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Abstract: This article proposes a study of the usage of the concept of “Galicia” in the leading Jewish political newspaper of interwar Eastern Galicia (southeastern Poland), the Zionist daily Chwila. The use of “Galicia” is analyzed along with its main concurrent in the public sphere, the term “Małopolska” (Lesser Poland). Each term had its realm of usage, while each was caused by a distinct kind of motivation. “Lesser Poland” dominated the political and common sphere as the name of the former Austrian part of Poland, while “Galicia” was reserved mostly for writing about cultural issues and stereotypes. “Lesser Poland” was supposedly accepted by Galician Zionists as a tool to express their loyalty to the newly restored Polish Republic, while “Galicia” was preserved as an instrument for communication with other Galician Jews abroad and their common Austrian past, as well as an instrument of othering them from the outside. Both terms continued to be used in such a way throughout the entire interwar period.

The history of the concept of “Galicia” was described by Larry Wolff. During the long 19th century, the name “Galicia” designated the easternmost province of the Habsburg Monarchy. Although the concept had medieval roots, it was newly introduced in the late 18th century by the Habsburgs for the part of partitioned Poland they annexed in 1772. Austrian Galicia ceased to exist after the collapse of the empire in 1918. Still, by that time, the term “Galician” had become a significant part of the identity of each of the three large national communities of the region – Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews. Even though “Galicia” as an official term was not used by any regime that held control over the former Habsburg province during the short 20th century, it reappeared with the fall of communism, and it still functions actively in public discourses of the Poland and Ukraine of today.¹

Wolff finished his book with a chapter called “Galicia after Galicia” where he briefly described the image of Galicia after 1918, when the province ceased to exist.² This article deals with the period that immediately followed the fall of the Habsburgs, the

interwar time, and focuses on the community that probably most articulated, culturally and politically, its belonging to Galicia – the Galician Jews.

Jews made up one of three main national communities of the region. It was less numerous than the two other communities of Poles and Ukrainians, but it was significantly represented among the urban population – and in some Galician towns (such as Brody) it made up the majority. Galician Jews had formed their own type of culture and identity. During the Habsburg times, they were distinctive both from the rest of Austrian Jews, especially from those living in Vienna, and – due to their particular Habsburg experience – from the rest of the Ostjuden, to which they traditionally belonged. They preserved their distinctive features once they became citizens of the interwar Poland, vis-à-vis the rest of Polish Jews (Jews of the Polish Republic), who before 1918 almost entirely belonged to the Russian Empire. Galician Jews were poor and mostly not acculturated like other Ostjuden, but, in contrast to them, enjoyed a much better juridical status, especially after the emancipation of 1867. The former difference was significant within the Habsburg Empire; the latter one, however, played an important role within the Polish Republic.

Within interwar Poland, the former Galicia was split into four distinct voivodeships (województwa). It also got a new name, “Lesser Poland” (Polish: Małopolska). Even though the new term was never introduced officially by any specific governmental decision and was never applied in the Polish Republic’s administrative division, it was widely used in political and public discourses. Very much like the name of “Galicia,” the concept of “Lesser Poland” also had medieval roots. It originally designated one of the main Polish historical regions centered in Krakow, but its medieval borders hardly coincided with those of Austrian Galicia. Thus, this article describes not simply the time when Galicia as a political entity ceased to exist, but also when the newly restored Polish Republic did its level best to integrate its former partitions into a single unitary state, in particular by replacing former terminology.

As the main source for analysis, this study uses the daily Chwila. Published from January 1919 until September 1939, Chwila was the most popular and most influential Jewish newspaper in Lviv/Lwów/Lemberg, the former capital of Galicia, with a circulation that reached 35,000 copies at its peak. Chwila was dedicated to political, social, and cultural affairs, and it devoted much attention to local and regional issues. The paper was founded by members of the Jewish National Council of Lwów as its main press organ and later on, throughout next two decades, it represented the East Galician Zionist Federation. Two of the paper’s founders, Henryk Rosmarin and Dawid Schreiber, were deputies to the parliament of the Polish Republic, the Sejm, from the East Galician Zionist Federation (Rosmarin headed the Federation in 1930s). The paper’s chief editor since 1920 till the end was Henryk Hescheles, a political journalist as well as a literary and theatre critic, and a member of Lwów city council. Chwila’s editors and publishers mostly belonged to the highly educated Jewish intelligentsia, acculturated into Polish culture. However, Chwila as the main source of this study comes with some restrictions.

---

4 Throughout this article I use the term “Lwów” as the name of the city, since such was its official designation throughout the interwar period.
First of all, although former Habsburg Galicia was administratively a single province, politically and culturally it consisted of two parts, Western Galicia, mostly Polish with its center in Krakow, and Eastern Galicia, with a Ukrainian majority and Lwów as its center. In the interwar period, both cities were the centers of two distinct Jewish Zionist federations, those of West and East Galicia, respectively. *Chwila* was the main press organ of Lwów Zionism, thus it does not reflect the views of West Galician Zionists.

Secondly, although *Chwila* was the leading Jewish newspaper in East Galicia, it was published in Polish, which made it more open to Polish discursive influences than those Jewish papers published in Yiddish or Hebrew. And last but not least, as a published paper *Chwila* provides only the public side of Lwów’s Zionist discourse, leaving aside its private, non-public component.

Thus, to be more precise, this article aims to reveal the usage of the term “Galicia” in the public Polish-speaking discourse of the East Galician Zionist movement based in Lwów, as represented by its leading newspaper.

Although dedicated mostly to Jewish themes, as a general political newspaper *Chwila* reflected other different discourses, in which the main role was played by the governmental and Polish ones but also the local Ukrainian one. All these discourses demand distinct attention. Thus, I will try to demonstrate, first, how the concepts of “Galicia” and “Lesser Poland” operated in *Chwila*’s broadcasting of the official and Polish discourses, and then, how *Chwila* used both concepts in the Jewish context.

**“Lesser Poland”: A new governmental term**

In the Polish public sphere the concept of “Galicia” had to compete with the alternative term of “Lesser Poland.” Katarzyna Hibiel analyzed the usage of both concepts in interwar Polish discourses and came to a conclusion that the term “Lesser Poland” dominated in Polish official and public discourses, while “Galicia” continued to appear only in the publications of leftist and liberal authors.7

For *Chwila*, the term “Lesser Poland” was introduced around the spring of 1919 through the governmental discourse. I will try to demonstrate this by the example of the newly created governmental bodies, especially those concerned with the issue of coal, as they grappled with the severe supply crisis affecting the region.

As early as in January 1919, the paper reported about the establishment of the new “Governmental Commission for Galicia, Silesia, Spiż and Orawa” [Komisyi Rządżącej dla Galicyi, Śląska, Spiżu i Orawy].8 In March, it was replaced by the newly introduced “Government’s Delegate for Galicia” [Delegat Rządu dla Galicyi].9 A few months after the reestablishment of the Polish state, both these governmental bodies created in January-March 1919 for governing the former Austrian part still contained the old term of “Galicia” in their names.
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7 Hibiel 2014: 254.
9 Hibiel 2014: 122.
Instead, already in April, as the paper reported, the “East-Galician industrialists” [przemysłowcy wschodnio-galicyjscy] who needed additional coal in the midst of the supply crisis might approach the new regional “Lesser Poland branch of the Ministry of Industry and Trade” [oddział małopolskiego ministerstwa przemysłu i handlu].10 In a governmental report in April, the industrialists still continued to belong to “Galicia,” while the new state institution already contained the new term for designating the region.

The new term could possibly have confused readers, as at least a month later the Ministry tried to explain its meaning in brackets: it was offering the coal for “industry in the eastern part of Lesser Poland (eastern Galicia)” [w wschodniej połaci Małopolski (wschodnia Galicya)].11 In the same way, in a report of Lwów municipals, Lesser Poland’s coal (obviously, the official term) was simultaneously called Galician (perhaps to explain) in brackets: “węgiel małopolski (galicyjski).”12 It seems that in this way the authorities were trying to clarify to the readers exactly what the term, well known from ancient Polish history and now being re-introduced, meant now, under the new political circumstances.

![Figure 1. A diagram illustrating the usage of the terms “Galicia” and “Lesser Poland” in Chwila by year](image)

Figure 1. A diagram illustrating the usage of the terms “Galicia” and “Lesser Poland” in Chwila by year

In other words, the term “Lesser Poland” began to appear in Chwila during the spring of 1919, first – here, in the case of coal – in the names of newly created governmental bodies, and then gradually, as an alternative designation of the region, mostly in the relaying messages of the authorities. The same year in September, the former branch of “Provisioning Ministry for former Austrian partition” [Ministerstwa aprowizacyi dla ziem byłego zaboru austryackiego] was replaced by the new “Provisioning Committee

10 “Kronika,” Chwila 27 April 1919, no. 103.
for Lesser Poland” [Wydział Spraw Aprowadzajnych dla Małopolski] which was to operate “on the territory of former Galicia” [na ziemi byłe Galicyi].

In general, during 1919, both terms were used almost synonymously, often in the same publications: in July, Chwila reported, “the delegation from Lesser Poland” [delegacya z Małopolski] arrived in Warsaw to deliver “the postulates of Galicia regarding the coal issue” [postulaty Galicyi w sprawie węglowej] and to draw the government’s attention to the “disastrous situation in Lesser Poland” [katastrofalne położenie w Małopolsce].

Figure 1 shows a diagram of the usage of the terms “Galicia” and “Lesser Poland” in Chwila by year. These are the results of an electronic search, so they are not capable of presenting the entire picture, but it may indicate at least one important trend.

As the diagram reveals, in 1919, a year after the restoration of Poland, the term “Galicia” still dominated over its concurrent. But further on, especially after 1923, the year when the issue of Eastern Galicia was finally resolved in favor of Poland, the usage of “Galicia” sharply fell, and during the 1920–30s “Lesser Poland” was used four to five times more often.

Geographically, “Lesser Poland” meant the same as “Galicia”: the four voivodships of Lwów, Krakow, Stanisławów, and Tarnopol, whose territories had belonged to Habsburgs until 1918. However, the usage of the two terms differed thematically, and I will try to demonstrate this tendency.

“Galicia”: Three spheres of the “old” term

There were three main areas where “Galicia” continued to be used with almost no alternative: the Ukrainian theme, the history of Habsburg Galicia, and the Galician Jewish diaspora in America. The first two themes are not the object of this research; thus I explain them only briefly.

Galician Ukrainians, who were in conflict with Poles over East Galicia in 1918–1923 and did not recognize, at least in their rhetoric, the belonging of the region to Polish Republic throughout the interwar years, did not accept the new term “Lesser Poland” in their public discourse, and continued to call their region “Galicia” and themselves “Galicians.” So, usually, did Chwila when mentioning local Ukrainians: even if the paper “transported” them geographically to “Lesser Poland,” it did not change their regional belongingness. For example, in 1929 Jews were concerned with the economic competition of “Galician Ukrainians” because of their great cooperative success in “Eastern Lesser Poland.” In other words, even if, for Chwila, the interwar Ukrainians of the region began to reside in “Lesser Poland,” they continued to be “Galician.” Moreover, in most of its “Ukrainian” publications, especially while relaying publications of
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13 “Rozporządzenie,” Chwila 30 September 1919, no. 255.
15 “Mizerya węglowa Galicyi,” Chwila 9 July 1919, no. 175.
16 The diagram presents the amounts of Chwila issues where the appropriate term was mentioned due to the search at the Polona digital library: https://polona.pl.
17 Hibbel 2014: 238, 253, 255.
the local Ukrainian papers such as Dilo, Chwila did not usually change the original term used there, thus allowing “Galicia” to remain an actual political and geographical entity within the Ukrainian context.19

The history of Habsburg Galicia, and particularly of the Jews of Habsburg Galicia, takes a significant role in the paper’s discourse. Its image was rather ambivalent and combined the irony over “Galician corruption” [galicyjskiej korupcji]20 or “elections in Galician fashion” [wyborów na modłę galicyjską]21 with notes of nostalgia for the liberal regime of the monarchy when “the deceased Austria […] kindly looked after her subjected peoples” [nieboszczka Austria […] opiekowała się miłościwie poddanymi jej ludami].22

The reports about Galician Jews in America [Żydów Galicyjskich w Ameryce], with their institutions such as Galitzianer Verband and cultural features, appeared regularly throughout the interwar period. In these reports, Chwila usually distinguished between Jews who originated from Galicia and those from Congress Poland, calling the former “Galician” and the latter “Polish.” Both groups, who had formed their distinct federations in the USA, were considered distinct groups on par with Jews from other countries; for example, in 1933 the paper mentioned “federations of Polish, Romanian and Galician Jews” [federacyj Żydów polskich, rumuńskich czy galicyjskich] based in New York.23

“Lesser Poland”: The old region with a new name

The fact that the term “Galicia” disappeared from the current political context does not mean that the region itself has lost its political relevance. This relevance was simply articulated by another term. Until 1939, “Eastern Lesser Poland” remained a relevant political entity with its numerous institutions – both governmental as well as non-governmental organizations – for a wide variety of fields. Chwila regularly reported on their activity.

Some of them mentioned in the paper operated only in the eastern part of former Galicia. Among them were the Congress of Liqueur and Vodka Manufacturers of Eastern Lesser Poland [Zjazd fabrykantów likierów i wódek Wschodniej Małopolski],24 the Pharmacy Chamber of Eastern Lesser Poland [Izba aptekarska Małopolski wschodniej],25 and the Union of Sawmills in Eastern Lesser Poland [Związek tartaków Wschodniej Małopolski].26 Some of them covered the entire territory of the former Austrian parti-

---


26 Ibid., 10 February 1923, no. 1410: 8.
tion, such as the Lesser Polish Agrarian Society [Małopolskie Towarzystwo Rolnicze we Lwówie] 27 with its seat in Lwów the Association of Lesser Polish Sugar Factories [Związek Małopolskich Cukrowni] 28 which had storage facilities in both Lwów and Krakow. Moreover, throughout the interwar period, the three East Galician voivodships were united by governmental bodies such as the Lwów school and appellate districts. Some of those institutions, such as the Economic Council for Eastern Lesser Poland [Rada Gospodarcza Małopolski Wschodniej], were founded even a year before the collapse of the Second Republic. 29

It is worth noting that all these organizations contained the new governmental term in their names. However, one of the most significant old Galician institutions preserved its traditional name until almost the end of the period: it was only in April 1939 that Chwila reported the Galician Savings Bank [Galicysjka Kasa Oszczędności] was being transformed into the Central Lesser Polish Savings Bank [Centralna Małopolska Kasa Oszczędności]. 30 Obviously, it only operated under its new name for a few months before the Soviet invasion.

Interestingly, “Eastern Lesser Poland,” which consisted of three separate voivodships, often appeared as an integrated region, as if it were still a distinct province even outside the governmental or institutional contexts: in 1939, the weather forecast was reported for Wileńskie, Polesie, Wołyń and Eastern Lesser Poland 31 – only the last on this list was not a separate administrative province within the Second Republic.

The main reason for such viability of the region was likely the fact that interwar Poland itself was a state of three, sometimes even four, macro-regions, cobbled together after 150 years of operating under separate systems. These were the former Russian, German and Austrian parts of Poland, with their own names in public discourse: Congress Poland/Kongresówka or Kingdom/Królestwo for the post-Russian part; Greater Poland/Wielkopolska or Poznańskie for post-German part; and Galicia/Galicja or Lesser Poland/Małopolska for the post-Austrian part. The fourth part often distinguished was the territory to the east which had belonged to Russian Empire but not to the Polish Kingdom within it This was known as “kresy wschodnie” (Eastern Borderlands), and before 1918 it was often also called the “Taken Lands/Annexed Lands” (in Polish: “Ziemie Zabrane”). And even if in 1939 these four parts of Poland were much closer to each other than in 1919, they still preserved many of their economic, social, cultural and political features throughout the period. 32

These deep regional divisions among different parts of Poland was also existed for the Jewish community.

First of all, the Jews of Lwów and the region also built their own East-Galician/East-Lesser-Polish cultural, political and economic structures. These included, for instance, as mentioned in Chwila, “Keren Hayesod for Eastern Lesser Poland” 33 and the “first Con-
gress of Tarbut organizations in Eastern Lesser Poland,” held in 1929. Some of them also operated in East Galicia, and some covered the whole region, such as the “Union of Associations for the Share of Professional Education among Jews of Lesser Poland.” Some of them also, according to the reports in Chwila, were founded not earlier than in the last year of Polish Republic, such as “Gmidath Chesed Central Cash-desk for Lesser Poland” with the seat in Lwów. The last example also approves that for Jews, the region stayed actual until 1939 as well.

Even in those institutions which covered the whole of Poland, Lwów Jews tended to defend their interests against what they called the centralist policy of Warsaw: In 1929, as Chwila reported, representatives of “Lesser Poland” suggested that the Union of Jewish Cooperatives in Poland “replace the former Varsovian centralism with decentralization in the form of regions covering one or more voivodships with close economic and social relations. […] The whole Lesser Poland was to constitute a distinct region.”

Even more, the Jews of East Galicia, unlike Poles, had their distinct political representation, often separate from Warsaw. The most influential of them was the Zionist Organization of Eastern Lesser Poland, the press organ of which was Chwila. For the entire interwar period in the Polish Republic there were four distinct Zionist federations, one each for Congress Poland, Wilno, East Galicia, and West Galicia. Besides the General Zionism movement, other political parties also had their separate branches for this region. For example, Poale Zion had in the interwar Poland three different branches of which one, the Poale Zion Left, was most influential in Congress Poland; another branch, the Poale Zion Right, was much stronger in Krakow than in Warsaw, and the distinct Poale Zion Right faction operated in East Galicia.

This disunity, and often conflicts, between distinct Jewish representations in Poland led Ezra Mendelsohn speak of distinct “Polish Jewries” rather than a single “Jewry.” The naming of these institutions also underwent an evolution which quietly coincided with the general practice of Chwila using both terms. While in 1919 one could hardly find “Lesser Poland” concerning Jewish activity in East Galicia, in 1923 both terms appeared in names of Jewish representations and Zionist federations synonymously, and
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34 “Dla odrodzenia języka hebrajskiego,” Chwila 1 January 1929, no. 3511: 3.
36 Chwila 20 April 1939, no. 7210a: 4.
38 On divisions within Polish Jews, see: Bacon 2018: 324–337.
41 Thus, as early as in January 1919, Chwila reported on the congress of Jewish National Councils of East Galicia (“Zjazd żydowskich Rad Narodowych wschodniej Galicji,” established to represent Jewish community after the fall of Habsburg monarchy) held then in Stanisławów. “Deklaracya polityczna wschodnio-galicyjskich Żydów”; Chwila 14 January 1919, no. 4: 1).
42 In January 1923 Leon Reich was the leader of the Union of the Jewish parliamentary deputies of East Galicia (“Związk posiłów żyd. wsch. galicyjskich.”). See: “Posiedzenie Rady partyjnej”; Chwila 3 January 1923, no. 1372: 6. However, the next month he headed the Union of the Jewish parliamentary deputies of East
by 1929 almost all Jewish organizations, as those mentioned above, were referred to in the paper as “Lesser Polish.”

It seems that the year 1923, when East Galicia was officially recognized as part of the Polish Republic, was a caesura in which Chwila stopped, at least in official reports, calling Zionist and other Jewish organizations “Galician,” decisively replacing this term with “Lesser Poland”/“Lesser Polish.”

In April 1929, Chwila reported on an “evening of Jewish Lesser Polish literature” [wieczór twórczości żydowskiej małopolskiej] which was a prelude to the “Congress of Jewish poets and writers from Lesser Poland” [zjazd literatów i poetów żydowskich z Małopolski]. In 1929, ten years after the governmental introduction, “Lesser Poland” became not only a geographical entity within Polish Republic, but also a defined cultural area for Jews with their own kind of literary output.

Moreover, ten years later, the term “Lesser Poland” appeared in an area where it had never occurred before. In March 1939, Chwila reported that the “Union of Galician Jews in America” [Związek Żydów Galicyjskich w Ameryce] had convened a congress where “all landsmanshaftn of Lesser Polish Jews in the United States” [wszystkie ziomkostwa Żydów małopolskich w Stanach Zjednoczonych] are expected to take part. This synonymity of both terms, which in the sphere of the state policy appears at the very beginning in 1919 and in the sphere of Jewish policy declined after 1923, came to appear until the end of 1930s even in the sphere of Galician Jewish émigrés in America.

“Lesser Poland”: The intentions of new discourse

Despite this great success of the term “Lesser Poland,” which during the interwar period penetrated into more and more spheres of Jewish life in Chwila discourse, in the field of Jewish policy the term “Galicia” continued to sporadically appear parallel to “Lesser Poland,” sometimes even in the same publications. However, such examples can be found mostly not in the editorials but in authorial texts.

To confirm, I will cite several texts by Leon Reich from 1929. In one of his articles, Reich three times mentioned the terrain on which his party operated: first he called it “our area, East Lesser Poland” [na naszym terenie, w Małopolsce wschodniej], and the next two times he is already speaking of the “East Galician field” [na odcinku wschodnio-galicyjskim]. There were no contextual differences between these three mentions.

Sometimes, such parallel use of both terms could be provided by a reference to the historical context. In another article of the same year, Reich first calls his federation “East Lesser Polish,” but then complains about statements by opponents of the “East
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44 “Zjazd żydow galicyjskich w Ameryce,” Chwila 10 March 1939, no. 7171a: 7.
Galician representation” [przedstawicielstwo wschodnio-galicyjskie], and that its activities resembled “old Galician pre-war assimilation.” [starogalicyjską asymilacją przedwojenną] The context of the Austrian Galician past was actualized by the transfer of the corresponding term to the present.

For comparison, the same year an editorial in the Chwila about a speech by Reich at the regional Zionist conference did not contain any mention of “Galicia.” Reich, like in previous articles, mentions several times the regional federation, the parliamentarians from the region, the terrain, and the like, but here, in the editorial version, each time the matter concerned “Eastern Lesser Poland.”

It is unclear whether it was Reich himself who, despite in the same year using the term “Galicia” in his articles intended for a broad audience, does not use it now, for a much narrower circle of members of his party, It may have been the newspaper’s editor who, in translating the leader’s speech from the internal sphere to the public, adapted his rhetoric to a more appropriate form. One example does not allow radical conclusions to be drawn. It does however show a general trend: in the editorials I have reviewed since 1923, I did not find practically any designation of the region as “Galicia” in a political context, although it does occur in some influential authors, such as Reich. It seems that the consistent use of “Lesser Poland” was part of Chwila’s editorial policy.

It is important to note that the term “Galicia” was never forcibly removed from public use by any government decree, and its use was not censored in the press. For Polish and Jewish publications the transition to the new terminology, although inspired from above, was purely voluntary.

If so, it is worth pondering the intentions of the Lwów Zionist periodical for adopting new terminology. Several speeches by Jewish deputies in the Sejm of 1923, literally quoted in Chwila, may shed some light on this.

Thus, the same Leon Reich mentioned in his speech that shortly after the war began in 1914, “the Austrian authorities in eastern Lesser Poland” [władze austryackie w Małopolsce wsch.] appointed a government commissioner as the head of the Jewish community in Lviv and complained that the Polish government still did not consider it appropriate to return self-government to the Jewish communities in Lwów and “most cities in Lesser Poland” [większej części miast Małopolski]. Wanting to link the events of 1914 to current politics, Reich used the term irrelevantly to the context he was speaking about, but relevantly to his time, to the audience he spoke to, and to his aims. Speaking to the Polish Parliament, seeking to achieve his goal, the politician chose to use the appropriate terminology.

The same year, Senator Jakub Bodek, a Zionist from Lwów, stated from the rostrum that “at the time when, due to the lack of Polish officials, there was a dangerous vacancy in former Congress Poland and Poznańskie, officials from Lesser Poland rushed there for the first call” [w czasie gdy z powodu braku urzędników Polaków zapanował
niebezpieczny wakans w b. Kongresówce i w Poznańskiem, urzędnicy z Małopolski pospieszyli tam na pierwsze wezwanie. Further, he complained about the tendency, due to the influence of chauvinistic sentiments, to dismiss Jewish officials “in former Austrian partition, in Lesser Poland, where the Jewish officials […] fulfilled and are still fulfilling their duties very conscientiously and for the benefit of the state” [w b. zaborze austryackim w Małopolsce, gdzie urzędnicy Żydzi […] spełniali i spełniają dotychczas swoje obowiązki bardzo sumiennie i z pożytkiem dla Państwa].

Before World War I, Austrian Galicia was indeed the only part of pre-partition Poland where a Polish bureaucratic class had been formed during the several decades of autonomous rule. Moreover, thanks to the Austrian liberal regime, Galicia was the only Polish region where a significant proportion of officials were Jews. With the Polish state’s revival, cadres from former Galicia, including Jews, indeed did fill many vacancies in other regions.

The same year, 1923, another Zionist member of the Sejm from Lwów David Schreiber argued for the same reason that “the state officials from Lesser Poland [were] the main core of state officials […] without which keeping the state machine in motion would be unthinkable” [pracownicy państwowi z Małopolski […] główny rdzeń urzędników państwowych, […] bez których utrzymanie machiny państwowej w ruchu nawet pomyśleć by się nie dało]. Here, both deputies, seeking to defend the Jewish officials’ interests from the parliamentary rostrum, proved both their loyalty and importance to the state. Significantly, they did it in terms of “Lesser Poland.”

Hence, my first assumption is that the editors of Chwila and the Lwów’s Zionists so willingly accepted the concept of “Lesser Poland” precisely because it served them as an expression of their loyalty to the Polish state. To be sure, the Jews of Eastern Galicia, in the words of Leon Reich “caught between two peoples,” accused by part of Polish society of “betrayal” because of their neutrality in the Polish-Ukrainian war of 1918–1919 over the region, needed to express their loyalty particularly sharply. Adopting the term, which was a litmus test of loyalty to the Polish cause in the region, was the best tool for that. For comparison, the Galician Ukrainians flatly refused to accept the term, while not recognizing the legitimacy of Polish rule over Eastern Galicia.

Besides the expression of loyalty, could there be any other motivation for accepting the new term? And what played the more crucial role here, the desire to attach to a new concept, or perhaps to dissociate from the old one?

“Galicia”: The discourse from outside

To find the answer, it is worth taking a deeper look at how the concept of “Galicia” continued to be used in the newspaper. In addition to the three areas mentioned first and the rare permeation of political topics into some texts, there was one other feature in the
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49 “Uposażenie urzędników państw. Mowa senatora J. Bodeka,” Chwila 1 October 1923, no. 1638: 3.
use of this term. “Galicia” often appeared also within the discourse from the outside. Let me consider a few cases.

In another article, Leon Reich expressed the hope that the Jewish faction leaders in the Polish parliament (who came from Congress Poland) would realize that “not all proposals and initiatives from the “East Galician” side have a personal basis” [nie wszelkie propozycje i poczynania, pochodzące ze strony “wschodnio-galicyjskiej,” mają podłoże osobiste]. Here, Reich put the designation “East Galician” in the mouths of his opponents from another part of Poland, with a clearly negative connotation.

A similar tendency could be observed on the international Jewish scale as well. In 1933, a correspondent of Chwila reported from the World Congress of General Zionists that there was a dominating idea that the entire course of General Zionism “was a Galician creation” [Jest to twór galicyjski]. The only representative of Congress Poland at the Congress Yehoshua Gottlieb stated that “he actually does not know what that General Zionism i.e. Galicia wants.” [on właściwie nie wie, czego ten ogólny sjonizm t.j. Galicja chce] The correspondent himself concluded that “in general, Lesser Poland is a leader here among general Zionists. We are considered to be the creators of the whole ideology” [Wogóle Małopolska jest tu kierującą wśród ogólnych sjonistów. Uważa się nas za twórców całej ideologii].

Notably, here, “Lesser Poland” appears in the author’s conclusion for the local reader, together with the collective “we,” while “Galicia” both times appears in the words said by someone there, at the World Congress.

This suggests my second assumption that even if “Lesser Poland” became for former Galician Jews an actual name of their “small motherland” in the inner public discourse, it was “Galicia” that was still preserved as a name of the region from outside, among the world’s Jews, and, in case of the delegate Gottlieb, even among the Jews from other regions of Poland.

This tendency was best manifested in the permanent opposition between Galicia and Congress Poland, the two largest regions of interwar Poland, especially regarding the Jewish context. In the political sphere, the confrontation between the two regions consisted in the two different political schools shaping the local politicians were formed – both Austrian and Russian – and, accordingly, in their two different approaches to policy-making. Educated in a liberal system, Galician Jews, unlike those of Congress Poland, tended to perceive a state as a friend and not as a principled opponent.

The culmination of this confrontation was the so-called Ugoda, a compromise agreement between the Galician Zionists and the Polish government, which was sharply condemned by the Warsaw Zionists. The leader of the last, Yitzhak Grünbaum, called the agreement a product of the “East Galician-Agudah-merchant majority,” and accused the initiators themselves: “the Galicians view our reality with Austrian glasses.”

The heated controversy over the agreement and its consequences continued for a year after its conclusion. Leon Reich, the East Galician Zionist leader, acknowledged in his
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article for *Chwila* that the situation had in fact escalated to a “civil war between Zionists of *Małopolska* and *Kongresówka*” [wojny domowej między syjonistami Małopolski a Kongresówki]. However, he blamed the “abuses and insults oozing from articles and speeches of deputies and senators from Congress Poland and directed against the ‘Galician doctors’” [obelgi i wyzywania, sązące się z artykułów i przemówień posłów i senatorów kongresowych, a skierowane przeciwko “doktorkom galicyjskim”]. Reich admitted that recent events had testified to “the dawn of a new era, the Varsovian era, in the political life of Jewry and the twilight of the ‘Galicians’” [świt nowej ery – ery warszawskiej w życiu politycznem Żydostwa i zmierzch “galjcjanderów”].

Here again, both times Reich put “Galician” in the mouths of his Congressional opponents, who were clearly negative towards the Galicians. Moreover, first he stated the war was between Congress Poland and “Lesser Poland,” then, after mentioning the Warsaw courtesies towards the “Galicians,” these were the same “Galicians” he called on to show solidarity. It seems that in this case, the discourse from the outside prompted him to correct his own rhetoric.

The following month, at the height of the Galician-Congress confrontation within the Zionist camp, *Chwila* published two short anonymous letters without further comment, one allegedly from Warsaw and the other a response from Lwów. The Warsaw letter complained about the Galician mentality, and saw the root of the problem, obviously, in the past:

*Unfortunately, we cannot reach an agreement on any organizational or professional matter. Your Galician mentality, your way of thinking is illogical. […] Here our Varsovian way of tactics is necessary. What this way is like, you Galicians, with your simple way of thinking, will not understand. We are separated by a gulf of different upbringing, a sea of Austrian culture, doctorates, and regrettable willingness to compromise. History will prove that we are right.*

In return, the Lwów Zionists asserted that they also did not trust their opponents’ home upbringing, acknowledging that they were accustomed to parliamentary forms of politics and were wary of radicalization.

Of course, we cannot be sure whether *Chwila’s* editors really received that letter, or who its real author was. In any case, this letter best demonstrates the main paths of political and cultural discussion between the Lwów and Warsaw Zionists: Austrian versus Russian upbringing and the proper political culture, compromise and opportunism versus radicalization and extremism in politics. It is not our task to delve here into the subtleties of the formation of mutual images of two different Jewish communities in Poland. What is important to us here the term under which this formation took place.

---
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The Austrian culture and compromise were components of the “Galician” mentality and attributes of the “Galicians,” not of residents of “Lesser Poland.”

The conflict over the Ugoda was not the end of misunderstandings which continued, albeit with less intensity, throughout the two interwar decades. Thus, ten years later, Franciszka Lapterowa described how a meeting of people from Lwów and Congress Poland built “a wall of prejudices, regional antagonism and evoked ‘fake local patriotism’” [mur uprzedzeń, wyłazi antagonizm dzielnicowy i falszywy “patrjotyzm lokalny”]:

That’s when one can hear enough. How petty, stingy, devoid of gesture and flourish we, Galicians, are.
[Można się wtedy nasłuchać. Jak to my Galicjanie jesteśmy malostkowi, skąpi, pozbawieni gestu i rozmachu].59

Galician Jews made their way to central Poland not only through the state apparatus but also as employees or even heads of many Jewish institutions. In 1929, Henryk Adler, one of the newspaper’s regular contributors, responded to a publication from Warsaw entitled “The Galicians conquer Poland” [Galicjanie zdobywają Polskę]. There the author allegedly stated that in the Jewish district of Warsaw, “all the chief positions are occupied by the Galicians” which reminded him of “‘Litvaks’ invasion of former Congress Poland” [wszystkie naczelne stanowiska zajmują galicjanie […] przypomina ono słynny ‘naijazd litwaków’ na b. Kongresówkę].

Adler instead offered to look at the “problem of ‘Galicianism’” [problem “galicjanizmu”] from another angle. He called his article “The Galicians conquer Varsovian women […]” [Galicjanie zdobywają warszawjanki […]] and wrote:

…while a capable Galician competitor, a doctor or not, is reluctantly seen ortolerated for Wars’s workplaces, how eagerly is the same doctor seen as a competitor for one’s daughter’s hand. […] Suddenly the “crafty Galician” turns out to be much less calculating in marriage matters than the average “Congressian,” and it is not rare for such a “cunning” Galician not to ask for a dowry but to pay beautiful words of love.
[…podczas, gdy zdolny konkurent galicyjski, doktor czy nie doktor, jest niechętnie widziany lub tolerowany w warszawskich warsztatach pracy, to jakże chętnie widzi się tego samego doktora, jako konkurenta o rękę córki […] “przebiegły galicjanin,” okazuje się w sprawach małżeńskich znacznie mniej wyrachowanym, niż przeciętny “kongresowianin” – i nie rzadkie są wypadki, że taki “chytry” galicjanin wcale o posag nie pyta i o miłości piękne słowa prawi].60

Interestingly, the author did not oppose the external negative discourse of “Galicia” with his more positive “Lesser Poland.” He opposed the stereotypes, distancing himself from this discourse by frequent use of quotation marks, but offered no alternative. Opposing the stereotypes about “Galicians” took place through use of the same term, “Galician.”

“Lesser Poland” became a means of accepting the new political reality and of expressing loyalty to the state but did not become an instrument for Galicians against the stereotypes of themselves.

“Galicia”: The bridge to the past and abroad

In addition to internal confrontations within Poland, “Galicia” played a similar role in discussions on the international Jewish stage. As in Poland, the formation of stereotypes on the global level began in the late 19th century with the mass migration of Galician Jews, especially to Vienna and America. Albrecht Lichtblau describes very similar characteristics of prejudices against Galicians in Vienna, like those mentioned above.\(^{61}\) Attitudes and stereotypes about Galicians abroad and, accordingly, the desire of *Chwila*’s authors to oppose them coincided. And even the terminology used for that preserved. Let me offer here some broader quotations that best demonstrate this.

In 1923, mentioning Galician Jews abroad, Ozjasz Tillemann, a Jewish scholar and literary critic from Lwów, wrote in *Chwila*:

> How strange is this poor, small, unpretentious, parochial, but after all, absolutely charming in its emotional tone Galicia […] this land, like a loving mother, unable to feed her beloved children, sends her best sons into the world. […] in this seemingly lean, sterile depth […] derive their sustenance Buber, and Agnon, and Abraham ben Jicchak, and so many others who, despite their Galician provenance, managed to carve out and emphasize their individuality.

It is worth noting that the author writes of “Galicia” in the present tense. Although all three persons mentioned here were brought up in Austrian Galicia, the crucial features of the latter – poverty, parochiality, provincialism, etc. – the aftermath of “Galician provenance” – had lasted up to the current time.

Naftali Gross, a Jewish writer born in Kolomea in Austrian Galicia and emigrated to the USA, as mentioned in *Chwila*, “returns his fantasy back to the Galician town” [wraca swoją fantazję – do miasteczka galicyjskiego]. According to the paper:

> Gross is a Galician not only by his origin but also by his creation. There is, after all, in his book […] the moment characterizing his *spiritual belonging to Galicia*. In his poems about nature […] the Galician color is clearly felt.

The fantasy of a Galician town provides a spiritual belonging to Galicia. “Galicia” acts here as a kind of *timeless* cultural phenomenon and “Galicians” – as a community that retains its features even outside the region.

---
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Another Jewish writer mentioned in *Chwila*, who was also born in pre-war Galicia but emigrated to Jerusalem, was Rabbi Binjamin:

…the *Galician reader* will also feel special satisfaction that this book [of Binjamin] is the work of one of those roving in the world and *disregarded Galicians.*

[…*czytelnik galicyjski* odczuwać będzie przy tym jeszcze szczególne zadowolenie, że książka ta jest dziełem jednego z poniewieranych w świecie i *lekcoważonych Galicjan*.]

“Galicia” seems to provide a connection between the reader, living in what was already called in *Chwila*’s current political discourse “Lesser Poland,” and an author who had been born in old Austrian province and by that time had moved abroad.

And the final example: in his article for *Chwila*, Ozjasz Thon, the leader of West Galician Zionist federation, mentioned Solomon Schiller, a Hebrew educator and Zionist writer who had been born in Russian Poland, laid the foundation for a nationalist Hebrew education in Galicia, and died four years earlier in Jerusalem. Thon called on his compatriots to join the Palestinian initiative to publish the collection of Schiller’s works:

I believe that this obligation is also imposed on us, Galicians […] He taught us a lot.

[Sądzę, że ten obowiązek też na nas Galicjanach […] ciąży. On u nas dużo uczył, nauczał.]

The Jewish inhabitants of “Lesser Poland” became “Galician” when it came to communication with their compatriots abroad. It seems that the concept of “Galicia” allowed Galician Jews to transcend the temporal border with their past and the spatial border with their relatives abroad.

**Conclusions**

Let me make a few points that have been central to me throughout this study. The new term “Lesser Poland,” introduced by the authorities in 1919, has made a great career during the interwar period, in the Jewish press, such as *Chwila*, as well. On the one hand, it confirms the success of state discursive policy. The same success, however, revealed two things.

First, the “old” region of Galicia continued its existence, regardless of what name it had. Administratively divided into three provinces, organizationally the region lived one life, both in Polish and Jewish contexts, as reflected in *Chwila*. Relations with Warsaw as the capital of the country and with Congress Poland as the central region of the country was one of the main triggers for the lasting articulation of “Galicia” and “Lesser Poland.” This was even more crucial in Jewish affairs, since the Galician and Congress Polish Jews were the main “others” within the Jewish community of the Polish Republic.

Second, since there was no law that required the use of the term “Lesser Poland,” Jews apparently had their own motivation to accept it voluntarily. “Lesser Poland” became an expression of the fact that the East Galician Zionists accepted a new political reality, the belonging of their region to a new state, and evidence of their loyalty to this

---


state. “Lesser Poland” was an instrument of political communication for the Jewish community both with the state and with the Polish majority in it.

Even though Chwila mostly adopted a state discursive policy in the political sphere, it still continued to use “Galicia” throughout these two decades. This success of “Lesser Poland” did not affect one important area: as soon as the point to be made concerned certain cultural features, heritage, or stereotypes “Galicia” appeared in the press again, as if it had never disappeared from the political map.

It seems that even if the Galician Jews wanted to completely renounce their old regional name, their compatriots from other lands, both from Poland and from abroad, would not allow them to do so. “Galicia” continued to be a means of othering the Jews of “Lesser Poland” from the outside, accompanied by various clichés familiar to this term.

Chwila’s authors often emphasized this external character of “Galicia” discourse by distancing themselves from it with the use of quotation marks. They did not, however, offer an alternative discourse tied to a new concept. For them, being “Lesser Polish” meant being loyal to the state they belonged to (despite being sometimes opposed to the government), while being “Galician” meant preserving their own cultural features adopted mostly in the previous era. “Galicia” was the instrument for Jews of “Lesser Poland” to build a bridge towards their own past and towards their brothers and sisters all around the world.

Along with these few conclusions, there are also few important questions that remain unanswered. Those questions are mostly defined by the restriction of our main source mentioned at the beginning.

First of all, since this article analyzes the discourse of only one party, the Zionists of Eastern Galicia, it is worth exploring how both terms were used in the press of other Jewish communities, both within the region and in other major Jewish centers the interwar Poland, Krakow, Warsaw, and Vilnius, in particular in their Polish-language publications.

Second, since this article reveals only Polish-language Zionist discourse, it is worth researching how the Yiddish press reflected the new state discursive policy. Did the Yiddish papers accept the term “Lesser Poland”? And did Yiddish contain such a term in general?

As well, since this article reveals only the public side of the discourse, the final question is: Did the Polish acculturated Jews, to which the publishers of Chwila mostly belonged as well, use the term “Lesser Poland” in their everyday language? In other words, was “Lesser Poland” a term reserved for public Jewish Polish-speaking discourse, or was it also used in private life? And in that case, which term dominated there?

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Press**

**Secondary literature**


Purchla, J., and W. Kos (eds.) (2014), Mit Galicji, Kraków.