jewish
Czechoslovak		Ashkenazim Jew
Czechoslovakia		Sephardic Jew
Tczechoslovakia		Sephardim
Tczechoslovakian		Yiddish
<i>Estonian</i>		<i>Kalmyk</i>
Estonian		Kalmyk
Estonia		Kalmuck
Liv		
Livonian		<i>Latvian</i>
		Latvian
<i>Finno-Ugrian, n.e.c.</i>		Latvi
Komi		Latvia
Mari		Lett
Mordovian		Lettish
Mordva		
Mordvin		<i>Lithuanian</i>
Udmurt		Lithuanian
Voytak		Jmoud
		Lithuania
<i>Georgian</i>		
Georgian		<i>Macedonian</i>
Gruziia		Macedonian
Gruzinets		Macedonia
		Slavophone

<i>Montenegrin</i>	—	<i>Serbian</i>
Montenegrin		Serbian
Crna Gora		Serb
<i>North Caucasian</i>		<i>Slovak</i>
North Caucasian		Slovak
Abkhazian		Slovakian
Adyge		Slovjak
Adzharian		
Avar		<i>Slovene</i>
Balkar		Slovene
Caucasus Mountains		Slovenian
Chechen		<i>Sorbian/Wend</i>
Cherkess		Sorbian
Circassian		Lusatia
Dagestani		Lusatian Serb
Darghinian		Lusatian Sorb
Gortsy		Wend
Ingush		Wenden
Kabardinian		
Karachay		<i>Soviet Turkic groups, n.e.c.</i>
Kumyk		Bashkir
Lezghian		Chuvash
Ossetian		Tuva
Tavlintsy		Tuvinian
		Yakut
<i>Polish</i>		
Polish		<i>Soviet Union, n.e.c.</i>
Gorali		Soviet Union
Kashube		Kuril Islander
Kashubian		Kurilian
Masurian		Saghalien
Poland		Sakhalin Islander
Pole		Siber
Polonia		Siberian
Polska		Union of Soviet
Slovjince		Socialist Republics
		U.S.S.R.
<i>Rumanian</i>		
Rumanian		<i>Tatar</i>
Bessarabian		Tatar
Dobruja		Crimean
Moldavian		Crimean Tatar
Romania		Kazan Tatar
Romanian		Nogay Tatar
Roumanian		Polish Tatar
Vlach		Tartar
Wallachian		Volga Tatar
<i>Russian</i>		<i>Turkestanti</i>
Russian		Turkestanti
Black Russian		Karakalpak
Galician Russian		Kazak
Great Russian		Kazakh
Little Russian		Kirghiz
Malo-Russian		Kirzig
Moscovite		Tadjik
Muscovite		Tadjik
Red Russian		Tadjik
Russia		Tadjik

Turcoman	<i>Yugoslavian, n.e.c.</i>
Turkmen	Yugoslavian
Turkmenian	Bosnian
Turkmenistan	Hercegovinian
Turkomen	Jugoslavia
Uigur	Venezia Giulia
Usbeg	Yugoslav
Usbek	Yugoslavia
Uzbek	<i>Eastern European</i>
	Eastern European
<i>Ukrainian</i>	Bucovina
Ukrainian	Bukovina
Carpatho-Ukrainian	East Europe
Galician Ukrainian	Galicja
Ukraine	Galician
	Silesia
<i>Windish</i>	Transylvania
Windish	
Prekmurje	<i>Slavic</i>
Vind	Slavic
Wind	Slav
Windisch	Slavish
	Slavonic

### III. Spanish Categories — Europe only

<i>Catalan</i>	Canarian
Catalan	Canario
Balearic Islander	Canary Islander
Catalonia	Castellano
Catalonian	Castile
Majorca	Castilian
Majorcan	Castillian
Mallorca	Espana
Mallorcan	Espanol
Mallorquin	Gallego
	Iberan
<i>Spaniard</i>	Ibero
Spaniard	Spain
Andalusian	Valencian
Asturian	Valenciano

---