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3 Literature Survey

3.1 Introduction

Next to the abundance of archival material found in Chernivtsi, Suceava, Bucharest and Vienna, this work obviously relies on much of the work that has appeared before. Many of those sources refer only partly to Habsburg Bukovina or, in many cases, only scrutinise one ethno-national, social or religious chunk out of the bewilderingly complex total. It seems useful to take a closer look at sources covering the situation in Austrian Bukovina in its entirety in order to see how the reader has so far been confronted with the existence of the crownland, especially when the authors in question have taken - or in some cases claim to have taken - a historian’s approach and have considered matters such as multi-ethnicity and/or identity. The publications presented here are in some cases of central value for the way Bukovina and its history have been viewed over the decades or even centuries. Other works are less prominent, but offer an illustrative picture of the category they represent.

Bukovina provides a classic example of the misery not only the historic, but also the historiographic turmoil ideologies may cause. Troubled history produces troublesome historiography and this category seems to dominate in the case of Bukovina. Already afflicted by nationalist shouting matches during the Habsburg years, fascism and mainly communism thwarted objective historical research until the demise of the communist regimes between 1989 and 1991. Post-war publication until that time was dominated by exile Bukovina Germans (Buchenlanddeutsche) and by the large number of memoirs by Jewish Holocaust survivors. Although the many Jewish memoirs published in the United States, Germany, Israel and other countries mainly deal with the interwar period and the devastating effects of the Holocaust on the Jewish population of Bukovina and thus leave the Habsburg era largely unaddressed, most of their authors refer to the memories of parents and grandparents.122

---

The fall of the communist regime in Romania and the breakup of the Soviet Union introduced a new phase in the historiography of the region. Redeemed from official taboos, old territorial claims regarding the former Moldavian Soviet Republic (Bessarabia) and the now Ukrainian North of Bukovina by nationalist Romanians enjoyed a short-lived revival in the early 1990s. Refreshed interest for the region’s past also generated some new volumes of village anecdotes in German and Romanian. Initially, traditional pre-communist views were simply rehashed: an unpublished study by Bukovinian-Romanian nationalist historian Ion Nistor from the 1960s was printed without a single reference to the debatable opinions it held, while in the newly-founded independent Ukraine the equally one-sided 1956 work by Arkadiy Zhukovs’kiy was reprinted without a word about the author’s connection with the violent and Nazi-affiliated Ukrainian nationalist organisation OUN. On a positive note, both Ukrainian and Romanian national and regional archives now became accessible to both domestic and foreign academics with a scholarly instead of a political focus, thus enabling the establishment of a new generation of literature on the various aspects of Bukovinian history. Young historians like Mihai-Ştefan Ceauşu from Romania and Constantin Ungureanu from the Republic of Moldova have already published valuable studies on Habsburg Bukovina based on recently enabled research.

At the opposite end of recent academic studies there are contemporary representations, stemming from eyewitnesses of Habsburg Bukovina. First of all, these are the reports by Austrian envoys addressed to the central authorities during the first years of the Habsburg occupation of the region. Their goal is clear: the newly-incorporated area needs to be developed according to the Austrian needs, standards and expectations and an accurate overview of the local situation is therefore required. The second collection of contemporary sources stems from decades onwards, when reports and research already showed subtle and less subtle traces of nationalist and ideological differences: there is material propagating the benefactions of Habsburg rule, accounts with clearly cultural and ethno-German nationalist overtones and critical Romanian nationalist material from the Kingdom.

126 See Ungureanu, Constantin, Bucovina în perioada stăpânirii austriece 1774-1918 from 2003 and Învățământul primar din Bucovina (1774-1918) from 2007, both published by Civitas in Chișinău.
The third category is found in between the previous two and is by far the most problematic. Post-factum historiography on Habsburg Bukovina started immediately after the demise of the Empire and the incorporation of the territory in Greater-Romania with its centralist-nationalist agenda. Views considered extremist in the eyes of the former Austrian rulers became - and to a certain extent still are - mainstream in the Romanian historiographic production. After the Second World War, when Northern Bukovina had been annexed by the Soviet Union, the touchy subject of ‘Bukovina as a historical part of Romania’ remained taboo in Romania for the first decades. However, when Romanian communist dictator Nicolae Ceauşescu increasingly started to play the nationalist card, the old rhetoric returned and even survived the fall of the regime. The Soviet occupation of Northern Bukovina had split Ukrainian-oriented historiography in two: contributions from the Soviet Union focused on the historical ties between Russia the Slavophone population of Bukovina and working-class oppression under the Habsburgs, while Ukrainian diaspora nationalists continued to present a mirror image of the Romanian discourse. In the German-speaking realm, a mixture of nostalgia and cultural superiority prevailed, elaborating on the ‘cultivation mission’ of German culture which had been propagated already during the Habsburg era.

The value of such older studies for present-day readers fluctuates. It is obviously historiography with a political agenda and should therefore be carefully filtered with regard to its interpretations and ideological assumptions. Then again, it would be unwise and wasteful to dismiss it altogether: it is often based on exhaustive source research - including sources which meanwhile have disappeared in the mayhem of revolution, war and arson – and, speaking with Leerssen and Beller, still have bibliographic use as a shortcut to the primary literary sources.128

### 3.2 Recent Academic Studies

German, Bukovina-born historian Emanuel Turczynski was the first author in the post-communist years to have published a comprehensive history of Bukovina.129 Crucial in his argumentation is the central role of the German language and enlightened Josephinism which enabled the transition from a Moldavian border province of the Ottoman Empire into the eventual Bukovinian culture landscape.130 Turczynski regarded both the German language and culture, combined with the loyalty to Empire and Emperor, ideal vehicles to achieve upward social mobility.131 His assumption that the changes in the electoral and constitutional laws of 1910 had canalised nationalist sentiments and had prevented poisoned relations between the

---

130 Ibid., p. 6.
131 Turczynski 1993, p. 172.
nationalities seems too rosy, however.\textsuperscript{132} Within the scope of this study, Turczynski is of particular interest as a supporter of a specific Bukovinian regional identity. He notices how ‘regional patriotism’ emerged as early as the first two decades of Austrian occupation\textsuperscript{133} and regards a common, German-language education as a stronger unifying force than language and/or ethnicity.\textsuperscript{134} With his ambition to compile a volume of modern-day Bukovinian history free from nationalist tendencies Turczynski - unsurprisingly - clashed with Romanian historians of a traditional nationalist signature who labelled him ‘an admirer of the Empire’ and ‘a nostalgic, trying to find excuses for a western regime’.\textsuperscript{135}

In her study of the Romanian government policies of interwar Greater-Romania and the idea of Bukovinian Romanians to forcibly Romanise other ethnic groups in order to become once more (like before 1880) the strongest group in the region,\textsuperscript{136} Mariana Hausleitner focuses on post-Habsburg Bukovina. Yet, she provides a thorough analysis of the developments leading to the situation at the time of the take-over by Romania. Hausleitner considers Bukovina a multicultural society before the First World War, a space where contacts between different nationalities were intense before the political elites isolated themselves by creating separate organisations around the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{137} She argues that colonisation had been the first step towards modernisation\textsuperscript{138} and that especially those Romanian speakers who had benefitted from the upward mobility enabled by the Austrian state turned against it after its demise by promoting a ‘reversed utopia’ (\textit{eine rückwärts gerichtete Utopie})\textsuperscript{139} of pre-Habsburg glorification. She reveals appreciable differences between the make-up of Ruthenian and Romanian nationalist organisations and like Turczynski, she acknowledges a soothing effect of the 1910/11 Bukovinian Compromise, which she maintains has taken the national sting out of social conflicts\textsuperscript{140}. ‘The Romanisation of Bukovina’ received widespread acclaim, though critics argued that Hausleitner had only dealt with ‘public history’ whereas ‘private history’ might have been essential in order to obtain a comprehensive assessment of the theme under discussion.\textsuperscript{141} Hausleitner operates a traditional ‘groupist’ approach and as such does not escape the dominant discourse of nationalist ideology.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{132} Ibid., p. 206. See Part III, paragraph 2.1: Landtag: Bukovinian Political Representation in Czernowitz and Vienna/ The Bukovinian Compromise.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Turczynski 1993, pp 60-61.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Ibid., pp. 159-60.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Hausleitner, Mariana, \textit{Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina - Die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Großrumäniens 1918-1944}, Verlag R.Oldenbourg, München 2001.
\item \textsuperscript{137} Ibid., p. 82.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Ibid., p. 46.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Ibid., p. 81.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Ibid., p. 80.
\end{itemize}
Romanian philologist and Germanist Andrei Corbea-Hoișie completed numerous studies on Bukovina (and mainly on its historical capital Czernowitz),\(^{142}\) His approach is a literary one, and, refreshingly, the author distances himself from the anti-Habsburg national historiographies typical for the first years of post-communism in Romania and Ukraine. According to his main theory, a class of specific Bukovinians only emerged in the nineteenth century in the shape of the Czernowitz bourgeoisie, a mixture of German-oriented Jews and newly-arrived German-Austrians, later joined by a small intellectual Romanian-Ruthenian segment. Corbea-Hoișie tends to acknowledge only a ‘provincial patriotism’ (\textit{Landespatriotismus}) and merely sees ‘true Bukovinism’ when the Freethinking Alliance (\textit{Freisinniger Verband}) was established in 1904.\(^{143}\) An expert in the field of German-Jewish cultural interaction in Bukovina, he notes how the fact that - unlike Western and Central European cities - Habsburg Czernowitz lacked a Christian bourgeois upper class enabled Jews to fill this position.\(^{144}\) In contrast to the previous two authors, Corbea-Hoișie is not convinced of the pacifying effect of the Bukovinian Compromise of 1910 since this had officially established national segregation and had forced the voter to determine one single nationality for himself.\(^{145}\) As such, Corbea-Hoișie’s critical views have contributed to a relativisation of Bukovina as the textbook example of a multi-cultural society.\(^{146}\) However, he confines himself to Czernowitz - all too often regarded as ‘an island of culture’ - and thus neglects the relations in and with rural Bukovina and other towns.

The detailed work by Austrian geographer Kurt Scharr\(^{147}\) focuses on the Austrian region’s institutional development, administrative structures, its demographic position and its status within the Monarchy. Scharr sees the development of regional institutions, the political conditions in the Habsburg Empire and the lively relations between Czernowitz and Vienna as the conditions which enabled Bukovina to become known as a ‘miniature Habsburg Empire’, and, mainly after the disappearance of the communist regimes, as a miniature blueprint for a tolerant, multicultural Europe. In line with scholars like Hausleitner and Corbea-Hoișie, Scharr does not deviate from the traditional subdivision of Bukovinians in homogenous ethnic groups. His focus is not so much on the population as on the policies and the institutions that provided the conditions for Habsburg Bukovina’s societal developments. Oddly missing as a description and analysis of the 1910 Bukovinian Compromise in his study are,\(^{148}\) Scharr’s

\(^{143}\) Corbea-Hoișie 2004, p. 60.
\(^{144}\) Corbea-Hoișie 2003, p. 50.
\(^{145}\) Corbea-Hoișie 2004, p. 66.
well-documented section on the current state of Bukovina research\textsuperscript{149} and his meticulous appendix with archival overviews are of particular value.\textsuperscript{150}

\subsection*{3.3 Contemporary Representations}

\subsubsection*{3.3.1 Writings with an Administrative Agenda}

\textit{General Splény's Beschreibung der Bukowina}

The first account available on the situation the Austrians encountered after their incorporation into the Empire of the area they called Bukovina is the report by military commander Splény. Largely descriptive and intended to advise the Emperor on future development policies in this region, the report also included the results of the first censuses of the population ever held. From the first moment of later nationalist debates - mainly between Romanian and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) - nationalists on the issues of ‘historical rights’ and ‘indigeneity’, these first military reports proved to be bones of content, with nationalist frontrunners from both sides attempting to disqualify the other as the indigenous and rightful inhabitant of the province. A second source from this era is the 1780 report by landowner Basilius Balsch (Romanian: Vasile Balș), appointed by the Bukovinian boyars and the Bishop of Radautz to present their views on the reorganisation of Bukovina. Though being the first source in which Romanian/Moldavian views are reflected, it contains certain elements which make it a less convenient tool within the Romanian nationalist discourse. This is less so in the case of Ion Budai-Deleanu, a Romanian-language Uniate priest, who was educated in Vienna and worked for the Galician administration in Lemberg. Budai-Deleanu did not see his critical observations published during his lifetime. His reflections on the first twenty years of Habsburg rule (Bukovina had been unified with Galicia) are critical of both the new administrative structures and the old clerical institutions. Since Budai-Deleanu was the first author to address the issue of the different ethnicities of the region explicitly, his writings were often quoted in nationalist debates from the nineteenth century onward.

Although the cession of Turkish territory was legalised by the Convention of 7 May 1775, Baron Gabriel Splény of Miháldy had already established his headquarters at Czernowitz in August 1774.\textsuperscript{151} After having stayed in the newly acquired province for more than a year, Splény finished his report to Empress Maria Theresa and Emperor Joseph II entitled ‘Description of Bukovina following its previous and existing consistency together with the non-binding proposal on how its state constitution up to now may be improved both

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{149} Scharr 2010, pp. 45-54.
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., pp. 249-260
\end{footnotesize}
politically and economically\textsuperscript{152} between 14 August and 16 September 1775. The author, a high-ranking military official of Magyar noble descent, born in Kassa\textsuperscript{153} (now Košice, Slovakia) in 1734, was assigned to Bukovina from 1 September 1774 until 6 September 1778.\textsuperscript{154} Previously, he had earned an outstanding reputation in the Austrian army, was promoted major in 1759 and major general in 1773. In that same year, Splény accompanied Emperor Joseph II on a trip to Galicia and his knowledge impressed the Emperor to such extent that he was assigned to supervise the occupation and administrative organisation of northern Moldavia, the later Bukovina.\textsuperscript{155}

The merit of Splény’s writing in the light of this study lies in the fact that it is the first written account on the state of affairs at the very beginning of Austrian rule over the territory. Moreover, it is the view of the outsider unfamiliar with the surroundings he describes, albeit not exactly a passive outsider: being the first (military) commander of the newly acquired region, Splény was not only supposed to secure it militarily, but also politically and socially: he let the entire population swear an oath of loyalty to Emperor and Empire and announced severe punishments for criminal behaviour. His report reveals his lack of illusions in this respect:

\begin{quote}
Even if some Moldavians served as volunteers during the latest war, one should not draw the conclusion that the nation is therefore inclined to military fervour; it rather seems that taking into consideration the conditions at the time, the boyars or noblemen were interested first of all in shaking off the Turkish yoke and acquiring a freestate. This hope as well as a certain degree of religious affiliation caused them to turn to the Russians. The common man, however, was interested in unhampered robbing and stealing according to his natural inclination.\textsuperscript{156}
\end{quote}

The feudal and in many ways medieval conditions in Bukovina must have shocked the educated nobleman. The state of education and civilisation of the locals repelled him and he was particularly unimpressed by the intellectual level of the local orthodox clergy: “the nobleman as well as the clergy hardly has any schooling or other education, and consequently

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{152} “Beschreibung der Bukowina nach der vorherigen und jetzo noch bestehenden Beschaffenheit deßelben nebst ohnmäßgebigsten Vorschlag, wie deßen bisherige Landesverfassung sowohl in Politicis als Oeconomicis in das künftige verbeßert werden könnte”.\n\textsuperscript{153} Another source claims Splény was originally from Kolozsvár (Cluj), see Csupor, Tibor, Mikor Csikból elindultam - a bukovinai székelyek élettörténete, Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, Budapest 1987, p. 66.\n\textsuperscript{154} General Splény’s Beschreibung der Bukowina, in: Grigorovici, Radu, Bucovina în primele descrieri geografice, istorice, economice si demografice, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest 1998, p. 22 (Ab. 23).\n\textsuperscript{155} The details of Splény’s biography are taken from the preface Johann Polek wrote to his 1893 edition of Splény’s work (included in Grigorovici 1998).\n\textsuperscript{156} “Wenn einige Moldauer in letzten Krieg als Volontairs gedienn haben, so dürfte hiemit noch nicht richtig der Schluß erfolgen, daß die Nation hiezü durch den Militargeist belebet war; vielmehr scheinet es, daß nach damaliger Lage die Absicht, und zwar erstens der Bojaren oder Edelleute dahin gieng, das Türkische Joch abzuschütteln und sich eine Freystatt zu verschaffen, diese Hofnung also und einige Religionsverwandtschaft veranlaste, daß sie sich an die Rußen wanden. Die Ansicht aber zweyten bey dem gemeinen Mann gieng dahin, nach seiner wahren Neigung ungehindert rauben und stehlen zu können”. Grigorovici 1998, p. 202 (Ab. 434).
the peasantry is even rougher”. Several observations made by Splény continue to fuel debates between Romanian and Ukrainian nationalists until this day, the central issue being that of ‘historical rights’. Although this particular subject will be discussed more elaborately in Part II, it is worth mentioning here that Splény explicitly noted the presence of both aforementioned ethnies:

*With regard to the characteristics and temper of the locals, one might distinguish between Rusnyaks and Moldavians. Both nations are Orthodox, of both nations subjects are present in the new Imperial part of Moldavia. The first are less in number and occupy mainly the regions on the Polish border.*

Furthermore, Splény questioned the popularity of the clergy among the people, and thus touched upon yet two other sensitive issues within the Romanian nationalist discourse: the position of the Orthodox Church as a national unifying force and the justification of the radical reforms introduced by the Austrian Emperor in the early 1780s.

The structure of Splény’s report is traditional: the first part is dedicated to the description of the geographical, economical and social circumstances. In this context this is the most relevant part, especially the third chapter which deals with the population. In the second part the author describes which sort of organisational measures needed to be taken immediately while the third part reveals his long-term strategy for the region. This strategy involved three pillars which will prove quintessential to economic reform policy in Bukovina throughout the entire Austrian era: immigration, education and industrialisation. Of particular interest are Splény’s views on the local peasantry. As has been noted above, these impressions were not entirely favourable: as well as thievish, he found them lazy and prone to alcohol abuse. On the subject of alcohol consumption, observed especially among clergy and peasantry, Splény identified two related causes for concern: first, the possibility of a rise in crime and

---

157 “Der Edelmann sowohl als der geistliche Stand hat fast keine Studien oder sonstige Education, und der Bauerstand ist folglichem um so roher”. Ibid., p. 58 (Ab. 72).

158 ‘Rusnyaks’ refers here to the Slavic inhabitants of the region, mostly referred to as ‘Ruthenians’ during the Austrian period. In this work, ‘Ruthenian’ will be used when referring to the Slavic speakers on Habsburg territory later known as ‘Ukrainian’.


160 Ibid., p. 76 (Ab. 147): ‘Ihr Privat-Lebenswandel will eben auch nicht allerdings belobet werden, doch wißen sie durch die Hypokrisie des allzustrengen Fasten die Einfalt des Pöbels in engen Feheln zu halten.’ [‘Their private moral conduct is certainly no reason for praise either, but they manage to keep the populace’s simplicity tightly chained by the hypocrisy of a far too strict Lent.’].

161 Ibid., p. 58 (Ab. 76) ‘Die Faulheit wird von dem Pöbel als der Grund der Glückseligkeit betrachtet. Ihre Arbeitsamkeit erstrecket sich nur auf das Nothwendigste der alljährigen Lebenßbedürfnißen (...).’ [‘Laziness is seen by the populace as the basis of bliss. Their industriousness only ranges to the most basic necessities of life (...).’].
disobedience and even resistance to the military order and second, an issue which was likely remain as well, namely the role of the Jewish community in the production and sale of spirits:

As it is only too true that the peasantry, especially the Rusnyaks, is submissive to the consumption of hard liquor, it is to be reconsidered that as long as one only bothers to settle Jews and that as long as the production of spirits is freely allowed as it is now, this debauchery in the province may only increase.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the rise of nationalist movements the alleged role of Jews in the spirits trade and most notably in usury would frequently prove to dominate anti-Semitic diatribes. Although Splény once again displayed his lack of trust in the local population, he did admit to certain more or less likable traits as well:

The talent of this nation basically shows a natural witticism, albeit with a disposition to shrewdness. This makes them dissembling and ambiguous in their doings, so that one should take neither the acts nor the words of a Moldavian for granted too easily.

Tolerance, another characteristic which will continue to play a pivotal role in the historic perception of Bukovinian society, had not escaped Splény’s attention either: he claimed that ‘on the whole the Moldavians were more inclined towards tolerance than their neighbours, the Vlachs [since] unlike the latter, they did not surrender so fully to the blind urge and guidance of their religion’.

The useful insights Splény provided in this first account are puzzling at the same time. The confusing terminology he applied to matters concerning ethnicity/nationality was to ignite fierce debates between Ukrainian and Romanian nationalist historians later on. As shown above, Splény sometimes referred to ‘Moldavians’ when he seemed to imply the entire Bukovinian peasant population, in other cases, as shown above, he clearly distinguished between ‘Moldavians’ and ‘Rusnyaks’. Another time he mentioned ‘Vlachs’ as the (Romanian) language community in contrast to the Germans. Complicating matters even more, Splény, as can be concluded from his remarks on tolerance quoted above, did

---

162 Ibid., p. 58 (Ab. 73).
163 “Uebrigens wenn es zwar nur gar zu richtig ist, daß das Landvolk, besonders aber die Rusniaken, dem Trunk der starken Getränke ergeben sind, so kommt andererseits wieder in Erwägung zu ziehen, daß, solang man die Population nur mit Juden zu machen besorget seyn wird, solang auch nach dermaliger Art das Brandweinbrennen frey bleibet, diese Ausschweifung im Lande immer zunehmen müße”. Ibid.,p. 200 (Ab. 433).
164 “Das Genie dieser Nation hat zum Grund einen natürlichen, doch zur Arglistigkeit mehr geneigten Witz. Dieser macht sie in ihrem Thun und Laßen verstellen und zweydeutig, so daß man weder denen Werken noch Wörtern eines Moldauers so leicht glauben soll”. Ibid., p. 56 (Ab. 63).
165 “Ueberhaupt sind die Moldauer mehr zu Toleranz geneigt als ihre Nachbarn, die Wallachen, pflegen auch nicht so sehr wie letztere sich dem blinden Trieb und Leitung ihrer Religion zu überlassen”. Ibid., p. 202 (Ab. 436).
166 Ibid., p. 108, Ab. 223-224). While ‘German’ can only be understood here as a German-speaking Austrian (and not in the present-day concept of ‘a citizen of Germany’), it is safe to assume that Splény refers here to a Romanian-speaking language community and not to ‘a citizen of Wallachia’ of some sorts.
distinguish between Moldavians and Vlachs.\textsuperscript{167} As will be discussed further in this chapter, representatives of the Ukrainian school tend to interpret Splény’s classifications as typical for a period preceding national consciousness in which the term ‘Moldavian’ simply serves as a regional common denominator. Romanian scholars generally maintain the opinion that ‘Moldavians’ can only mean ‘(ethnic) Romanians’.\textsuperscript{168} The existing confusion automatically reflects on the results of Splény’s population census: although they indicated a predominantly Romanian character of the area (Romanians 11,000 families, Ruthenians 1,261, Jews 526, Gypsies 294 and Armenians 58), other sources claim that the majority was indeed Romanian speaking, but that the census simply qualified every Orthodox as Romanian.\textsuperscript{169} The debatable results of Splény’s census in comparison to those of Splény’s successor Enzenberg’s efforts are at times attributed to Splény’s alleged lack of knowledge of the region and its inhabitants.\textsuperscript{170} More likely, the puzzling results of Splény’s census are the product of a lack of criteria, definitions and terminology. Ethnological counts were not even attempted, which led to more unresolved mysteries than only the respective numbers of ‘Romanians’ and ‘Ruthenians’ at the time of Splény’s military administration.\textsuperscript{171}

\textit{Beschreibung der Buccowina und deren innern Verhältniss von Basilius Balsch}

On 4 April 1780, a conference was installed to decide on the structure of the Bukovina district, presided over by Count András Hadik, president of the Austrian Imperial Council of War.\textsuperscript{172} Led by Basilius Balsch, member of the Conference, a delegation of Bukovinian aristocracy including Bishop Dosoftei Herescul made the case for a separate status for Bukovina,\textsuperscript{173} a matter made urgent by the fact that in 1779, Splény’s successor Enzenberg had

\begin{itemize}
\item Grigorovici insisted that Splény does not regard Moldavians and Vlachs as separate ‘nations’ (‘Trebuie remarcat că în ochii lui Splény, moldovenii și valahii formează o singură națiune’). However, the author neither substantiated this statement nor provided his particular definition of a ‘nation’. Grigorovici 1998, p. 221.
\item In his presentation, at a conference at the Bucovina Study Centre in Rădați (31 May - 3 June 1996) entitled ‘Bucovina 1775-1862. Political, Social, Cultural and Demographic Aspects’, R. Grigorovici discussed the vision as presented in the Ukrainian translation of General Splény’s report. Grigorovici stated that ‘Moldavians’ can only have meant ‘Romanians’: people of Splény’s rank did not talk to commoners, and the nobility was exclusively Romanian at the time. However, this standpoint ignores Splény’s clear distinction between ‘Moldavians’ and ‘Rusnyaks’. See Purici, Ștefan, \textit{Bucovina 1775-1862. Aspecte politice, sociale, culturale, economice și demografice}, in: \textit{Glasul Bucovinei}, 2(10), 1996, 30-31.
\item Hofbauer, Hannes and Roman, Viorel: \textit{Bukowina, Bessarabien, Moldawien : vergessenes Land zwischen Westeuropa, Russland und der Türkei}, Promedia, Wien 1997, p. 27.
\item Kapri, Emanuel. M. F. v., \textit{Buchenland. Ein österreichisches Kronland verschiedener Völkergruppen}, Eigenverlag Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen e.V., München/Stuttgart 1974, p. 15
\item For instance, nationalist Romanian historians like Nistor and Iacobescu tended to ignore the existence and importance of gypsies in Bukovina in order to keep the ‘absolute’ number of 70,000 Romanians in Bukovina in 1774 intact. Wagner, Rudolf, \textit{Vom Halbmond zum Doppeladler - Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bukowina und der Czernowitzer Universität ‘Francisco-Josephina’}, Verlag 'Der Südostdeutsche', Augsburg 1996, p. 362.
\end{itemize}
suggested splitting up the newly acquired province.\textsuperscript{174} In his report to Hadik, entitled ‘Description of Bukovina and its Internal Relations’,\textsuperscript{175} Balsch ventilated his views on the local conditions.

Boyar Basilius Balsch (1756-1832) was born in Iaşi to a family of large landowners with close ties to the power circles in Moldavia and Austria. From 1771 Balsch, who had studied in Vienna, was the administrator of the Czernowitz region, served as a delegate of Moldavian Prince Grigore III Ghica and soon became Austria’s confidant in the early years of the Austrian administration of Bukovina.\textsuperscript{176} Many boyars had not been inclined to swear the oath of loyalty to the Austrian Emperor and had taken up residence in Moldavia. Only a small number of families had stayed on. To maintain relations with the boyar class, Vienna had appointed Balsch in the provincial administration.\textsuperscript{177} Balsch’s ideas on church reform and modernisation were in line with those proposed by the Austrian military commanders Splény and his successor Enzenberg\textsuperscript{178} and were certainly influenced by Josephinism and Enlightenment, but also alienated him from both the indigenous nobility and the Orthodox clergy. Balsch was granted the title of baron in 1781 and installed as a member of the Imperial Council of War in 1783. From 1792 to 1808 he was Captain of Bukovina, the first Moldavian to fill that position.

Balsch’s report provides the first insider’s view of conditions in Bukovina. It should be noted that, naturally, the opinions ventilated by Balsch are those of a particular insider: the provincial nobleman and the cosmopolitan Josephinist in one. The nobleman clearly felt contempt for the peasantry, calling them ‘a generally lazy, fraudulent and disobedient lot [one could] only get to work with curses and beatings’.\textsuperscript{179} At the same time he cautioned, as Splény had done five years earlier, against - mainly Jewish - usury as a major threat to that peasantry:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{‘They requested that Bukovina be turned into an autonomous Moldavian province, in keeping with its historic past and its ethnically different character, which should be administered autonomously according to its old customs and traditions’}, ibid., p. 29.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{178} Although Kapri was of the opinion that Balsch hardly added new insights to those already reported to Vienna by General Enzenberg, he did give him some credit for suggesting the establishment of a number of colonies as an example for local farmers. Kapri 1974, pp. 36-39.

In order to counteract the matter of usury, which is detrimental to the general peace, safety and well being of the public, forms of rental should be allowed neither to strangers nor to Jews, the complete expulsion of the latter being the most beneficial.180

Next, Balsch took the opportunity to discredit the lower nobility of Bukovina, the so-called mazils, who in his view unjustifiably presented themselves as boyars and enjoyed their privileges while neglecting their duties as local supervisors. He maintained, incorrectly,181 that mazils could not lay claim to a title of nobility and that they were direct subjects of the boyars.182 Balsch the Josephinist advocated public schools and the creation of Austrian citizens:

(...) if according to the most heartfelt wish of all compatriots it was taken into consideration to establish public schools for the instruction of Christianity and other essential subject matter in order to educate this offspring in due time as worthy pupils of the state, thus upholding the love felt in the whole of Moldavia and enriching Bukovina considerably, the majority in Moldavia would happily and impatiently send their children there while the monasteries would be inclined to establish a fund to cover the expenses anyway.183

The establishment of public schools was not the only issue Balsch addressed in order to change the feudal injustice within the clerical order. He challenged the powers of the Archbishop of Iaşi, who, in spite of the presence of Bishop Dosoftei in Radautz, still ruled over large monastery estates in Bukovina and was held responsible by Balsch for many cases of extortion and abuse of power. Superintendent positions, officially to be allocated through elections, were simply sold to the highest-bidding. Balsch found the reasons for these various forms of misconduct with Ottoman influences, which he said had thoroughly corrupted the clerical order. He therefore proposed to have Bishop Dosoftei appointed as the sole head of the Orthodox Church in Bukovina.184 In view of the pivotal role Balsch had reserved for the bishop, it seems only logical that the latter was in full support of the reform plans proposed first by Enzenberg and now endorsed by Balsch. Although at this point Balsch only suggested to appoint ‘Imperial supervisors’ to control monastery revenues,185 the price Dosoftei

---

180 “Um dem der allgemeinen Ruh, Sicherheit und Besten des Publicums so nachtheiligen Pachtungs-Gegenstand wirksamst entgegen zu dammen, solle weder denen Fremden, weder denen Juden, welche letztere gänzlich wegzutreiben am zuträglichsten wäre, einige Gattung von Pachtung zu gestatten seyn”. Ibid., p. 356 (Ab. 58).
184 Ibid., pp. 338-340 (Ab. 17-23)
185 Ibid., p. 342 (Ab. 27).
eventually paid for his clerical omnipotence would prove to be much higher: complete secularisation of church property through the establishment of the Church Fund and the closure of all but three of the Bukovinian monasteries. A supplementary argumentation provided by Balsch to support his reform proposals sheds light upon the lack of popular support of the Orthodox Church at the time:

_The other advantage of this salutary measure would be that the discipline and order of the clerics be restored in keeping with the laws and conventions of their congregation, that the Church be maintained within the boundaries of its religion according to the true principles of Christianity and that, no less, the customs of the nation be remodeled, as the people are used neither to going to church nor to respecting a cleric._\(^{186}\)

Balsch intended to secure the traditional power position of the boyar class, while advocating Josephinist modernisation of the province under Austrian rule.\(^{187}\) He regarded the Austrian occupation of the northern part of Moldavia as a convenient opportunity to rid the territory of Ottoman corruption and did not hesitate to discredit practically all other social groups in the process: the peasantry, lower nobility and the vast majority of the clergy. He must have been well aware of the fact that he was addressing a peer, Field Marshall Count Hadik, who, being a nobleman himself, might have been expected to sympathise with a boyar’s grievances. In addition, Balsch hinted at the possibility of the incorporation by Austria of southern Moldavia as well,\(^{188}\) while, one source claims, he was even trying to convince Vienna to integrate Wallachia on top of that.\(^{189}\)

For Romanian historians, and especially for those pursuing a nationalist agenda, Basilius Balsch proves to be a wayward and ambiguous protagonist. Whereas he indisputably pioneered the plea for Bukovinian autonomy and was therefore rightly regarded by Nistor as the instigator of the first political manifestation of the Bukovinian population after the secession from Moldavia,\(^{190}\) it requires a vivid imagination to expose him as a representative of retrospective Romanian nationalism: first of all, his intervention in favour of provincial autonomy indicates implicit recognition of the Austrian annexation of northern Moldavia, which Romanian nationalists consider the beginning of all misfortune - support for an autonomous Bukovina means acceptance of the division of Moldavia, so they reject the concept altogether. Balsch went the extra mile: he explicitly advocated the benefits of Austrian rule and even proposed to utilise public education to turn pupils into loyal Austrian subjects. Romanian historian Grigorovici reprimands Balsch for ‘seemingly not having

---

186 “Der andenwärtige Vortheil dieser so heilsamen Einrichtung wäre: dass die Zucht und Ordnung deren geistlichen nach den Gesätzen und gebrauchen ihres Ordens hergestellet, und die Kirche in denen Schranken ihrer Religion nach den wahren Grundsätzen des Christenthums erhalten, wie nicht minder die Sitten der Nation, da das Volck ohnehin weder in die Kirche zu gehen, noch für einen Geistlichen Achtung zu haben gewohnet ist, umgeschaffen würden”. Ibid., p. 344 (Ab. 31)
188 Ibid.
realised the existence of the national problem of the people he belonged to\(^1\) (and simultaneously provides an illustrative example of the retrospective nationalism often found with - not only - Romanian historians). Even though some tried to accredit Balsch with promoting the introduction of education in the Romanian language,\(^2\) careful reading of his suggestions only reveals his insistence on the introduction of Latin in the curriculum.\(^3\)

Ion Budai-Deleanu: *Kurzgefasste Bemerkungen über die Bukowina*

Discovered amidst Budai-Deleanu’s family heirloom by Gheorghe Asachi in 1868, Ion Budai-Deleanu’s ‘Compact Remarks on Bukovina’\(^4\) were first transferred to the Museum of Antiquities in Bucharest\(^5\) before being incorporated in the collection of the Romanian Academy. Romanian historian Ion Nistor attributes the fact that the work had never been published during Budai-Deleanu’s lifetime to its abrasive criticism of the authorities.\(^6\) Initially published only in Romanian by George Bogdan-Duică in the ‘Gazeta Bucovinei’ in 1894, the original German text first appeared in the annex of Nistor’s ‘The Romanians and Ruthenians in Bukovina’.\(^7\)

Born the son of an educated Uniate priest in the early 1760s in the Transylvanian village of Csigmó (present-day Cigmău in Romania),\(^8\) Budai-Deleanu studied law in Vienna, where he also mastered fluent German. He returned to Transylvania to teach at the Uniate seminary of Blaj, but a conflict with Bishop Ioan Bob caused him to abandon both Blaj and his theological ambitions. He then settled in Lemberg where his knowledge of law, Romanian/Moldavian and German made him the ideal candidate for the position of translator and clerk at the Lemberg court: with Bukovina now subordinated to the Lemberg Gubernium, the court had been left with numerous law records in Moldavian to be translated into the language of administration (German) as well as with official decrees and even codes of law in German requiring a Moldavian translation. His activities, easily surpassing those of a mere translator, included a Romanian-German dictionary, studies on Romanian grammar as well as juridical, literary and historical works.

---


\(^{192}\) Satco 2004.

\(^{193}\) Balsch did in fact substantiate this proposal with the argument that the Moldavian language had used the Latin alphabet until the Church Convention of Florence in 1493. Balsch, Basilius in Grigorovici 1998, 350 (Ab. 40).


\(^{195}\) Vatamanu, Dimitrie in Grigorovici 1998, p. 6.


\(^{198}\) The details of Budai-Deleanu’s biography are taken from Vatamanu, Dimitrie, Nistor, Ion (pp. 426-27), Bogdan-Duică (pp. 376-77) and Grigorovici, Radu (pp. 430-31), all in Grigorovici 1998, as well as from Nistor 1991 (p. 53).
Budai-Deleanu provided, like Balsch had done before, an account of the state of affairs in Bukovina from the point of view different from that of the typical Viennese government official. However, to maintain with Grigorovici that the reports by Balsch and Budai-Deleanu are ‘the only two documents from the first years of the Austrian occupation written by Romanians’199 is anachronistic or at least far-fetched: it is open to question which similarity between the Moldavian boyar and the Galicia-based Transylvanian jurist is the most striking, their mother tongue or rather their Viennese education? Budai-Deleanu explicitly states his sense of belonging when discussing the Moldavians: “the time they have been under the lenient Austrian government has been too short [for them] to really benefit from our customs”200. ‘They’ are the Moldavians; ‘we’ are the Austrians. Furthermore, a native or even an inhabitant of Bukovina Budai-Deleanu certainly was not. Hence his impressions are, like Splény’s, those of an outsider - hetero-images instead of auto-images.

For the first time, a more detailed picture of the famously diverse population of Bukovina emerged. Budai-Deleanu estimated the entire number of village communities at 300 and the total number of inhabitants at 190 to 200 thousand: Moldavians, Rusnyaks, Germans, Jews, Armenians, Greeks, Magyars, Lippovans and Gypsies.201 Unlike Splény, he provided clarity on what (to him) ‘Moldavians’ actually were: they belonged to the Romanian or Vlach nation; more often, Budai-Deleanu referred to ‘Vlachs’ as a common denominator for ‘Romanians’: Moldavians were also considered to be Vlachs.202 Next to this qualification, which rules out the possibility that to the author ‘Moldavian’ can be just any inhabitant of Moldavia, he was the first to give expression to two major pillars of the Romanian nationalist discourse in Bukovina, namely that Romanians were the historical majority in the province and that their number was decreasing.203

Whereas Budai-Deleanu criticised the local population like Splény and Balsch had done before him, his judgment was less harsh. He mainly blamed the catastrophic Ottoman influence for the character flaws he identified and, in line with his approach as referred to above, singled out the Moldavians as a separate group amidst the others:

*With this mishmash of nations it is easy to assume little unity between the inhabitants and all kinds of customs or rather that no customs or character can be assigned to the Bukovinian occupants; in particular one should absolutely not look for virtues here; for what can be expected of a nation (even if one only takes the Moldavian nation into consideration), which

202 Ibid., pp. 380-82 (Ab. 10-13).
203 ‘Obwohl die Zahl der Moldeauer seit der Revindizierung sehr abgenommen weil viele von ihnen ihren alten Gebräuchen getreu sich nach Türkisch-Moldau begaben, kann man demnoch selbe für die Hauptvölkerschaft in dieser Provinz annehmen’. Ibid., p. 380 (Ab. 10).
the prolonged despotism has oppressed like slaves, which has belonged to one, there to another during the alternately frequent Russo-Turkish wars and has been ransacked and abused either by one or the other, which has never seen any good but all the bad, which has never experienced the act of a foreign nation as being kind and benevolent but always as brutal, barbarous and avaricious, what virtues I say can one expect from the Moldavian nation under these conditions?  

When discussing the peasantry, Budai-Deleanu’s ‘nationality consciousness’ seemed to disappear. Now, he referred to ‘the Bukovinian people’:

(...) one can safely take the peasantry for altogether good-natured and placid, one can do anything with them and one would do them an injustice by blaming the Bukovinian people for everything that goes wrong in Bukovina. The prevalent vice one can justifiably charge them with to some extent is rustling. This is rampant here and every day such people are brought in.

Budai-Deleanu was certainly not the first observer to describe local usury practices. His report, however, contains exact descriptions of how the system worked and why the Jews of Bukovina were blamed for the poor living conditions it created. According to Budai-Deleanu, the boyars had moved to Turkish Moldavia and had leased their domains to ‘private individuals’ in a way that was ‘not only disadvantageous to the highest treasury, but also to the contributing people’:

The leaseholders keep Jewish innkeepers and propination lessees everywhere in Bukovina (in defiance of the ban); however, in order to evade the law, they award the contracts to the Jew on a foreign, Christian name, for only the Jew notoriously masters the skill to make perfectly clear to those who do not know how to calculate that the entire reason for being of the manor is to make sure that the peasants booze more from day to day, from year to year. (...) In case a leaseholder runs out of compulsory labour days and he really needs a few hundred, he turns

204 “Bei diesem Mischmasch der Nationen ist auch leicht zu vermuten, dass wenig Einigkeit zwischen den Inwohnern herrsche und dass allerlei Sitten allda zu finden seien oder besser zu sagen gar keine herrschende Sitten und Charakter der Bukowiner Insassen zu bestimmen sein; besonders aber Tugenden darf man hier gar nicht suchen; denn was kann man von einer Nation (wenn man auch die moldauische selbst betrachtet) erwarten, welche der langwierige Despotismus unter die Klasse der Sklawen niedergedrückt, welche bei den abwechselnden häufigen russisch-türkischen Kriegen bald diesem, bald jenem zugehörte und entweder von diesem, oder von jenem ausgeplündert und misshandelt wurde, sie etwas gutes, wohl aber alles schlechte sah, die Handlung einer fremden Nation gegen sich nie mild und wohlwollend, sondern allezeit grausam, barbarisch und habsichtig empfand, was für Tugenden, sage ich, kann man in dieser Voraussetzung von der moldauischen Nation erwarten?” Ibid., pp. 400-402 (Ab. 40).

205 “Bei allen diesen kann man es als eine gewisse Sache annehmen, dass das Landvolk überhaupt gutmütig und ruhig sei, mit welchem man alles machen kann, und man tut ihm sehr Unrecht, wenn man alles, was in der Bukowina schlecht geschieht, dem Bukowiner Volke zumutet. Sein herrschendes Laster, was man ihm mit einigem Rechte vorwerfen kann, ist das Viehstehlen; dieses ist hier allgemein und tagtäglich werden hier solche Leute eingeführt”. Ibid., p. 404 (Ab. 43).

206 “Die Bojarengüter aber, weil diese sich nach der türkischen Moldau begeben haben, werden denen Privatleuten verpachtet; eigentlich diese Pachtungen sind es, welche nicht nur dem höchsten Aerario, sondern auch dem contribuerendem Volke sehr nachteilig sind”. Ibid., p. 416 (Ab. 52).
to his Jewish lessee; the latter must hand in his specification of subjects still owing for spirits and cash in these debts.\footnote{46}

Although Budai-Deleanu’s comments clearly indicate the ways in which the boyars managed to use the services of Jewish usurers to subdue the peasantry, it was only Jews who were blamed for the results thereof: “Woe the land where the Jews gain the upper hand!”\footnote{207} This partial blindness would prove to be a recurring phenomenon in the Romanian nationalist and anti-Semitic discourse.

Even more inconvenient for advocates of Romanian nationalism is the criticism Budai-Deleanu saved for the state of affairs within the Orthodox Church. Bishop Vlahovici’s knowledge was said ‘not to have exceeded that of an Orthodox village priest, for episcopal dignity had made him loftier, but not more learned’\footnote{208} The education of new clerics seemed marred by corruption, their admittance decided upon ‘by the gifts they brought rather than their skills and good conduct’.\footnote{209} Interestingly, it is the entire chapter on the conditions within the Orthodox Church of Bukovina which was omitted when Bogdan-Duică published the first translation of Budai-Deleanu’s work in ‘Gazeta Bucovinei’ in 1894. The harsh criticism it contained was most likely ill-fitting to the editors at the time; after all, ‘Gazeta Bucovinei’ was the party organ of the Romanian National Party.\footnote{210}

Had Budai-Deleanu saved his criticism for the local nobility and the clergy, his reports just might have reached the Imperial authorities. After all, many reports and complaints were sent to Vienna and were apparently read with interest.\footnote{211} The fact that he not so much found fault with Austrian legislation as with its local implementation implicitly incriminated his own employers, the responsible authorities in Lemberg:

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{207} “Die Pächter halten überall in der Bukowina (ohngeachtet allen Verbot) jüdische Schenker und Propinationspächter; um aber das Gesetzt zu eludieren, geben sie die Contracte dem Juden auf einen fremden, christlichen namen, da nur der Jude bekanntemassen mehr Geschicklichkeit besitzt, einen der seine Rechnungskunst nicht versteht, sonnenklar begreiflich zu machen, dass der ganze Nutzen einer Grundherrschaft darin bestehe, wenn die Bauern von Tag zu Tag und von Jahr zu Jahr immer mehr und mehr saufen. (...) Wenn nun dem Pächter die Robotstage ausgehen und er notwendig ein Paar Hundert braucht, so wendet er sich zu seinem jüdischen Arendator; dieser muss seine Spezification der Untertanen, welche für Getränke schuldig geblieben, eingeben, und bei denselben um die Eintreibung dieser Schulden einkommen”. Ibid., p. 418 (Ab. 53).
\item \footnote{208} “Wehe dem Lande, wo die Juden überhand nehmen!” Ibid., p. 390 (Ab. 24/25).
\item \footnote{209} “Seine Kenntnisse erstrecken sich auch heutzutage nicht weiter, als eines griechisch nicht unierten Dorfpopen, denn die Bischofswürde hat ihn nur stolzer, aber nicht gelehrter gemacht”. Ibid., p. 420 (Ab. 56).
\item \footnote{210} “(...) bei der Aufnahme der Alumnen wird selten auf gute Conduite und Geschicklichkeit, sondern bloss auf Geschenke gesehen”. Ibid., p. 422 (Ab. 59)
\item \footnote{211} Grigorovici 1998, p. 374.
\item \footnote{212} Turczynski, Emanuel, Geschichte der Bukowina in der Neuzeit: Zur Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte einer mitteleuropäisch geprägten Landschaft, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 1993, p. 61.
\end{itemize}
Generally, one can state with a clear conscience: the best and most lenient laws of the Austrian government do not serve to advance the common good in this land, but rather to corrupt and subdue the inhabitants!\(^{213}\)

For this reason alone, the Lemberg Gubernium may have prevented Budai-Deleanu from forwarding his report to Vienna. Yet Budai-Deleanu went as far as to rebuke the central authorities for their appointments to the Bukovinian judiciary and lamented that ‘the positions had been filled by the quaintest people right from the start, [by] worthless individuals, sottish good-for-nothings, carpenter assistants’, and that ‘even lackeys had been sent and appointed to Bukovina as presidents, assessors and chancellors’.\(^{214}\) Certainly, no one in Lemberg would have wanted to take the responsibility for sending this kind of analysis to the ‘lenient Austrian government’: to prescribe remedies for the persistent wayward ways of local elites was one thing, to snub instructions given on behalf of His Apostolic Majesty was quite another.

Budai-Deleanu’s comments proved to be a source of inspiration for Romanian nationalists: not only did he confirm their notion of being the historical majority population, he also acknowledged the massive influx of Ruthenian-speaking immigrants and the problems attributed to Jewish usurers. On top of that, he clearly linked Moldavians and Vlachs as members of the same ethnic group. The timing of the resurfacing of his writing in 1868 was even more convenient, since the nationalist debate was rapidly gaining ground. As indicated above, not all characteristics of the report were equally applicable within this context, the most obvious evidence being the mentioned omission of the sections on the Orthodox Church, but not only this: the fact that Budai-Deleanu saw himself as Austrian and the clear way in which he described how Romanian-speaking boyars eagerly invoked the services of usurers fitted the nationalist agenda to a much lesser degree.

### 3.3.2 Writings with an Ideological Agenda

Hermann Ignaz Bidermann: *Die Bukowina unter österreichischer Verwaltung 1775-1875*

By stating ‘We only wanted to highlight part of the successes and the apparent run of events through facts, which in turn explain the gratitude with which the commemorating population these days solemnises the centenary of the country’s linkage with Austria’,\(^{215}\) legal historian

\(^{213}\) “Überhaupt kann man mit gutem Gewissen behaupten; die besten und gelindesten Gesetze der österreichischen Regierung dienen hierlands nicht um das allgemeine Beste zu befördern, sondern viel mehr zum allgemeinen Verderbnisse und Unterdrückung der Inwohner!” Budai-Deleanu, Ion in Grigovici 1998, p. 408 (Ab. 47).

\(^{214}\) “Aber zum Unglück wurde diese Stellen gleich vom Anfang an mit den bizartesten Leuten besetzt. Kassierte personen, versoffene Taugenichts, Tischlergesellen, ja sogar Livréebedienten wurden nach der Bukowina als Vorsteher, Besitzer, Kanzelier etc., geschickt und angestellt”. Ibid., p. 408 (Ab. 48).

\(^{215}\) ‘Wir wollten bloß einen Theil der Erfolge und den äußerlichen Verlauf durch Thatsachen markiren, aus welche die Wärme der Dankesempfindung sich erklärt, womit in diesen Tagen die ihrer eingedeneke Bevölkerung der Bukowina die Feier der hundertjährigen Verbindung des Landes mit Oesterreich begeht’. Bidermann,
Hermann Ignaz Bidermann completed his ‘Bukowina unter österreichischer Verwaltung 1775-1875’. By 1875, many of the conditions in Bukovina described by the first Austrian envoys had changed dramatically: the aftermath of the 1848 revolutions had accelerated the process of Bukovinian disengagement from Galicia and had eventually led to independent crownland status. Immigration had continued and urbanisation had taken root, especially in Czernowitz and to a lesser extent in the towns of Suceava and Radautz. National consciousness among the elites of Romanian and Ruthenian speakers was on the rise and was to be enhanced by the founding of the Franz Joseph University in 1875. Wallachia and Moldavia had merged and were about to be recognised as an independent nation, thus encouraging Romanian nationalists in both the Principalities and in Bukovina to contest the Austrian occupation of Northern Moldavia with renewed energy. The centenary celebrations, including the inauguration of the university, raised controversies in different intellectual circles. In addition to Bidermann, the renowned statistician Adolf Ficker published his ‘Centenary of the Unification of Bukovina with Austria’. These complacent works, containing nothing but praise for the Habsburg achievements, provoked an anonymously published reaction from the Romanian side by politician and publicist Mihail Kogălniceanu, entitled ‘The Theft of Bukovina’. Moreover, the correspondence between Chancellor Kaunitz, Internuntius Thugut and the High Porte regarding the process of the Austrian annexation of Bukovina was published in both Romanian and French. The booklet was immediately forbidden in Bukovina, which tarnished the festivities. According to Nistor, the preparation of the festivities had taken place without the participation of even one Romanian boyar, while the inauguration of the university was accompanied by provocative speeches like the one by the dean of the law faculty, Frederic Schuler Libloy, who argued that ‘Romanians had not contributed one bit to the progress of science and should be glad to be enabled to receive now what they could not produce themselves.’

Not only were the publications by Bidermann and Ficker the first works for a larger audience dealing with Austrian Bukovina, they also specifically aimed at glorifying the Austrian achievements on the occasion of an anniversary which in the eyes of Romanian nationalists was no reason to celebrate to begin with. Adding insult to injury, Bidermann challenged several pillars of the Romanian nationalist discourse: he quoted Bukovina’s second military commander, Splény’s successor Enzenberg, who had estimated the number of ‘true Moldavian’ families to be only 6000 out of 23,000 at the time and had claimed that most boyar families were not of Romanian/Moldavian descent. Furthermore, Bidermann rejected the notion that the Romanians/Moldavians had settled in ‘empty territory’. As for the
alleged influx of Ruthenians, he pointed out how Enzenberg had not accommodated new immigrants from Galicia and had demanded a written declaration from the Galician landowner that the individual in question had indeed been free to go and he stipulated that in 1804, the area between Dniester, Sereth en Czeremosch was already inhabited by Ruthenians. Contrary to Romanian nationalist assertions that ‘Ruthenians’ and ‘Hutsuls’ were separate tribes, Bidermann saw them as one. Reactions like the one by Kogălniceanu were hence to be expected. Criticism was also passed within Austrian circles, though. Julius Platter, whose study on usury in Bukovina - to be discussed below - was to provide anti-Semitic with useful ammunition, asserted that books like Bidermann’s and Ficker’s painted a far too rosy picture of the state of affairs in the crownland.

Karl Emil Franzos: *Aus Halb-Asien. Kulturbilder aus Galizien, der Bukowina, Südrussland und Rumänien*

Novelist and journalist Karl Emil Franzos (1848-1904) is one of the most frequently quoted sources on Austrian Bukovina and a key figure in contemporary images of the crownland. Born of Jewish parentage in Podolia, he spent his early years in Galicia, attended the Czernowitz gymnasium and studied law in Vienna and Graz before becoming a journalist and a travel writer. He was forced to abandon a career in administration because of his controversial membership of a German-nationalist student association advocating the unification of Austria and Germany. In spite of his Jewish background and his Galician birthplace, Franzos was raised a ‘cultural German’. His firm belief in the beneficial influences of German culture in Eastern Europe was not so much based on a settled conviction of German superiority per se, but on that of the role model of western culture in general. At the same time, though, his colonial approach towards those whose morals he tried to elevate encountered understandable resistance, not in the least with Romanian nationalists, when he published his ‘Semi-Asia: Cultural Images from Galicia, Bukovina, Southern Russia and Romania’ in 1876:

> To awaken the cultural ambition of those nations, to be the stick for their national culture to twine up to - that is the task of Germanity in the East. If this has only been realised to a limited extent so far, those nations are to blame themselves. They have allowed only limited access to western education, to French and German, and have not properly processed that limited amount; it has not become second nature to them and therefore is not much more than the

---

222 Ibid., p. 66.
223 Ibid. p. 67.
228 Corbea-Hoisie 2004, p. 36.
Varnish to cover indigenous barbarity. Hard work should have been part of a productive adoption [of western culture] and unfortunately hard work is apparently the eighth cardinal sin to the Pole and the Romanian.  

Within the scope of this study, a number of points should be made on Franzos’ travel accounts, which were first published in the Austrian *Neue Freie Presse* between 1874 and 1876, then appeared in two volumes to be reprinted numerous times and translated into 15 languages, thus making it the first internationally accessible publication dealing with Bukovina. As said, Franzos was by no means the unbiased traveller, eager to gain new insights into a world yet unknown: his liberal, Josephinist way of thinking had made him a staunch defender of the assimilation of the Jews into German culture, of freedom for Ruthenian-speaking farmers (in Galicia) as well as a harsh critic of Romanian-speaking boyars and orthodox Jews. His travel accounts merely served to illustrate how in his view much remained to be done and continue to provoke (even post-communist) Romanian historians, who reproached Franzos for utterly failing to understand the national aspirations of the nationalities of the Dual Monarchy. The fact that ‘Semi-Asia’ was often reprinted reveals the sustained interest for Franzos’ travels and his views. Franzos himself updated his book regularly and this way provides the reader with fascinating observations of the changes in Bukovina between 1876 and 1901. At times it requires careful simultaneous reading of different editions to disclose the author’s altered perspective: in 1901, Franzos remarked that ‘the brilliant idea of the Monarch to turn Austria into a German civic society had only materialised to some degree in Bukovina’.  

The ‘Era of Reconciliation’, almost continuously dominating from 1879 onwards, has caused a discord between the nations everywhere, unheard of even in this unfortunate state, the worst being in Galicia and Bukovina (…) Still the situation in Bukovina is somewhat better, but there as well the ‘Reconciliation’ already boasts rather alarming successes. Already, Romanians and Ruthenians clash; Germanity, hitherto the mediatory element, is now feuded by both sides, the Poles are gaining ground and already the religious denominations are at loggerheads in the same little land that only in 1876 was an Eldorado of unconditional tolerance. And with all the German university in Czernowitz might have meant for the entire East, it is currently treated like an orphan by the government and, scantily equipped, carves out a miserable existence.  

---

233 Die seit 1879 fast ununterbrochen herrschende ‘Versöhnungs’-Ära hat überall einen selbst in diesem unglücklichen Staate unerhörten Hader der Nationalitäten herbeigeführt, mit den schlimmsten auch in Galizien.
Franzos’ views on Bukovinian multi-ethnic culture and its development seem to be contradictory at times, probably caused by inconsistent editorial work on the different editions of ‘Semi-Asia’. Notwithstanding his expectation that ‘all brooks of different national cultures and backwardness (Unkultur) would eventually flow into one stream without anyone’s guessing its former variety of colours’, he concluded that the reason for the harmonious coexistence of different religions and nationalities was the mere fact that none of them was dominant enough to oppress the others. Towards the end of his life, Franzos became bitterly disappointed with the unifying and harmonising forces of German culture in ‘Semi-Asia’, as well as with the progress of Jewish assimilation into that same culture. Not only did the assimilation failure result from the rigid customs in the Jewish quarters and the adverse attitude of the non-Jewish environment, but also, according to Franzos, from the mitigation of German cultural influences in Galicia and Bukovina which had pushed the cultural orientation of Jews towards Zionism: whereas the choice between ‘remaining a Jew’ or ‘becoming a German’ was easy since their own ‘corrupted slang’ (he meant Yiddish) was close to German and obtaining ‘a language of culture’ was attractive, a choice between ‘remaining a Jew’ or ‘becoming a Romanian or a Pole’, would probably result in ‘remaining a Jew’. Nevertheless, Viennese authorities were eager to invoke Franzos’ dismissal of a Jewish national identity when the government refused to officially recognise that identity in 1911, reasoning along the lines that ‘the government cannot be requested to acknowledge a Jewish identity when even Jews themselves oppose it’. Franzos’ later disillusionments with Jewish integration as well as the question why he should suddenly figure as a representative of Jewish nationalism were conveniently ignored.

234 Ibid., p. 265.
235 Ibid., p. 268.
236 Bentz 2004
237 Franzos 1901, pp. XXXVIII-XXXIX.
Nicolae Iorga: *Neamul românesc din Bucovina*

A true mirror image of Franzos’ work is Nicolae Iorga’s ‘The Romanian People in Bukovina’, first published in 1905 and reprinted together with its twin ‘The Romanian People in Bessarabia’ in 2006. Strikingly, the reprinted edition lacks the necessary preface or introduction to the author’s xenophobic and anti-Semitic ramblings and therewith aptly illustrates the return to prewar nationalist historiography which can regularly be observed in post-communist Central Eastern Europe. Although Iorga experts disagree on the intensity of his anti-Semitism, his views on the Romanian nation left no room for multi-ethnicity.

The Romanian historian Iorga is a fitting example of the impossible balancing act between scholarly activity and political activism. Author of more than 1,200 books and 20,000 articles, Iorga was one of the most prolific scholars of all time and a member of the Romanian, French, Yugoslav, and Polish academies. In addition, he was deeply involved in the political life of Romania throughout the first four decades of the twentieth century, serving as a member of Parliament, as President of the interwar National Assembly, as minister, and briefly (1931-32) as Prime Minister. He was a co-founder (in 1910) of the Democratic Nationalist Party. As a Romanian citizen he had no official status in Austrian Bukovina, but his activities within the Bucharest-based Cultural League (*Liga Culturală*, established in January 1891 by Bucharest students to draw attention to what they perceived as actions taken by the Habsburg Monarchy against the Romanians living within its boundaries) intensified when the inter-ethnic Freethinking Alliance won the Bukovinian Diet elections in 1904 and thus formed a direct threat to local Romanian nationalist activism.

‘The Romanian People in Bukovina’ is presented like a travel account, a pilgrimage even, undertaken by Iorga without a clear purpose. The wandering observer finds a land of natural beauty and eternal Romanian heritage, unfortunately spoiled by foreign elements and corrupting governance:

> In Solca they say the Jew is the master, some hundred Jews rule over several thousands of Christians. (...) The Austrian breeding which brought about class consciousness, state

241 Oldson 1973, p. 56: ‘At one time, he maintains that all foreigners mean ill for Romania, that not one - and there he names the Russians, Germans, and Jews - wishes the Romanians well. On other occasions he says that nationalistic politics, and hence Romanian nationalism in general, should have a deep respect for other nations. (...) As with so much of what Iorga says, though, I believe that Iorga’s initial sentiment of fear and distrust of foreigners remains closer to his true beliefs’.
fetishism and the love for the material goods of life has marked the soul. One does not see any confidence in the people, in Romanianness as a whole, in another future.\textsuperscript{243}

As Corbea-Hoişie emphasised, the traveler only comes across ‘beautiful’, ‘tall’, ‘broad-shouldered’ Romanians and ‘big’, ‘fat’, ‘long-nosed’ Jews with a ‘calculating’ and ‘pompous’ pace.\textsuperscript{244} His alleged coalition with the Jews makes the Habsburg Emperor the anti-Christ in person.\textsuperscript{245} Direct personal attacks are reserved for Aurel Onciul, the Romanian front runner of the Freethinking Alliance, and his ‘infamous, unheard-of mockeries,\textsuperscript{246} as well as for the latter’s Ruthenian counterpart Stepan Smal’-Stocky, ‘the Galician agitator and baptised Jew, more agitator than professor.’\textsuperscript{247}

Iorga’s ‘travel accounts’ cannot possibly serve to provide reliable information on the ethn-national relations and the general status quo in multi-ethnic Bukovina: they are too obviously a political pamphlet. In spite of the questionable assertion by Iorga biographer Nagy-Talavera that ‘Iorga was first and foremost a historian (…) and had good instincts and great talent to recreate the event, but always on the basis of documents and facts’,\textsuperscript{248} therewith obviously ignoring how amply documents and facts can be manipulated, it is safe to conclude with Hobsbawn\textsuperscript{249} that political agendas produce ramshackle historiography. Still, Iorga was a prominent voice in the increasingly bitter intra-national disputes in and about Bukovina as well as a headache for the Austrian authorities. His international reputation as a scholar certainly enhanced the persuasiveness of anti-Semitism and indigeneity theories such as the one about the allegedly Slavicised Bukovinian Romanians who only needed to be ‘reminded’ of their Romanian ancestry.\textsuperscript{250} His work was to become very influential in the Romanian nationalist propaganda of the 1920s and 1930s.

\textsuperscript{243} “În Solca va să zică stăpân e Evreul, cei vre-o sută de Evreî ață în mâna lor cele câtea miți de creștinii. (…) Creșterea austriacă, din care iese spirit de clasă, fetișism față de Stat, iubirea bunurilor materiale ale vieții, aceasta și-a pus pecetea pe suflet. Încrederea în popor, în Româniea toată, în alt viitor, nu se vede”. Iorga 1905/2006, pp. 78 and 120.

\textsuperscript{244} Corbea-Hoişie 1996, pp. 86-87.


\textsuperscript{246} Iorga 1905/2006, pp. 57-58.

\textsuperscript{247} Ibid., p. 211

\textsuperscript{248} Nagy-Taravela 1998, p. 517.

\textsuperscript{249} Hobsbawm, Eric J, \textit{Nations and Nationalism Since 1780}, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990: ‘(…) I cannot but add that no serious historian of nations and nationalism can be a committed political nationalist, except in the sense in which believers in the literal truth of the Scriptures, while unable to make contributions to evolutionary theory, are not precluded from making contributions to archaeology and Semitic philology. Nationalism requires too much belief in what is patently not so.’ p 12.

\textsuperscript{250} Iorga 1905/2006, p. 228: ‘Nici el nu știe românește. Dar, știind așa pe gânduri, cu ochii aceia bună, duioși, cari ni pătrund, el își aduce aminte. [‘He does not know Romanian either. But, thus rapt in thought, with those good, gentle eyes penetrating us, he remembers’].
Marie Mischler: *Soziale und wirtschaftliche Skizzen aus der Bukowina* and Julius Platter: *Der Wucher in der Bukowina*

Two other publications with a prominent role for the Jewish population of Bukovina are the social-economic analyses by Julius Platter, ‘Usury in Bukovina’ from 1878\(^{251}\) and by Marie Mischler, ‘Social and Economic sketches from Bukovina’ from 1893.\(^{252}\) The economist Platter (1844-1923) was no stranger to Bukovina, where he had taught at the Franz Joseph University. Platter had clear persuasions with regard to social justice and staunchly defended social reform from above, the responsibilities of the property-owning class and the right to fair wages. His work, including a review of Marx’ ‘Das Kapital’, called the attention of Engels to Platter’s work.\(^{253}\) Mischler had similar academic affiliations through her husband, Ernst Mischler, a renowned statistician who taught at the Franz Joseph University from 1888 to 1891 and who in 1890 established the Regional Statistic Authority of the Bukovina Duchy.\(^{254}\)

Both works are refreshing in the sense that they distanced themselves from the Austrian ‘cultural mission’ and elaborated on the actual situation *in situ*, more often than not passing implicit and sobering criticism on the efforts made by the central authorities. Platter pointed out how the situation of the peasants had not improved over the last hundred years. Czernowitz was a dirty city with half-naked children playing in its streets, servants were seldom seen, there was no industry to speak of and for reasons unknown to the author, the new railroad did not reach the larger market towns of Sereth, Radautz and Suczawa, thus depriving them of trade opportunities.\(^{255}\) Mischler noted that all towns were in a backward condition, without gaslight or a sewerage system. Snow was not being removed in the winter. She blamed the absence of a healthy middle class on the lack of an organic urbanisation of the rural population and called upon the authorities to create more favourable conditions to advance such development.\(^{256}\)

Not only were Platter and Mischler the first authors to address social issues in Bukovina, they also proved to be the first exponents of ‘German nationalism’ in the Bukovinian context. Whereas ‘Austrians’ like Bidermann and Franzos had exclusively invoked the German language and culture as vehicles to civilise the ‘barbarians’, Platter’s and especially Mischler’s references to things ‘German’ specifically implied an ethnic component. Platter noted how Germans could be recognised by their ‘decent presentation’, how many alleged Germans were in fact Galicians who had only a German name to show for their Germanness and were inclined to speak French or Polish rather than German at home. Jews, he claimed,
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\(^{251}\) Platter, Julius, *Der Wucher in der Bukowina*, Fischer Jena 1878.


\(^{255}\) Platter 1878, pp. 38-40.

\(^{256}\) Mischler 1893, pp. 10-11.
‘could not wash away their nationality with baptismal water, even when their parents had already been christened and had raised their children to be Christians’ and not many ‘real Germans’ were to remain. Mischler observed how immigrated Germans ‘regrettably dwindled away due to interaction, mixed marriages and the lack of national cohesion, that they turned into ‘nationless’ people, speaking two, three or even four languages provided they had not simply been Polonised at an earlier stage’. She added that there was hardly a more German province among the mixed-language provinces in Austria than Bukovina and acknowledged the contribution by the forceful Jewish population in this respect ‘to some extent’. Strikingly, both Platter and Mischler emphasised the large and visible Polish presence in Bukovina in a time when the Polish influence in the now independent crownland had already significantly decreased. Mischler even observed a growing Polish influence by means of land purchases by the Polish.

These impressions may have resulted from the fact that both authors were members of urban communities and probably were well-connected to German Roman-Catholics, circles with a traditionally strong Polish presence. Additionally, in Platter’s case the frustration of the academic surfaced in his struggle with ethno-national qualifications: while he claimed that Romanians and Ruthenians could easily be identified as such by their last names - which was certainly not correct - Jews could not always be distinguished from (ethnic) Germans since they almost invariably bore German family names.

Platter and Mischler embody two opposite factions of German nationalism: Platter and his remarks on ‘baptismal water’ indicate a segregationist vision, aiming at racial purity, whereas Mischler showed an assimilationist tendency in which Jews were part of the German nation. It should be stressed that this does not place Mischler automatically in Franzos’ league, the difference between them being that Franzos advocated assimilation of Jews into the German cultural community while Mischler referred to the German ‘tribe’. Platter might not have seen a place for Jews within the German ‘tribe’, yet he did see a future of ‘real citizenship’ for them in Europe, albeit only on the basis of complete assimilation:

*Only truly higher education will denationalise the Jew completely, it will turn him into a true citizen, into a true member of European society in the way we can most clearly observe through countless examples in Western-European countries (that is, in Europe proper), especially in France.*

Corbea-Hoișie has characterised both Platter and Mischler as writing ‘anti-Semitically slanted narratives’ (*antisemitisch geprägte Schilderungen*), but this portrayal fits only Platter and
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then merely to a certain degree. Unlike nationalists like the Romanian historian Iorga,\(^{263}\) Platter did not attack Jews as such, but addressed the problem of usury in Bukovina and stressed the prominent role of Jews in this field. Admittedly, he did not shy away from racial slur and derogatory statements when he claimed for instance that ‘Jews would never, or at least not any time soon, become farmers, since they loathed physical labour’.\(^{264}\) This aside, his views on assimilation were remarkably similar to those held by Franzos. Platter’s reference to Western-Europe as ‘Europe proper’ clearly recalled Franzos’ ‘Semi-Asia’ and in his final remarks Platter even quoted him:

> The peasant is inclined towards idleness and brandy. The townsfolk are inclined to prey upon their fellow man (unlimited greed without industriousness!) and on squandering and the Jew stuffs everything into his pocket. “Each country gets the Jews it deserves”, K.E. Franzos says. If this is true, and there is a lot to say for it - then everyone should draw his own conclusions with regard to our case.\(^{265}\)

Platter remained ambiguous in more ways than one: he did not always clearly distinguish between ‘Jews’ and ‘usurers’ and although his language on Jews was often racist and offensive, he did regard them as the most intelligent part of the Bukovinian population.\(^{266}\)

Anti-Semitic activists quoting Platter’s observations later on usually painted the picture of an innocent, submissive peasantry trapped by the unscrupulous usurer. However, Platter himself placed the responsibility for the bad state of affairs firmly with the community, which did not seem inclined to assist its own members in time of need. The author failed to identify a community to begin with, but only saw a sum of individuals, no villages but mere collections of clay huts. He showed no understanding for the local tradition of lavishly celebrated births, weddings etc. when it was clear that the expenses could not be covered and was even more abhorred by party guests who ‘feasted and gormandised when they most certainly knew that, through their stomachs, hearth and home of the host went into the usurer’s pocket’.\(^{267}\) Not only peasants borrowed irresponsibly, landowners did it too, some even to idly gamble fortunes away: secret gambling sessions organised by large landowners were always attended by several Jews (ein oder zwei schmutzige Kaftanjuden), ready to provide the necessary sums.\(^{268}\) Jews themselves, Platter asserted, simply did not indebt themselves for weddings and funerals.\(^{269}\) Platter’s disenchanting sketches of Bukovinian society may or may not have been

\(^{263}\) Iorga, Nicolae, Neamul românesc din Bucovina, Minerva/Semne, Bucharest 1905/2006).

\(^{264}\) Platter 1878, p. 46.

\(^{265}\) Ibid., p. 54. p. 195: This specific Franzos quote had not escaped Iorga’s attention either: “Fiecare țară are Evreii ce merită”, a zis cineva al cărui interes era să creadă astfel. “Fiecare țară se poartă cu Evreii săi cum merită ei”, trebuie să fie răspunsul. Cît merită însă această pâcătoasă calicime leneșă, care spurcă țara pe care o locuiește?” [‘Each country has the Jews it deserves’ someone has said whose interest it was to believe as much. “Each country deals with the Jews the way they deserve to be dealt with”, the answer should be. What does that miserable, lazy poor lot, which desecrates the land, deserve?” Iorga 1905/2006, p. 195.
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accurate, yet the fact remains that there was an obviously dark side to the rosy images provided before by the likes of Bidermann and later, after the Dual Monarchy had disappeared, by nostalgically inclined German historians and Jewish memoirists.

In the introduction to her survey, Mischler pointed at an important feature of Bukovinian life for the educated newcomer: “The social stratum that might pay homage to the Westerner is small; on the other hand, the latter mostly comes entirely alien to the region and will not stay long. He mostly lives a ‘colonial life’ which withholds him from searching and finding gratification in the ado of society (...).” Although Mischler was less explicit than Bukowiner Rundschau, which characterised Bukovina as a penal colony for Austrians five years later, she clearly indicated that to Viennese intellectuals Bukovina was just a stopover on their way to new career opportunities. Her own life during the years in Czernowitz can therefore best be seen at that of today’s ‘expatriate spouse’. As she herself explained, her work was compiled of her own impressions enhanced by her husband’s economic and statistic overviews. This way of compiling data and personal experiences may have led to the rather awkward and unbalanced way Mischler structured her book: the first three chapters follow a traditional setup (Towns, Crafts, Trade), followed by a fourth on usury and parasitism and a fifth on the life of Chassidic Jews. The usury chapter might have been inspired by the social urgency of the topic and the political prominence attached to it by Platter’s publication fifteen years earlier. The chapter on Chassidic Jews can only be explained by the author’s personal fascination with this exotic phenomenon and highlights the sometimes curious mixture of economic analysis, journalistic approach and travel account. Although there is one case in which Mischler’s observations have a slightly anti-Semitic ring to them, she generally adopted a neutral tone in relation to the ethnicities in Bukovina and addressed one of the most notable features of Austrian Bukovina: the gap between rural and urban communities, not only in terms of development, but also in terms of ethnic composure. She noted that the majority of the rural population, Romanians and Ruthenians, were underrepresented in towns and cities, where Germans, Poles and Jews constituted the majority. In spite of the fact that the countryside grappled with overpopulation (causing fragmentation of arable farm land), migration to the urban centres failed to materialise and urban growth in Bukovina was due exclusively to immigration from beyond its borders. Countryside and cities showed an unbalanced growth: in the first century after Austrian occupation, cities grew tenfold, villages only threefold.

Both Platter and Mischler have presented fascinating accounts, certainly from the descriptive point of view: they provided their readers with statistic and ethnographic information,
critically addressing neglect by the central government as well as social flaws within Bukovinian society. For this study, their value lies most of all in the connotative sphere of their publications, revealing not only contemporary shifts towards the national discourse and with, in some cases, racial and anti-Semitic implications, but above all their own struggles with the unclear and variable identifications of the local population.

3.4 Other Representations and Interpretations

Menachem Beir Şafran: *Die inneren kulturellen Verhältnisse in der Bukowina (1825-1861)*

With Bukovina becoming part of Greater-Romania (*România Mare*) after World War I and the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, historiography followed suit. As mentioned by Brubaker et al: “One problem is the dense entwining of history and nationalist politics. Historiographic debates have been ethnicised, and ethnopoliitical struggles cast in historic terms, throughout East Central Europe, and beyond; historiographic and ethno-national fault lines have often coincided”.274 This ‘dense entwining’ could already be traced in the work of Iorga and remained consistent throughout the interwar/Greater-Romania period and has to some extent, as will be discussed further on, resumed after 1989.

An interesting example of historiography within the parameters of Romanian nationalism is presented by Menachem Beir Şafran from Bacău, who in 1939 defended his dissertation on the internal cultural relations in Bukovina between 1825 and 1861 in Basel.275 Having chosen this specific period in Bukovinian history in order to analyse the radical change in ethnic composition of the region during this time, Şafran has delivered a textbook example of the Romanian nationalist discourse, including its anachronisms, for instance when dealing with the situation in the 1830s:

> The available documents reveal to what extent the socially privileged made every effort at the Court in Vienna to obtain some personal benefits and how little they cared about the national interests of the Romanian part of the population. (...) at that time, 'National Romanian' and 'enemy' were synonyms in government circles.276

Immigrants are blamed for squeezing out the Romanians from trade and handicraft, although the author does not specify how these immigrants had managed to succeed so smoothly.
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274 Brubaker et al., 2006, p. 23.
275 Safran 1939.
276 ‘Aus den vorhandenen Akten kann man ersehen, wie sehr sich die Sorgen der Sozial Höhergestellten um die Erlangung irgend einer persönlichen Begünstigung am Wiener Hofe drehten und wie wenig sie sich um die nationalen Interessen des rumänischen Volksteiles kümmerten. (...) Nationalrumäne und Feind waren damals den regierenden Kreisen gleichbedeutende Begriffe’. Ibid., pp. 42-43.
Aristocracy is said to have assimilated into the German circles. While the mixed populations of Bukovina had ‘lacked a unified cultural direction’, colonists had ‘flooded the country and deprived it of its purely Romanian character’. The Romanians alone were the indigenous population and bearers of the historical and cultural traditions of this once Moldavian swathe of land, while ‘based on its historical past and as the representative of a specific, Romanian nationality’, Bukovina had managed to achieve separation from Galicia and its political autonomy.

To Şafran, the authentic Bukovinian is the Romanian peasant. As expressed in the quotations above, Bukovinian aristocracy is accused of squandering its Romanian heritage. Şafran emphasised that although in most parts of Austria farmers had still lived in medieval conditions, the situation in the eastern parts of the Empire had been downright deplorable. The abolition of serfdom had been a great improvement on a moral level, but in reality the peasants’ position had only deteriorated since he was not given any arable land and credit facilities to bridge the difficult transition period had not been available. The deep distrust towards the boyars had resulted in a flat refusal to work for them, which in turn had provoked the boyars to recruit workforces from Galicia. Şafran blamed the boyars for both the cultural deprivation of the peasant class and for the influx of ‘foreign’ immigrants taking over its jobs.

The author’s background make his views all the more fascinating: Şafran was the son of the Chief Rabbi of Bacău, Bezalel Şafran. His elder brother Alexandru was to become the youngest Chief Rabbi of Romania in 1940 and later, after being expelled by the communist regime, Chief Rabbi of Switzerland. His other brother Joseph was Chief Rabbi of Iaşi. Being of such prominent Jewish descent during a particularly violent anti-Semitic phase in Romanian history probably did not leave the author another option than to work within the discourse of contemporary Romanian nationalism. After having graduated at the Jewish Theological Academy in Vienna, Şafran had continued his studies of history, philosophy and religious history at the Vienna University, until in 1938 ‘continuation of his studies in Vienna proved to be impossible’, whereupon he had finished his dissertation in Basel. Although
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hardly any other data on the author’s further endeavours are available apart from the fact that Romanian Chief Rabbi Alexandru Șafran is said to have saved his persecuted brothers during the war.\textsuperscript{284} It is remarkable how widely spread the publication of his doctoral thesis is: copies can still be found in libraries throughout Europe and the United States.\textsuperscript{285}

Ion Nistor: \textit{Istoria Bucovinei}

Before Ion Nistor finished his ‘History of Bukovina’\textsuperscript{286} in the 1950s, he had been released from the communist Sighet prison after having served a five year sentence. His work on Bukovina was only published in 1991, but is so much in line with the thinking of Romanian nationalism before and during Greater-Romania that a classification within bibliographies on Bukovina from the 1950s (or even the 1990s) would feel contrived. Nistor was, like Iorga and others, much more a political activist than an unbiased historian. A Bukovina-born history professor and a member of the Romanian Academy from 1915, Nistor played a prominent political role after Bukovina had been united with Romania. He was elected rector of Cernăuți University from 1920 and was a cabinet minister in several governments between 1922 and 1940, serving his first term as Minister of State for Bukovina. Communist purges ended his career and eventually landed him in Sighet.\textsuperscript{287} As pointed out by Hausleitner, Nistor’s ‘History of Bukovina’ did not fulfil the title’s promise since Nistor only focused on Romanian activities and only marginally discussed the other nationalities - while regarding them as disruptive intruders.\textsuperscript{288} Just like Iorga’s ‘The Romanian People in Bukovina’, Nistor’s work was published in 1991 without any critical observations by the editors, in spite of its militant, xenophobic and anti-Semitic character.

Not surprisingly, Nistor advocated the traditional Romanian nationalist point of view which was by and large no different from that of his contemporary Iorga. ‘History of Bukovina’ provides a fine example of the intensified tensions between Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists. Centre stage of dissent was the Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{289} Romanian nationalists claimed the Orthodox Church to be ‘theirs’, part of the Romanian national identity\textsuperscript{290} and dreamt, until the 1867 Compromise (\textit{Ausgleich}) between Austria and Hungary rendered this impossible, of a secession from Dalmatia in order to establish a religious community of Transylvania and Bukovina, thus uniting all Romanian-speaking Orthodox within the Habsburg Empire. There were also financial matters to be considered: the Austrian government had secularised the possessions of the Orthodox monasteries in the Church Fund

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{284} \textit{Nécrologie Alexandre Safran}, Le Monde, 31 July 2006.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Source: http://www.worldcat.org
\item \textsuperscript{286} Nistor, Ion, \textit{Istoria Bucovinei}, Humanitas, Bucharest 1991.
\item \textsuperscript{287} Neagoe, Stelian, \textit{Ion Nistor, un istoric pentru eternitatea romanilor de pretutindeni}, Humanitas, Bucharest 1991, pp. V-XVII.
\item \textsuperscript{288} Hausleitner, Mariana, \textit{Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina - Die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918-1944}, Verlag R.Oldenbourg, München 2001, p. 449.
\item \textsuperscript{289} See also Part II, 2.3: The Bukovinian Orthodox Church.
\item \textsuperscript{290} See for instance Iorga 1905/2006, p. 208: ‘Ce e biserica, ortodoxă sau națională? Națională, spun Românii cu iubire de neam (…)’.
\end{itemize}
and Romanian nationalists now feared that the Ruthenian Orthodox faction would lay claim to its wealth.

Eugen Hacman, a theologian and from 1835 Bishop of Bukovina, had successfully insisted on a 1820 guarantee that would allocate Church Fund means strictly to the Orthodox. This had prevented the Catholics from claiming Church Fund resources during the years of Galician rule, but could not be invoked against the Ruthenian Orthodox of Bukovina. Hacman saw himself as the bishop of all Orthodox believers and was not impressed by nationalist claims. He tried to create a situation acceptable to both sides. A fusion of the Transylvanian and Bukovinian bishoprics was not a viable option to Hacman, since this would severely weaken the position of the Bukovinian Ruthenians. He proposed the establishment of an independent Bukovinian Metropoly or archdiocese instead. Romanian nationalists, many of whom were clerics now staunchly opposed Bishop Hacman, who would live just long enough to see the formation of the Metropoly of Bukovina and Dalmatia in 1873. Hacman and his obvious disregard of Romanian nationalist interests made him a prime target for Nistor’s bitter attacks. Nistor maintained that Hacman’s stance in the matter was not attributable to conviction, but to fear of losing his position of archbishop. That is why he fought national interests in clerical matters. He was an ‘opportunist’, a ‘malleable and docile instrument of Vienna which took advantage of his character weakness and his ambition to become Metropolitan at any price’. Nistor found the sole motivation for the Imperial decree to establish a Metropoly for Dalmatia and Bukovina with the Bishop of Bukovina promoted to the rank of Metropolitan in the ambitions of the Dual Monarchy to establish the division of territories once and for all, and to keep nationalities divided along these lines, instead of in Hacman's ‘senile ambitions’.

Even worse, he saw Hacman as a promoter of ‘Bukovinism’, this notion of a regional identity of multi-ethnicity cemented by Austro-German ‘Hochkultur’ and loyalty to the Emperor and thus very close to the ideal envisaged by Franzos. In the post-Habsburg years, Romanian nationalists in Bukovina would accuse the Austrian government of a deliberate strategy to create a ‘homo bucovinensis’ in order to thwart Romanian national ambitions. In this context, according to Nistor, Hacman even forbade his clergy folk to attend Romanian theatrical performances and his students to read Romanian newspapers while constantly preaching tolerance towards ‘foreigners’. By accusing Hacman of Bukovinism and anti-
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295 Similar views are held in Romanian academic circles to this day and even appear in recent publications of the Romanian Academy: ‘Se demonstrează că ‘Homo Bucovinensis’ este un personaj inventat, fără identitate națională, ca să servească politicii antiromânești’ ['It is proved that the homo bucovinensis is a character without a national identity, invented to serve anti-Romanian policies'], Vatamaniuc, D., *Bucovina între Occident și Orient - studii și documente*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest 2006, p. 533.

Romanianism, Nistor provided his readers with a fine example of how his nationalist parameters troubled his analytic observations: the fact that Haacman was not supportive of the Romanian nationalist cause within the Orthodox Church did not make him automatically anti-Romanian. The Bishop presented himself first and foremost an Orthodox believer with a responsibility for his entire religious community, no matter how (some of) its members might have identified themselves individually along national lines. Moreover, he showed a practical nature and feared an exodus of believers if the nationalist infighting continued.297

Nistor exposed a similar one-track mind when he discussed the role of German culture in Bukovina, consistently mixing up the concept of ‘Leitkultur’ as advocated by Franzos and his own narrow ethno-national notions. He therefore qualified ‘Germanisation’ of education as a hindrance for the schooling of the ‘indigenous population’298 and the founding of the university in 1875 as ‘a pivotal instrument to promote German culture’.299 He found further proof of the Bukovinism concept deliberately turned into a doctrine in the influence of large numbers of ‘German’ functionaries in Bukovina, propaganda in the German press and in the fact that the ‘German administration’ was in charge of the Church Fund.300 Even more than against Haacman, Nistor agitated against Aurel Onciul, one of the leading figures of the earlier mentioned Freethinking Alliance and one of the initiators of the Bukovinian Compromise of 1910.301 To Nistor’s outrage, Onciul had claimed that defending Romanian national rights hindered the cultural progress of the Ruthenians.302 According to Nistor, the Freethinking Alliance had meant only stronger support for the Ruthenians, who - he claimed - had been backed in Bukovina by the Austrian government to make up for the fact that there was little Vienna could do for them in Galicia where the Poles were so clearly the dominating force. The internally divided Romanians, Nistor observed, had been incapable of offering resistance.303

The theory of Daco-Roman continuity, ‘historical rights’ and indigeneity was imported from Transylvania. Its character proved to be profoundly different in Bukovina. For Transylvanian Romanian speakers it served within the context of the emancipation struggle against Magyar landowners, while in Bukovina those very landowners were Romanian speakers and the

---

299 Ibid., p. 212. As will be argued further in this chapter, Ukrainian nationalists like Botushans’kyi similarly suspected Vienna of Germanisation intentions in relation to the establishment of the university.
300 Ibid., p. 208.
301 This compromise provided a complicated system in which elections were held according to national representation. See Stourzh, Gerald, Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs, 1848-1918, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1985, pp. 233-38.
303 Ibid., p. 324.
indigeneity argument was shifted towards the Ruthenian population. Thus, in contrast to Transylvanian Romanian nationalists who tried to bring about change, Bukovinian Romanian nationalists argued along their nationalist lines to maintain the status quo.\textsuperscript{304} Within the framework of Romanian nationalism in general, anti-Ruthenianism was unique for Bukovina: Nistor carefully stuck to a division of ‘Ruthenians’ and ‘Hutsuls’ so as to deny their total number a majority on Bukovinian soil\textsuperscript{305} and claimed they were consciously abused by the Austrians as a tool against the Poles in Galicia, the Magyars in Sub-Carpathia and the Romanians in Bukovina.\textsuperscript{306} Romanian political parties were said to have refused cooperation with Ruthenian parties ‘because of [the latter’s] hostile attitude towards the Romanian population, their support of Hacman and their continuous penetration of the land in order to denationalise the Romanians’. Nistor saw no difference between Young-Ruthenians and Old-Ruthenians: both groups wanted to claim Bukovina, albeit for the realisation of different state concepts.\textsuperscript{307}

As far as interethnic relations are concerned, even Nistor admitted there were no tensions to speak of in daily life. The fact that Romanian speakers tended to assimilate more easily into Ruthenian-speaking communities, a great frustration of Romanian nationalists at the time, was simply attributed to the combination of interethnic (but intra-religious) marriages and the Ruthenian-speaking wife, who was unwilling or unable to learn her husband’s native language:

\textit{Relations between native Moldavians and foreign settlers - Ruthenians, Germans, Lippovans, Armenians etc. - were normal, imposed by the Romanian’s spirit of hospitality. The difference in religion, however, impeded marriages between orthodox Romanians and catholic or protestant Germans. On the other hand, since the Galician Ruthenians went over from the Uniate to the Orthodox Church once they had settled in Bukovina, marriages between Romanians and Ruthenians occurred frequently to the detriment of the Romanians. The smarter Romanian woman easily learned her husband’s foreign language whereas the Ruthenian woman did not really learn Romanian, thus imposing her language on the entire family.}\textsuperscript{308}

The first Romanian ball organised in Czer nowitz in 1864, Nistor noted, might have been about national pride, but most of all served to make clear to non-Romanians that they did not belong. He quoted one of the attendees stating in the \textit{Concordia} newspaper:

\textit{(…) foreigners, wondering how we, Romanians, organise a ball in their place, have felt for the first time during our carnival that they are on foreign territory and that it is them who are the minority where first they felt they were dominant.}\textsuperscript{309}

\textsuperscript{304} Hausleitner 2006, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{305} Soviet authorities employed the same method by distinguishing between ‘Romanians’ and ‘Moldavians’ when referring to the Romanians in Soviet (North) Bukovina.
\textsuperscript{306} Nistor 1991, pp. 101-02.
\textsuperscript{307} Ibid, p. 309.
\textsuperscript{308} Ibid., p. 22.
\textsuperscript{309} Ibid., p. 166.
Press reports in other newspapers of the time paint a different picture and only mention the balls of the different nationalities in a harmonious context.\footnote{See for instance Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, *Czernowitzer Angelegenheiten: Junimeaball*, 1498 (1909), p. 5, on the Junimea ball organised by the Romanian Junimea society: ‘(…) and the entire intelligentsia, the Romanian as well as the others, [were] joined in a solemn yet cozy gathering’.}

Nistor’s zealousness to present Bukovinian history within a framework of heroic struggle of aggrieved Romanian nationalists not only conflicted with other contemporary sources, it also produced some noteworthy contradictions within his own discursive framework: unlike Šafran, Nistor portrayed Bukovinian aristocracy (*boierime*) as a stronghold of Romanian self-awareness and anti-Habsburg resistance. This is how he interpreted their reluctance to take part in sessions of the Galician *Sejm* during the years of Galician dominance, while he left unexplained the contradicting fact that Bukovinians had not hesitated to respond to a call for help from their ‘adoptive motherland during the 1809 war against Napoleon’.\footnote{Nistor 1991, pp. 58-59.} A similar inconsistency concerned the role of Bishop Hacman allocated to him by Nistor, when a delegation of prominent Bucovinans presented a list of wishes to Emperor Ferdinand in 1848:

\begin{quote}
*A delegation led by Bishop Eugen set off to Olmütz to present to Emperor Ferdinand the petition of a land that, however small, still represented a nation, a Moldavian nation, as the Bishop declared in his address to the Emperor.*\footnote{Ibid., p. 94.}
\end{quote}

Even if Hacman’s ‘senile ambitions’ to be promoted to the rank of metropolitan had been all-consuming enough to let them prevail over possible nationalist sentiments, the gap Nistor left open without any further explanation between the ‘malleable and docile instrument of Vienna’ and the pioneer of Moldavian nationhood is simply too wide.

Nistor can be seen as the father of today’s Romanian historiography on Bukovina. His ideas on indigeneity, ‘historical rights’ as well as his anti-Semitic views were not new and rarely his own findings, but he has coined several aspects of the Romanian nationalistic discourse such as Bukovinism and anti-Ruthenianism. His publications prominently appear in every Bukovina-related bibliography in Romania and are mostly quoted without criticism. Much of the information he provided on the descriptive level is useful, but, to put it mildly, his analyses do not stand the test of time and deserve a critical approach.

Emanuel von Kapri: *Buchenland. Ein österreichisches Kronland verschiedener Völkergruppen*

Before the fall of Communism, research on Bukovinan history studies suffered from a great deficit: the only contributions stemmed from the ‘Bukovina Landsmannschaft’, an organisation formed by and supporting expelled Bukovina Germans and their families, while the contributions from the Soviet Union and Socialist Romania were largely moulded to fit...
ideologic purposes and were therefore seldom included in debates on Bukovina’s Habsburg past. As a result, the German postwar discourse is of a largely nostalgic nature, focusing on a utopian and ideally tolerant society which was ultimately ruined by destructive external forces.\textsuperscript{313} This lack of discussion promoted the utopian view on the Habsburg era in Bukovina with its tolerance being attributed not only to Austrian governance, but to the Germanophone community as a whole.\textsuperscript{314}

Born a German Bukovinian nobleman of Armenian descent who lost his property partly because of the 1920s Romanian agrarian reform, partly as a result of communist nationalisation, Emanuel von Kapri was allowed to leave Romania for the Federal Republic of Germany in 1971. He died ten months later. His ‘Bukovina - An Austrian Crownland of Various Peoples’ was published posthumously in 1974.\textsuperscript{315} Kapri stressed that his work should not be understood as the result of personal research, but refrained from quoting his sources specifically. Instead, he mentioned Austrian scholars like Kaindl, Polek and Ficker as his main sources of information. For Kapri, Austrian rule and German culture were one and the same thing: the sole driving force behind Bukovinian cultivation, that is, of its economical and cultural development. Every Bukovinian - defined here as ‘every fellow citizen who had joined the German cultural sphere wholeheartedly’\textsuperscript{316} - especially the Romanian, should realise that he owes \textit{everything} to German culture.\textsuperscript{317} Although Kapri dismissed Romanian-Ruthenian differences as ‘pointless’ in the patronising way typical of nostalgic German sources, he did make some valuable points in his analysis of the unification of Bukovina and Galicia under Polish supremacy: like other analysts, Kapri maintained Galicia had nothing to offer to Bukovina since it was poor and hardly able to solve its own problems such as the gap between the feudal Polish-speaking nobility and the Ruthenian-speaking peasantry. Moreover, the nobility was Roman Catholic, the peasantry Uniate/Greek Catholic; theologically close maybe, but very different from the (liturgical) outside - and this was what mattered to the simple layman. The situation in Bukovina was different: nobility and peasantry, Romanian and Ruthenian speaking, were united in the same religion and the revenue of church property was (under German supervision, the author underscores) beneficial to all. Thanks to German leadership, Bukovina had made enormous progress, whereas the Polish distrusted ‘strangers’ and wanted to solve their problems themselves.\textsuperscript{318} Kapri mainly blamed tensions between

\textsuperscript{313} Corbea-Hoișie 2003, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{314} See for example Ciuciura, Theodore B. with Nahrebecky, Roman, \textit{The Role of German Language and German Community in the Multi-Lingual Austrian Kronland of Bukovina (1775-1918)}, in: \textit{Jahrbuch der Ukrainekunde}, 19, 1982, pp. 88-101: ‘In conclusion one might say that the sympathies of Bukovinians toward Old Austria, that outlived the Habsburg Monarchy, were quite natural and justified. This is due not only to the general character of the Austrian rule but also to the human qualities of Bukovina’s Germanophones. They always displayed non-aggressive and conciliatory attitudes; served as mediators in ethnic conflicts, innovators in agriculture, crafts and industry; and finally as brokers of novel ideas and ideologies’.
\textsuperscript{316} Ibid., p. 120.
\textsuperscript{317} Ibid., p. 8: ‘Jeder Buchenländer, gleichgültig welcher Abstammung und Nationalität, ja vornehmlich der \textit{Rumäne}, muß bekennen: Was ich ward und werd gewesen, verdank ich deutscher Art und Wesen’.
\textsuperscript{318} Ibid., pp. 96-97.
Romanians and Ruthenian nationalists during the post-Galician period for a temporary delay in cultural development: he provided the example of brand new school buildings in mixed villages remaining empty for years because no compromise had been reached regarding the language of tuition. Like Ciuciura and Nahrebecky, Kapri attributed the lack of tensions in Bukovina in general to mediation by the Germans, ‘free from nationalist self-seeking and arrogance’. With his reasoning exactly following Franzos’ theory of German cultural supremacy, objections against Kapri’s views can easily be imagined. Additionally, Kapri hardly seemed to take notice of Jewish culture, anti-Semitism and, eventually, Nazism and its consequences. Kapri complimented Austrian commander Enzenberg, for instance, for his ‘warm heartbeat of love for the peoples entrusted to him’. He conveniently ignored the fact that Enzenberg regarded Jews as ‘insects’. As far as the Second World War is concerned, Kapri only mentioned how Berlin wanted to save Bukovinian and Bessarabian Germanity from falling into Soviet hands, nothing more.

Works by Rudolf Wagner

Of a more scholarly nature but stemming from the same school of German exile nostalgia as Kapri is Rudolf Wagner, who both wrote and edited volumes on Bukovinian history. One of the most prolific publicists in the field, Wagner was born in Duliby near the Galician town of Stryj in 1911 and moved to Bukovina with his parents after the First World War. After having served in the Romanian army, Wagner studied Comparative Religion in Marburg between 1934 and 1938 and received a PhD degree for his dissertation on the Ruthenian reformatory movement in Eastern Galicia. His activities during the Second World War remain controversial: although Wagner himself only admitted to having been a Wehrmacht soldier and a chief of staff of the relocation commission responsible for bringing the Bukovinian Germans ‘back home’ (heim ins Reich), he denied having been a Party member, while left-wing circles in postwar Germany accused him of having been a high-ranking SS official closely affiliated with the notorious Wannsee Institute. After the war he presided over the

319 Ibid., pp. 104-5
320 Ibid., p. 118.
321 Ibid., p. 29.
322 Bidermann 1875, p. 69.
323 Kapri 1974, p. 123: ‘Man wollte in Berlin das Bessarabien- und Bukowinadeutschum den Russen nicht ausliefern, was je dessen Knechtung, sowohl auch Verschleppung und Vernichtung bedeutet hätte und setzte dem Kreml gegenüber ein am 5. September 1940 unterfertigtes Abkommen durch, welches die Umsiedlung dieser Deutschen ins Reich ermöglichte’.
Assistance Committee for Protestant Resettlers from Bukovina (Hilfskomitee der evangelischen Umsiedler aus der Bukowina) and was elected spokesman of the Bukovina Landsmannschaft and a member of the Bavarian Landtag.325

First and foremost, Wagner idealised both the Dual Monarchy and Bukovina. He stated that ‘the Danube Monarchy on a large and Bukovina on a small scale were examples of the peaceful coexistence of various tribes and peoples in spite of the preservation of their respective cultures’.326 He maintained that almost every inhabitant of Austrian Czernowitz had mastered three languages, some even four and ‘if one takes Yiddish into consideration, even five’.327 Apart from the fact that Wagner painted a rather rosy picture of the knowledge of languages in Czernowitz, he did not seem to regard Yiddish as a distinctive language and on other occasions referred to it as a ‘medieval German dialect’.328

Wagner did not eschew the confrontation with representatives from the Romanian nationalist discourse when he discarded their key argumentation of indigeneity: even if one admits to the alleged medieval Romanian rights to the entire Bukovina, he stated, one cannot claim these rights to be everlasting; the land belongs to those who have cultivated it.329 He insensitively branded even the painted monasteries, cornerstone of Romanian/Moldavian cultural pride in Bukovina, teamwork of German builders and Byzantine monks.330 In turn, he considered the monasteries aesthetically outclassed by the Habsburg architectural splendour of the Metropolitan residence in Czernowitz.331 Wagner also contested the number of ‘Romanians’ claimed by Romanian nationalists to have been present in the region at the time of the 1774 Austrian occupation. He challenged the (proto-)Romanian ethnicity of the pre-Habsburg Moldavians - according to Wagner, Orthodox believers in 1774 were both Romanian and Ruthenian speakers calling themselves ‘Moldavians’332 - as maintained by Nistor and Iacobescu. On top of this, he criticised modern day Romanian historians for downplaying the presence of Gypsies in the pre-Austrian times for the sake of keeping the number of indigenous Romanians at 70,000 in 1774 in the process.333

Whereas Wagner’s criticism of the Romanian nationalist approach of historiography is of value, he significantly weakened his case by (exclusively) invoking Ukrainian nationalist sources to support his claims. The so-called ‘theft of Bukovina’ (răpirea Bucovinei) by the Austrians, coined by Kogălniceanu and embraced by Iorga, Nistor and Bălan, is said not to

328 Wagner 1979a, p. 17.
331 Ibid., p. 57.
333 Ibid., p. 262.
have taken place because it is denied by Ukrainian sources. Diaspora Ukrainian authors Nowosiwskiy and Kolotylo have defined Austrian Bukovina as ‘a truly constitutional state’ with an equal status for Ruthenians, Romanians and Germans. Besides the fact that Wagner mixed up two separate issues - the justification of the Austrian annexation and the quality of the Austrian administration - an assumption made by nationalist Ukrainians does not automatically nullify nationalist Romanian claims. The same criticism applies to the way Wagner argued against the Romanian nationalist assumption (Iorga and Cândea) that the establishment of a German university in Czernowitz had been an anti-Romanian measure: Wagner emphasised how Ruthenians/Ukrainians (and again his sources are Nowosiwsky and Kolotylo) had considered the university important for the development of their people. Wagner added that ‘this statement was more significant than the Romanian [one] not least because, in spite of the fact that it once belonged to the Moldavian Principality, Czernowitz is located in the Ruthenian-speaking and not in Romanian-speaking territory’. Both sources and reasoning only weakened Wagner’s substantiation: since Czernowitz had been the capital of whole Bukovina and the location of its only university, the exact number of Romanian or Ruthenian speakers in the Czernowitz area seems entirely irrelevant and the author’s argumentation only underpinned the credibility of Romanian nationalists’ accusations of Wagner’s pro-Ukrainian bias. Avoidably so, since more solid and valid arguments could have been asserted to invalidate those Romanian nationalist suspicions, as will be discussed further on.

Interestingly, Wagner was one of the first ‘Western’, pro-Habsburg scholars to engage in the post-communist debates on Bukovina with Romanian and Ukrainian fellow historians. His comments displayed useful insights into the areas of tension between the three groups in question, first and foremost proving how Bukovinian historiography in the 1990s was still practiced from a strictly national(ist) point of view. Second, mutual criticisms exposed where tensions lie within the German-Romanian-Ukrainian triangle: roughly, Germans and Romanians disagree on the justification and advantages of the Austrian occupation, Romanians and Ukrainians fight each other on questions of indigeneity and assimilation, whereas Post-Soviet Ukrainians historians do not seem to reproach the Germans with major issues of perceived injustice, but rather regard the Austrian administration with its Josephinist modernisations as a major vehicle for the development of Ukrainian national consciousness and emancipation in the nineteenth century. Today’s Romanian nationalists - while hesitantly admitting the advantages of the Habsburg modernisations - still adhere to the ‘theft of Bukovina’ dogma. At odds with both other ‘parties’, their position remains relatively isolated

334 Wagner 1979a, p. 10.
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336 Wagner responded to Mircea Grigoroviţă: ‘Neu ist [auch], daß man automatisch rumänenfeindlich ist, wenn man, wie ich es in der Universitätsfestschrift von 1975 getan habe, neben Rumänen auch Ukrainer für ihr Sprachgebiet zu Wort kommen läßt’ [It is [also] new that one is automatically anti-Romanian when, next to Romanians, one lets Ukrainians have their say concerning their language area like I did in the 1975 commemorative publication of the [Czernowitz] university] (Wagner 1996, p. 431).
337 Wagner likened the persistent denial of Austrian accomplishments by authors like Mircea Grigoroviţă to fighting windmills, Wagner 1996, p. 405.
to this day, while Ukrainian and German/Austrian exchanges within the field show more dynamism.

Wagner criticised the apparent lack of knowledge of German surfacing in numerous recent Romanian publications, quotes and footnotes of authors like Iacobescu. Although this criticism is justifiable, it is applicable to more than only Romanian authors: many Ukrainian and German publicists suffer from the same lack of access to sources published in other languages and it is safe to assume that, while nationalist authors might deliberately ignore dissenting opinions, scholars with the ambition to produce objective results are confronted with similar obstacles.

A strikingly apologetic position was adopted by Wagner in respect of the ‘Association of Christian Germans’ (Verein der christlichen Deutschen), founded in 1897 by Bukovinian German ethno-nationalists who wanted to distance themselves from Bukovinian Jews. The Association owed its success to the rise of anti-Semitism in Austria and the growing social mobility of Bukovinian Jews and regarded Jews as the only profiteers of the Bukovinism doctrine. The anti-Semitic upswing in Austria provoked reactions like Theodor Herzl’s, who published his ‘The Jewish State’ (Der Judenstaat) in 1896 and therewith prepared the ground for the later Zionist movement. Wagner put it as follows: “The name of the association can only be explained by the political, national (völkisch) and economic situation at the end of the last century, when old-school liberalism had to retreat in favour of the specific aspirations of separate peoples and, in the words of Lang, the Jews in Bukovina had remained, unlike those in Berlin and Vienna, orthodox, racially authentic (eigenvölkisch) and Zionist. Their number, bigger than that of the Germans, could only be determined through a declaration of religion and therefore the association founded in 1897 added the epithet ‘Christian’ for reasons of distinction (...)”. Not wasting a word over the rampant anti-Semitism of those times, Wagner inverted cause and effect by presenting German isolation as a result of Zionism and Orthodox Jewish dissociation. The source he quoted is Franz Lang, a prominent figure in the interwar German community in Romanian Bukovina and an advocate of racial segregation. The terminology applied (völkisch, eigenvölkisch) was not only outdated, but also tainted by its use in Nazi-era racial science.
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Readers interested in Ukrainian historiography from the period of the Cold War can consult Soviet sources as well as publications written by Ukrainian historians outside the Soviet sphere. Next to the more or less obvious traits which distinguish Soviet from Ukrainian diaspora publications such as the predictable emphasis on peasant revolt, landowner oppression and class struggle, some interesting analogies can be observed. Here, these different aspects will be illustrated primarily by quoting from two works, each of them representative of one of these categories: the Soviet publication ‘Sketches from the History of Northern Bukovina’ (in Ukrainian) by V.M. Botushans’kyi344 and ‘Bukovinian Ukrainians; a Historical Background and Their Self-Determination in 1918’ by I.M. Nowosiwsky,345 published by the New York-based Association of Bukovinian Ukrainians.

The appreciation of the Austrian role in the development of the Ruthenians/Ukrainians and their national consciousness is one of the notable differences between ‘pro-Ukrainian’ works from inside and outside the Soviet Union. In the words of Ciuciura and Nahrebecky: “Soviet writing on Bukovina is often meticulous, but always one-sided, criticising peasant and urban misery. This way, it is ignored that, despite all its flaws, the situation in Austria was still much better than in the Russia of the time, a fact even acknowledged by Lenin”. Acknowledged by Lenin or not, Botushans’kyi not only ignored the better situation in Austria, but flatly denied it: “The tactics of the Austrian national policy in Bukovina were also connected to the preparations for the war with Russia and aimed at misleading the Ukrainians in Russia by creating the illusion that for Ruthenians in Austria life was still better”.346 Similar views were reflected in a 1963 Russian-language brochure from Moscow, which in true Soviet tradition accentuated not so much ethnic background, but mainly social classes when anachronistically expressing the ‘workers’ centuries-long yearning to be united with the Ukrainian SSR and only hinted at a historical justification for the occupation by referring to the former Austrian and Romanian rulers as ‘foreign, cruel and evil stepmothers’ (чужую, жестокую, лихую мачеху).348 However, in 1935 Ukrainian nationalist Olexandr Shul’gyn had already called the Russian invasion of 1914 disastrous for the Ruthenian-speaking

344 Botushans'kyi, V.M. et al., Нариси з історії північної Буковини [Sketches from the History of Northern Bukovina], Naukova Dumka, Kyiv 1980.
347 Botushans’kyi 1980, p. 156: ‘Маневрування і австрійській національній політиці на Буковині були пов’язані також з підготовкою до війни з Росією і розраховані на те, щоб дезорієнтувати українців у Росії, створивши в них ілюзію, ніби українцям в Австрії живеться краще’.
348 Vashchenko, P. P., Советская Буковина [Soviet Bukovina], State Pedagogical Publishing House of the Ministry of Information, Moscow 1963, p. 51: ‘Так було и на Буковине вплоть до ее воссоединения с Украинской ССР. Здесь все богатства, особенно земля с ее дарами, принадлежали эксплуататорской верхушке. А сколько столетий ждали ее трудящиеся!’ [This was also the situation in Bukovina [one of exploitation of workers] before the unification with the Ukrainian SSR. Here all wealth, especially land and its proceeds, belonged to the exploiting leading clique. But how many centuries had they awaited this [unification]]!
population in Galicia, since Habsburg Galicia and Bukovina were the only territories where Ruthenian speakers had had their proper schools, libraries and so on.\textsuperscript{349}

If the role played by Austria was divergently appreciated, so were the Habsburg intentions: Soviet sources emphasised the Austrian policy of divide et impera and concluded that in multi-ethnic regions where ethnic Germans were a minority, they had oppressed some nations while winning over the landowners and bourgeoisie of other nations. In this way, they were said to have controlled the Ukrainians by winning over the Hungarian ruling classes in Transcarpathia, the Polish in eastern Galicia and the Romanians in Bukovina\textsuperscript{350} (not surprisingly, as has been mentioned before in relation to the Romanian nationalist discourse, the same argument had been invoked by Nistor, albeit with the Ruthenians in the role of instrument against the respective Poles, Hungarians and Romanians). Nowosiwsky, on the other hand, portrayed the Austrian authorities as a gullible instrument of alleged Romanian nationalist machinations:

\textit{The Romanian leading elite of Bukovina at that time was loyal the Austrian throne and the government; among them were active Austrian patriots. To this category belonged the editorial group of Bucovina, who hailed from all parts of the Romanian settlement - Bukovina, Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia. But they were Romanian nationalists first. In order to pull wool over the eyes of the Austrian government, the lead editorial of Bucovina's first issue (1848) proclaimed as its motto 'full equality of the nationalities of Bukovina', only subsequently to negate the existence of the Ukrainians at every turn and their aspiration to equal rights in Bukovina.}\textsuperscript{351}

A similar divergence of opinion surfaced in the question of the role of the Czernowitz University: whereas Botushans'kyi presented the establishment of the institution as one of the most powerful instruments of an obvious Germanisation policy\textsuperscript{352}, Nowosiwsky lauded it as having been pivotal for Ukrainian national emancipation.\textsuperscript{353}

Another central element of the Soviet discourse on Bukovina was the emphasis on the historic relations between Bukovinian Ruthenians and the Russian state. While the first decades of Austrian rule in Bukovina had seen lively migration movements between the Ottoman, Russian and Habsburg empires, Botushans'kyi mentioned migration away from Habsburg Bukovina exclusively and attributed the phenomenon to the alleged oppression of the

\textsuperscript{349} Choulguine, Alexandre, \textit{L'Ukraine contre Moscou 1917}, Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris 1935, p. 37:
'L'occupation de la Galicie orientale par les armées de Broussiloff fut un véritable désastre pour la population ukrainienne, car la Galicie et la Boukovinie se trouvant sous la domination autrichienne, ce furent les seuls pays où les Ukrainiens aient eu leurs écoles, leurs bibliothèques, etc.'.

\textsuperscript{350} Botushans'kyi 1980, p. 155.

\textsuperscript{351} Nowosiwsky 1970, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{352} Botushans'kyi 1980,p. 153.

peasants. Moreover, these emigrants were said to have fled to Russia, not only because of this oppression, but also to reunite with their fellow Ukrainians on Russian soil. This way, the author did not only paint a very selective picture of the mentioned migration, he also conveniently ignored the harsh circumstances in the Russia of the time (the fervour to ‘reunite with fellow Ukrainians on Russian soil’ might have been tempered slightly by prohibitions in 1863 and 1876 in Russia to speak and write in Ukrainian) and bestowed an anachronistic national consciousness upon the implied emigrants. Migration to Russia aside, Botushans’kyi devoted ample space to all possible trade relations between Bukovina and Russia and highly valued the many exchanges in the fields of economy, culture, lifestyle and, of course, class struggle. He even suggested that, next to the enhancement of cross-border Ukrainian national unity, contacts with Russia had had a modernising and emancipating effect on Bukovinian Ukrainians. All the same, Nowosiwsky argued that the only Ruthenians in Bukovina and Galicia to favour closer ties with Russia had been the Old-Ruthenians - also known as Russophiles- one of the two competing factions within the Ruthenian/Ukrainian emancipation movement in the Monarchy and - more importantly - the one which would eventually lose to the stronger popular appeal of the Young-Ruthenians. What is more, he regarded the conservative Old-Ruthenians as having been a major obstacle to emancipation, since they had joined forces with the Romanian ruling classes in Bukovina.

Notwithstanding the clearly ideological differences which led to diverging interpretations of the role of both the Russian and the Habsburg empires by Soviet and non-Soviet scholars, the ‘indigeneity principle’ remained a remarkable constant in both schools, or, as formulated by Glajar:

*In retrospect and based on nationalistic assumptions, both Romanian and Ukrainian historians argue about who were the first and more numerous settlers of Bukovina prior to Austrian occupation. (...) By manipulating specific historical aspects, different nationalities create ‘rival versions of the past’ and a myth of origins which is meant to establish and legitimate the claim to cultural autonomy and eventually political independence.*

---

354 Botushans’kyi 1980, p. 94: “Як констатувало Окружне управління Буковини, селян емітрували через поміщицький гніт, здирства орендарів та невпевненість у безпеці свого майна засобів до існування” [As the regional administration concluded, peasants emigrated because of landowner oppression, extortion by leaseholders and incertitude of the safety of their property and means of existence].
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The views held by Romanian nationalists have already been noted with regard to the works by Iorga and Nistor and the ‘rival version’ deployed by their Ukrainian adversaries followed the typical strategy of inversion of the Romanian claims: where Romanians maintained the indigenous population of Bukovina had consisted of Moldavians and therefore of Romanians, Ukrainians would argue that ‘Moldavian’ was used as a generic term for inhabitants of the region and had therefore included Ruthenians as well - or even claim that Ruthenians/Ukrainians had shaped the historical Moldavian state to begin with. When discussing majority and minority populations, Ukrainian nationalists once more invoked the conversion argument: whereas Romanians blamed their own adaptation qualities and a conscious Austrian policy for their allegedly shrinking population contingent, Ukrainians lamenting an equal fate accused Romanian officials of census fraud and of taking advantage of an illiterate and ignorant peasant population, key Romanian figures in the Orthodox Church of forging birth and wedding certificates and, in the tradition of their Romanian opponents, the Austrian government of Machiavellian machinations.

Interethnic inarticulateness was not confined to an ethnic or regional interpretation of the term ‘Moldavian’: equal confusion and fuel to the nationalist debate was provided by the term ‘Wallachian’/’Vlach’. According to Nowosiwsky, both the Romanians and the Ukrainian peasants were of the Orthodox faith, both belonging to the ‘Wallachian’ church. Thus Ukrainians often would call themselves ‘Wallachians’, although they spoke the Ukrainian language. Small wonder, then, that this ethnic confusion should often have been repeated by foreigners, unacquainted with ‘the true state of affairs’. Botushans’kyi affirmed that ‘Romanian priests (…) called the Orthodox faith ‘Vlach’ and its believers ‘Vlachs’, that is to say, Romanians’. Naturally, Romanian nationalists followed Nicolae Iorga in explaining the confusion surrounding the term ‘Wallachian’/’Vlach’ differently: to them, the phenomenon merely served as proof that (at least many) Ruthenian speakers were in fact Ruthenised Romanians, who, although they had forgotten their original native language, still ‘remembered’ their true ethnicity.

*The Romanian approach*

In 1947 and 1948, the newly-installed communist Romanian government had issued decrees outlawing the circulation of some seven hundred publications covering the former Romanian-ruled provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovina and the Romanian royal family. Furthermore, a wave of systematic arrests meant imprisonment for the vast majority of Romania’s prewar
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intellectuals. The publications of the arrested were proscribed and access to inter-war Romanian intellectual work was henceforth denied and replaced by Marxist-Leninist ideology and versions produced according to Soviet instructions. Implicitly, authors such as Iorga and Nistor were declared ‘undesirable’. Although Stalin may have felt compelled to exploit the forces of national consciousness in order to provide a pre-revolutionary historical justification for the Soviet present, around 1947 historians carefully referred to their object of interest as ‘the development of human society’ and not of that of ‘the Romanian nation’, which was to be analysed ‘on the territory of today’s Romania’ instead of bluntly ‘in Romania’. East-Moldavia was completely ignored in early communist historiography.

Marxist historiography regarded non-Eastern European peoples as a threat, as could be observed above in sources from Soviet Ukraine. Especially the Turks, the Tatars and the Habsburgs were suspected of wanting to destroy the ‘Eastern-European family’ from the outside. The Kievan State and ‘the Russian feudal state of Galicia’ were presented as a positive influence on the development of Moldavian history. Soviet historians distinguished between Romanians and Moldavians which enabled them to dismiss Romanian claims to the territory of the ancient Moldavian state - surely, a continuous settlement by Moldavians in the region which also included Bukovina since the fourteenth century could only mean there had never been a Romanian colony to speak of.

In the 1960’s, competition between the USSR and China diversified the once extremely homogenous and centralised communist block. This might have encouraged the Romanian Communist Party’s self-confidence and caused an emancipatory tendency from Soviet tutelage, one of its results being a partial return to a nationally oriented representation of history. A speech by Romanian communist leader Nicolae Ceaușescu on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the RCP on 8 May 1966, seen by Radio Free Europe as ‘probably the most notable effort yet made to project the Party as the continuance and the embodiment of Romanian nationalism’ openly disputed the annexation of Bessarabia and Bukovina by the Soviet Union. Ceaușescu stated that ‘the Marxist-Leninist teachings proclaim the right of the peoples to self-determination, not for the purpose of breaking up established national states but, on the contrary, for the liberation of the oppressed peoples and for constituting them into sovereign national states in accordance with the will and the decision of the broad people’s
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RFE analysts concluded that by presenting the Romanian case on an issue which the Soviets had hoped was closed for good, Ceauşescu was ‘showing a dangerous originality in his historical interpretations’. The speech was followed by the June 1966 issue of ‘Class Struggle’ (Lupta de Clasă), dealing with the unfortunate pre-war policies of the Comintern and with a direct reference to Bessarabia. For the first time, Bessarabia and North Bukovina were said to be ceded to the USSR ‘as the result of an ultimatum’. The expression was to remain and in a later stage also appeared in Romanian publications specifically aimed at an international audience.

Within Romanian national circles, the distribution of newly developed views gathered speed from the end of 1975, when historians Ion Ardeleanu and Mircea Muşat published an article in Anale de istorie - a publication by of the Romanian Institute for History and Social Policy - that would reignite the debate on Bukovina. The two reaffirmed the unification of Bukovina with ‘the Romanian motherland’ as the culmination of both a battle of centuries by the Romanian people and the realisation of a dream and added that the right of self-determination of nations was acknowledged ‘by collective international socialism’. The new treatment given to the Bessarabian and Bukovinian issue is illustrated by the two editions of ‘Political Life in Romania, 1918-1921’ (Viaţa politică în România 1918-1921), by the same authors. The first edition was published in 1971, the second in 1976. Unlike the first edition, the second begins with a nineteen-page discussion of the achievement of national unity in Romania in 1918. The section dealing with the union of Bessarabia and Bukovina with Romania was one of the most detailed and complete reviews of the history of these two territories published in Romania since 1945. Elaborate according to the standards of Socialist Romania as these reviews may have been, they provide little additional information for today’s reader interested in Habsburg Bukovina. Representative of the discourse is how the Habsburgs were customarily accused of swindling Moldavian land out of Ottoman hands and how in 1918 Bukovina ‘had been restored to the fatherland as one of its provinces’.

Tellingly, the authors generously quoted Ion Nistor, who was evidently acceptable again. The fact that the revised edition was favourably reviewed by the party historical journal and other publications, some of which cited in particular its treatment of Bessarabia and Bukovina, meant it had enjoyed approval on the highest level. A second key-note speech by party leader Ceauşescu to the Congress on Political Education and Socialist Culture in Bucharest in
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June 1976 stated that ‘certain problems inherited from the past (...) did not affect the cooperation and solidarity between the respective parties and peoples’ and that ‘Romania had no territorial or other problems with the Soviet Union or its other neighbouring socialist countries’.\(^{388}\) It was a clear indication of Ceauşescu’s intention to use the ‘falsification’ of the national past for internal consumption without provoking the Soviet Union with territorial claims.

A luxury edition of a photo book by Ion Miclea (comments by Radu Florescu) entitled ‘Sweet Bukovina’,\(^{389}\) published in several foreign languages, displayed a similar non-confrontational approach: while Florescu sang the praise of the beauty of the ‘Suceava region’ and the wise leadership of Ceauşescu, he flatly ignored the mere existence of Northern Bukovina and the shared history of the now separated territories. In his ‘Illustrated History of the Romanian People’, Dinu C. Giurescu drily informed his readers that ‘the land between the rivers Prut and Dniester (Bessarabia) and the northern part of Bucovina became part of the Soviet Union on June 26, 1940’ and left it at that.\(^{390}\) In a volume edited by Ceauşescu’s brother Ilie in 1983, Mircea Muşat once again mentioned how ‘on November 15/28, 1918, the Congress of representatives of the population of Bukovina decided unanimously ‘the unconditional union, for good and all, of Bukovina with Romania, within its former frontiers’.\(^{391}\) Unlike Muşat’s previous publications, this contribution noticeably lacked referrals to ‘the right of self-determination of nations as acknowledged by collective international socialism’ or even the Soviet ultimatum. It simply continued with a bland quote of President Ceauşescu on ‘the tireless struggle for unity’.

Only in 1985, a more daring statement appeared in a history volume edited by Andrei Oţetea (English-language edition by Andrew MacKenzie) when the author accused the Soviet Union of supporting the Magyar cause in Romania:

> Another possible reason for Russian background support for the Hungarian agitation about its minority is a fear that the Romanians might reclaim Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. This, I gather, is not a Romanian intention, but if it were, Russia could have a useful card in reserve by implying that it could hold the Hungarians in check if a dispute developed over Transylvania but only if Romania did not press her claims to what is now Soviet territory.\(^{392}\)

Although the book failed to specify whose hypothesis this is, Oţetea’s or MacKenzie’s, it later became apparent that Bucharest had provided the manuscript and that MacKenzie’s input had

\(^{388}\) Scînteia, 3 June 1976 as quoted by King 1976, pp. 1-2.
been marginal. It is therefore safe to assume that this view had official sanction from the communist regime at the time.

3.5 Conclusion

It is challenging, to put it mildly, to find source material dealing with regional identity in Habsburg Bukovina that is not tainted somehow by a political agenda. Post-socialist developments and recovered scholarly freedom initially led to a worrying come-back of old-school nationalism and is, in some cases, still prominently present in recent Ukrainian and Romanian publications on Bukovina. However, the newly obtained access to relevant source material inspires both Western European scholars such as Hausleitner and Scharr and their Eastern colleagues like Corbea-Hoişie, Purici and Ceauşu to produce critical, unbiased analyses. Combined with the possibility of free exchanges and discussions with fellow academics abroad, the debate on Bukovinian history is likely to become much more dynamic.

The first primary sources, texts meant to inform Vienna on the state of affairs in its newly acquired region, prove to be the most refreshing in their ambiguity: the seemingly careless way of dealing with ethnicity and nationality, the clear contempt the aristocracy showed for peasantry and clergy alike and the active role an ‘ethnic Romanian’ like Balsch played in the confiscation of Orthodox Church property are a far cry from the creative nationalist interpretations of the nineteenth century. Still, the roots of later discontent were already present in this early stage. Especially the bare anti-Semitism was an ominous precursor of what was to follow when nationalism gained ground. With an interval of several decades, the accounts from Austrian Bukovina’s ‘finest hour’ are already infiltrated by nationalist, ethnocentral and, in some cases, racist influences. Rosy pictures of a multi-ethnic family stemming from Austrian authors should be taken with a grain of salt, while nationalist pamphlets such as Iorga’s and the ‘cultural mission’ of a Franzos have little to do with serious historiography. The excitement experienced by Viennese correspondents when confronted with Bukovina’s multi-ethnic exoticism risks depicting the local community in an overly-segregated way.

The tricky middle category provides a mixed bag of useless propaganda and valuable source material. Apart from an impressive number of (sometimes arguable) facts, Greater-Romania’s nationalist studies are anti-innovative by definition, since they serve invariably to back Romanian nationalist dogmata such as ‘indigeneity’ and ‘squeezing out’. Socialist historiography did not fundamentally eradicate this tradition: periods of deafening silence on Bukovina aside, the aforementioned dogmata remained firmly in place. The situation ‘on the other side’, in Soviet Ukraine, was not much different. Under a layer of ‘class struggle’ and ‘eternal Russian-Ukrainian friendship’, the predictable ‘rival indigeneity version’ surfaced in close resemblance with contemporary Ukrainian diaspora writing. Meanwhile, German authors, not constrained by an authoritarian regime, endeavoured - in good Habsburg tradition - to interpret Bukovinian history in the role of the nonpartisan mediator. Nostalgic sentiments for the ‘paradise lost’, struggle with the German role in the dramatic developments of the
Second World War and the continuation of bitter polemics with traditional (mostly Romanian) adversaries often proved these ambitions elusive.