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3.1 Cultural Claims

In the debate on nationalities, their rights, accomplishments and influence, Bukovinians with roots in the German linguistic and cultural realm as well as those identifying with this realm took a position profoundly different from those discussed before. While Romanian and Ruthenian activists stressed their claims of ‘indigeneity’ once they mobilised their nationalisms in the political arena, in spite of how challenging it sometimes was to substantiate these claims, the majority of Jewish and non-Jewish German speakers had clearly entered the scene after – and because of - the Austrian occupation of the territory. The colonial aspect of their presence had positive connotations in the interpretation by Austrian and other pro-Habsburg sources of ‘the civilising mission of German culture’, but was despised by Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists and later by their own like-minded historians who explained the phenomenon in terms of ‘foreign occupation’ and its agents therefore as ‘foreigners’ or ‘strangers’. When the competition between the Romanian and Ruthenian brands of nationalism in Bukovina intensified, the local German-language press depicted Jewish-German political and cultural forces as a buffer (*Isolierschichte*) between the two and deemed ‘a neutral Jewish-German position’ beneficial to all parties involved.429 Predictably, Ruthenian and Romanian factions questioned this neutrality. Ion Nistor accused Germans and Jews ‘of having befriended the Ruthenians in order to wring political power from the hands of the Romanians’.430 However, competition was not exclusively a matter between Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists. ‘Jewish-German forces’ were not the monolith some periodicals liked to see in them, and once nationalism caused a rift in the representatives of German culture in Bukovina, it became a matter of political survival for Jewish and German nationalists to side with either of the ‘indigenous’ nationalist forces.

3.2 German-speaking Settlers

Small numbers of German speakers, often Jews, have reportedly lived in what was to become Bukovina from the fourteenth century onward. Jews were known to be native to Suceava and Sereith as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth century,431 and were presumed either, as Kassner claims, to have arrived from Palestine during the first century A.D. or to have come from the neighbouring areas in more recent times.432 According to Wagner, German soldiers in the Austrian army introduced Germanity as a cultural factor ‘in the Old-Austrian spirit’,433 but the real influx of immigrants of mainly the southwestern German regions was the direct result of the Austrian policy of settling (*Peuplierung*). The Josephinist patents of 17
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September 1781 had granted immigrants religious and other advantages. This policy was initially focused primarily on Galicia, but its unexpected success caused significant delays and land scarcity. Lemberg authorities were overwhelmed and undercapacitated and thus proposed to engage Bukovina as a ‘pressure valve’ for the surplus. Emperor Joseph II supported this solution, and although the military administration in Bukovina had proposed a colonisation policy in the first place, opinions on which groups were to be encouraged diverged in Vienna and Czernowitz.

Commander Enzenberg considered German-speaking settlers far too expensive and too dependent on state support: while regional settlers used to arrive with their personal belongings and basically took care of their personal needs, German-speaking immigrants expected and received considerable support and benefits from the state. Enzenberg feared that this kind of assistance would attract only the poor and destitute. The additional circumstance that a considerable number of candidates had spent their personal resources while waiting for proper allocation in Galicia had caused them to rely on state support entirely. In the end, Joseph II’s high expectations of the ‘civilising effect’ of German immigration prevailed.

State-organised colonisation proved to be a tiresome enterprise. Local immigrants remained loyal to their nomadic traditions and moved on once harvests failed, as was the case in 1785. Modest Magyar and Lippovan colonies were established, but newcomers from the German lands joined existing settlements such as Czernowitz, Rosch, Zuczka, Molodia and Mitokadragomirna instead and so the Emperor’s vision of a string of German colonies did not materialise. Balthasar Hacquet, who traveled around Bukovina shortly after the Habsburg occupation, reported that the first German settlers were twenty-two beggar families from the Banat region, who unsuccessfully settled close to Suczawa. The presence of these families also indicated that not all German-speaking immigrants arrived directly from the German lands. Still, they were commonly known to Vienna as ‘Bukovinian Swabians’ (Bukowiner Schwaben), no matter whether they originated from the Palatinate, Hessen, Baden, Württemberg or Franconia. By 1814, Baron Meidinger reported from Bukovina:

---
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Only very few Germans are present, and it is exactly these people who might make the country prosperous. The biggest mistake with such settlements is that most people who move to the area are either beggars or scallywags who did not get ahead in their native land. They may indeed contribute to a population increase, but not to the culture of the territory. Such colonists cost the government much while the area benefits from them little or not at all.\textsuperscript{443}

This description echoed the caveat of military commander Enzenberg, who had warned his superiors for ‘destitute Germans who had mostly fled their homeland because of debauchery’ and that of Hacquet, who depicted the German colonists as ‘crippled and badly shaped’ in Galicia and Bukovina alike.\textsuperscript{444} Summarily, state-ordered colonisation in Bukovina proceeded sluggishly and as far as German-speaking colonists were concerned, their spread was scattered and haphazard. By 1844, Kohl reported that German immigrants were mainly found in the cities and towns where they worked as merchants and mechanics.\textsuperscript{445} The tiresome colonisation process had certainly not satisfied the Imperial Court and once Bukovina was united with Galicia, settling policies were abandoned altogether.\textsuperscript{446}

Images of German Colonists

Predictably, reported tensions between the newcomers and the long-time residents were a godsend for Romanian nationalist authors who intended to glorify the peaceful pre-colonial epoch. Iacobescu mentioned hostile reactions when immigrants infringed customary rights\textsuperscript{447} and Nistor recounted how German settlers caused outrage in Suczawa when they used bricks from demolished Orthodox churches to build houses for themselves. He also mentioned an incident in Satulmare near Radautz (which is likely to be the same referred to by Iacobescu) caused by settlers who had occupied land.\textsuperscript{448} Once again, a more detailed account was provided by Balthasar Hacquet:

\begin{quote}
Of course, the old inhabitants are not very happy with all these new plantations, since they can no longer let their fields lie fallow, and since these newcomers also too often arrogate to themselves what is not for them. This way I overheard people complain before the imperial commissioner one day about these settlers, whose number is not large at all, claiming that the latter had not only plundered their small gardens, but had also dared to infringe and curtail their ancient rights in different ways. The affronted have been satisfied, and the perturbators were told in private that their lives were in constant danger, for once they would be at odds with the Wallachians or Moldavians they may rest assured that even the unborn child would
\end{quote}
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This unfavourable depiction of the 'savage, violent and nomadic' (Romanian-speaking) residents might explain that this more explicit source is not quoted by Romanian nationalist authors.

German colonists in Bukovina were widely respected for their orderliness. German ethno-nationalist Julius Platter maintained they could be recognised immediately, not so much by their features as by their decent presentation.\(^{450}\) Even Romanian nationalists, who reproached the Germans from the village of Illishestie for their alleged bargain purchase of land from the local population, admitted that the 'Swabians' were very talented and prosperous farmers.\(^{451}\)

Though they were said to stick together, they were also said to uphold the differences from the regions they came from originally.\(^{452}\) The colonists showed little interest in social mobility and city life and, in spite of the bleak economic situation, were not inclined to leave their villages.\(^{453}\) Habsburg-era authors distinguished between what they considered ‘real Germans’ - the countryside colonists - and city dwellers with German as their mother tongue: The latter were said to be Jews, or Galicians who spoke more often Polish or French at home than German.\(^{454}\) Although Radautz was characterised as an exception and a real ‘German town’ by both Mischler and the British Foreign Office,\(^ {455}\) Ion Sbiera in his memoires insisted that the town had been ‘completely Romanian’ when he went to school there in 1845: Even Jews and Germans were said to communicate in Romanian.\(^ {456}\)

Conflicting views of the German presence in Habsburg Bukovina are not limited to the character of a town like Radautz. In her memoirs, Gudrun Windisch from the village of Molodia recounted that German colonists often had only limited contact with their Romanian- and Ruthenian-speaking workers and that weddings and funerals were only attended according to ethnicity.\(^ {457}\) Adolf Katzenbeisser, who was born in Czudyn, confirmed that in his village Germans kept their distance from Romanian-speaking villagers and from Jews, but also maintained that marriages between members of these different groups were no exception.\(^ {458}\) Philipp Menczel observed that German and Romanian speaking communities easily merged and that their settlements ‘contrasted favourably’ with those consisting purely of Romanian speakers and even more with those exclusively inhabited by Ruthenian speakers.

---
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Moreover, Menczel stated that in contrast to mixed Romanian-German speaking communities there were no Ruthenian-German speaking localities. Ion Nistor’s ethnographic map of Bukovina, based on the - admittedly inadequate - 1910 census results, confirms this assessment.

Villagers’ accounts in Romanian were generally positive about the interaction with German speakers. In Solka, Orthodox inhabitants praised forester Lugert, who had immaculately cleaned up the area around their church in spite of the fact that he was ‘of another nation and denomination’ (de altă nație și lege). Dragoș Luchian from Alt-Fratautz recalled how Romanian and German speakers had lived peacefully together in the village for 150 years, recognising each other’s talents. Mixed marriages were said to have been common and an elderly German woman had allegedly provided herbal medicine free of charge to both German and Romanian speakers. Another German had been known throughout the Radautz for his treatment of bone fractures and dislocations and later passed on these skills to his son. In his account of the Magyar colonies of Bukovina, Tibor Csupor mentioned that the Magyars (Szeklers) had learnt about farming from the Germans and that ‘communication with the Germans had been easy anyway because of the approximity of their villages, their shared Catholic religion - with its shared holidays - and their general view on things’. According to Adolf Katzenbeisser, in spite of confessional contradictions between Germans and Lippovans (Russian Old-Believers), general harmony had prevailed and in some communities both groups had even shared one chapel. Gudrun Windisch remembered how German women had mostly refrained from taking part in Romanian dances and had been mocked by their peers for dancing with a ‘Vlach’, but also underlined that well into the 1930s, occasional village brawls had never had the character of ‘Germans vs. Romanians’.

Luchian from Alt-Fratautz testified that ‘German arrogance’ had sometimes led to tensions. A principal cause of friction had been the Bukovinian German speakers’ lack of knowledge of the local languages, although the picture painted by Olaru and Purici - who sustained that the Bukovinian Germans had not mastered any local languages while the other nationalities had all known German to a certain extent - is overdrawn. Still, Oscar Jászi’s observation of the situation in the Czech lands, where German arrogance and consecutive refusal to learn the languages of their ‘servants and lackeys’ resulted in monolingualism, applies to some extent
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to Habsburg Bukovina as well.\textsuperscript{468} Since Bukovinians were required to have a command of the crownland’s three official languages in order to be employed by the local authorities, German-language Bukovinians had not done themselves a favour with their ‘German-only’ attitude. \textit{Bukowinaer Post} commented that if government positions were either reserved for German-language non-Bukovinians or multi-lingual Bukovinians, German-language Bukovinians would not stand a chance.\textsuperscript{469}

### 3.3 German Culture

In spite of the derogatory terminology devoted to German settlers in early reports, they were soon considered ‘the yeast that brought growth and life to the formerly delapidated and completely uncultivated area’, welcomed by a ‘destitute and illiterate population all too willing to be led and taught by them’.\textsuperscript{470} German culture spread fast and was the connecting link between Vienna and Czernowitz - and many other cities in the Habsburg Empire. German-speaking immigrants, found mainly among soldiers, civil servants and teachers, proudly regarded themselves as ‘vehicles of civilisation’.\textsuperscript{471} Possibilities for social climbing in Bukovina were decided by one’s degree of access to German culture. A considerable number of Jewish Bukovinians, Karl Emil Franzos being the most prominent, considered themselves ‘cultural Germans’.\textsuperscript{472}

When addressing Germanity in Bukovina, a clear distinction between German culture and German ethno-nationalism should be made. When nationalist voices became louder, the difference between the two quickly faded. \textit{Bukowinaer Rundschau} emphasised in 1891 that the need for culture in the newly occupied territory had been obvious:

\begin{quote}
\textit{We have not been Germanised, but German culture was inoculated into us to protect us against our uncultivated environment and this German culture is now a precious and inalienable peculiarity of Bukovina. We owe the rapid intellectual blossoming of our province to it, and today it weaves the intellectual threads that tie us to the civilised West, reaching over Galicia. But we are not in the least inclined to say that Bukovina belongs to the Germans.}\textsuperscript{473}
\end{quote}

There was indeed an affinity with the Habsburg-style German \textit{Hochkultur} which was unrelated to German nationalism. Even if the Viennese authorities proclaimed a nationally neutral system of redistribution and welfare, their own identity reflected a set of social values which could not be kept out of the social sphere.\textsuperscript{474} More, a beneficial influence of German culture was actively pursued. Before nationalism became a political force in Bukovina,
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German culture - including the language - was not only dominant, it was the ‘taken-for-granted’ culture and, in the terminology of Brubaker, ‘masked’. Its position and presence were obvious and thus not an endangered species eligible to fuel German nationalism. German speakers in Bukovina generally put the accent elsewhere. In the words of Christopher and Hugh Seton-Watson: “Many, perhaps most, German-speaking citizens of the monarchy did not consider themselves part of a German nation at all. They belonged to the German cultural world and were proud of it, but their political loyalty was given not to the German nation but to the monarchy and to its dynasty as the symbol of the monarchy: they were kaisertreu”. This way, Austrian endeavours to assimilate Bukovinian Jews were not aimed at assimilating them into the ethnic Germans of Bukovina, but into the greater German cultural sphere (Kulturnation). Later, German nationalists in Bukovina refused to distinguish the two phenomena and regarded them as subsequent phases of one single process. They had seen the ‘German mission’ as twofold from the start, aimed both at bringing civilisation to the East and at protecting Germanity. As long as nationalism and those representing it had not yet spread equally among other groups, the first task had been easy. The centralist government had epitomised Germanity, but this was no longer self-evident. When German cultural superiority had ceased to be a given and German interference was met with hostility, German nationalists concluded that the only way to protect what they considered to be rightfully theirs was national autonomy (völkische Selbstverwaltung). They strongly supported the register system (the Bukovinian Compromise) which was introduced in the Bukovinian regional diet in 1911 and they encouraged its introduction on municipal and state levels.

As such, German nationalists broke the mould of ‘German mediation’, which had become a truism in its pervasiveness and a key element of the ‘Bukovinian myth’. The mediation element was generally directed at competing Romanian and Ruthenian factions and was so commonly referred to that in its mission statement, Czernowitzer Tagblatt specifically mentioned its aspired ‘mediating role, moderate and with German as the language of peace between two rival nationalities’. This hardly distinguished the periodical from its predecessors or competitors. When Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung tried to explain the difference between Galician and Bukovinian Ruthenian nationalism, it claimed that Ruthenian nationalists in Bukovina were more moderate because the use of German worked as a buffer between the competing forces, while in Galicia they were at the mercy of not only political, but also linguistic Polish dominance. This view was similar to the observations of Leon Kellner in the Viennese Neue Freie Presse. Kellner was a Galician-born Zionist university

professor who had come from Vienna to teach at Franz-Joseph University and his Bukovina-related contributions for Neue Freie Presse were reprinted in Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung ‘since they reduced the prevailing prejudices’:

Romanian and Ruthenian in the flanks, German in the middle - Czernowitzers have conciliated themselves with it and have no cause to regret the centre position granted to the Germans. Not only Romanians and Slavs are comfortable with German culture, which in the East is synonymous with Austrian culture and to which Bukovina owes so much; all heterogeneous elements in the population of the aspiring province willingly join forces when German work ethic and German community spirit serve as the core of crystal formation.481

Karl-Emil Franzos set a lasting tone for the nostalgia which was to dominate pro-German historiography when he maintained that peace in Bukovina was held by the spirit of culture, ‘or, in this case, Germanity’:482 Within the boundaries of the Empire, only Bukovina had fulfilled Joseph II’s dream of a state united by a common education: not a German nation state, but a German culture state.483 As mentioned in relation to the Bukovinian myth, Kapri had enthused in the post-Habsburg period that there had been ‘only brothers in this land, older and younger, so to speak, with Germanity as primus inter pares’.484

Towards the end of the century, when political nationalism was given increasing prominence, opponents no longer distinguished German cultural influence from German nationalism. Whereas in 1890 Moritz Stekel had marveled at the absence of German associations in a city so obviously German-oriented as Czernowitz,485 by 1911 Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal warned German Bukovinians that ‘the struggle of all nations against the Germans in Bukovina required men of proven grit and extensive knowledge’ were they to stand a chance in the regional diet elections.486 Bukovinian German nationalism was a product of growing Romanian and Ruthenian nationalism rather than the result of an autonomous emancipation process. As long as German cultural dominance was taken for granted, such nationalism had seemed redundant.

The main accusation Habsburg authorities, and in the course of history, Bukovinian German nationalists faced was that of pursuing an active policy of ‘Germanisation’. At first, and understandably, in the eyes of Bukovina’s early visitor from Bremen, Johann Georg Kohl, ‘Germanisation’ had a positive ring when he had reported in relation to the local aristocracy that ‘the influence of Vienna had at last begun to Germanise them a little’, that they ‘learned French and German, called themselves Baron and Graf, and dressed in the German fashion’.487
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In 1902, *Bukowinaer Journal* with its Romanian nationalist orientation downplayed the risk of German influence in relation to its own project, but simultaneously defined ‘Germanisation’ as a direct competitor of Romanian nationalism:

*The Romanians, who were always well-disposed towards the Germans, do not fear Germanisation, even though the German language is now prevalent in all offices which in turn are occupied by German officers. They [Romanians - HFD] readily acknowledge the cultural importance of the German language as a mediation language and know very well that the Germans do not aim for Germanisation, in other words denationalisation of the Romanians.*

Post-Habsburg Romanian and Soviet/Ukrainian sources did not waste time on such subtleties and stated that the character of the administration was German and its goal had been Germanisation *tout court.*

Within the context of Habsburg Bukovina, the Franz-Joseph University was seen by many as the most powerful symbol of Germanisation. When in 1868 regional Diet deputy Pompe unsuccessfully pleaded for the establishment of a law academy in Bukovina (the university was only established in 1875), he declared to do so because of the moral and linguistic ineptitude of Lemberg University: Pompe deemed Galician politics subversive and the planned languages of tuition - Polish and Ruthenian - inaccessible to most Bukovinians. He hastened to add that ‘he did not want to Polonise or Germanise Bukovina, but wanted it to have an appropriate blend and a functional combination of the German cultural element and national development’.

Franz Joseph University dean Tomasciu also invoked the threat of ‘Polonisation’ in a speech he held in Vienna in 1884. While he decried an alleged increase of Polish-Galician influence in Bukovina in only a few years’ time, he emphasised that during the previous hundred years of extensive German cultural influence not even one family in Bukovina had been Germanised. By 1897, *Czernowitzer Presse* dismissed ‘those who had regarded the university as a mere bastion of Germanity’ as ‘just a few nationalist hotheads’.

---
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Influenced by the dire economic situation in and the large-scale emigration from Bukovina in the following decades, the university and therewith the beneficial influence of the German ‘culture injection’ began to lose prestige. Journalist Hermann Menkes concluded with dismay that ‘the forcibly transplanted German culture had produced neither the expected fruit, nor the organic compound’ while ‘the university was a factory of professional and intellectual proletarians, who had no inner relation to all the science taught by strangers’. The collapse of the Habsburg Empire also shut the doors of its German-language university in Czernowitz. Typically, Germanisation remained an issue until the very last moments when university dean Herzog addressed Franz Joseph University’s very last graduates:

Ladies and gentlemen, do not believe it when the anti-German side assures you that this university was founded to Germanise the land or when they even claim it has had a Germanising effect. Apart from the fact that it would have been useless to endeavour the Germanisation of a land so far away and isolated from the German homeland, you will notice that it is precisely the local leaders of the national movement [meant are the Romanian nationalist leaders], the leaders in battle who have almost all attended this German university. Do ask them if even the slightest attempt was made to influence their national sentiments. To us Germans, our national conviction is far too sacred to expand it to other peoples. If the university which was founded in this land had German as the language of administration and instruction, it was only for practical reasons (...).

Herzog aptly illustrated how Joseph II’s vision of the civilising mission of cultural Germanity was now retrospectively interpreted within the narrow boundaries of German ethno-nationalism. Moreover, in spite of the fact that Herzog congratulated the Romanians on their newly acquired power position, the cited fragment from his speech highlights the irony of the Franz Joseph University: established to emancipate and develop the most eastern section of the Empire and to involve it more closely in Austrian collectivity, it had turned out to be instrumental in the education of nationalists and the distribution of their ideas. Explicitly national associations had only emerged in Bukovina after the university had been founded.

German Language

Clearly, the most obvious flagship of German cultural influence was the German language. Although Ruthenian, Romanian and German were the official languages of Habsburg Bukovina, its position of ‘state language’ (Staatssprache) clearly distinguished German from the other two and the ‘practical reasons’ of German-language tuition mentioned by dean Herzog in 1919 were a matter of course in the Habsburg Empire.

---
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Zeitung emphasised how German as the language of tuition transgressed national interests and had a function in Bukovina comparable with Latin. It enabled its university graduates to pursue careers outside of the crownland, which, in view of the abundance of graduates and the scarcity of available positions, would soon prove to be of vital importance.\footnote{Der Sturm gegen die Universität, Czernowitziter Allgemeine Zeitung, 04.11.1909, p. 1.} It had also helped to create a homogenous and cosmopolitan Bukovinian elite.\footnote{Corbea-Heisie 2004, p. 21.} Moreover, knowledge of German was status-enhancing, since a number of languages (German, Polish, Italian and Hungarian) had a higher social standard in the Empire than ‘developing languages’.\footnote{Stourzh, Gerald, Der nationale Ausgleich in der Bukowina, in: Slawinski, Ilona and Strelka, Joseph P. (ed), Die Bukowina - Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, Peter Lange, Bern 1995, 35-52, p. 37.} By the end of the 1880s, \textit{Bukowinaer Nachrichten} had presented the universally accepted German language as the ultimate Bukovinian defense against the different brands of nationalism which had gained ground in other Austrian crownlands, but even here, it had sounded more like the wish being father to the thought than like an accurate representation of the situation in Bukovina:

\begin{quote}
Not the love for Mother Austria alone, at whose breasts they were nurtured, not just the enthusiasm for the Austrian state, which freed them from Turkish rule and guided them from barbarism to education and prosperity, but their own enlightened interests demand them to ignore the endeavour to replace a fully developed language which unites all with a myriad of others, including sublanguages [Sprachkinder], which still struggle to express themselves and which would be at a loss if the rich German thesaurus would not lend words and terminology to them.\footnote{Die Staatssprache und die Bukowina, \textit{Bukowinaer Nachrichten} 03.06.1888, pp. 1-2.}
\end{quote}

The quotation presents the German language as more than an instrument of mediation and social advancement: just like German culture should function as a \textit{Leitkultur} for lesser-developed cultures, German should show the way as \textit{Leitsprache} to those languages still struggling with codification and vocabulary development.

A decent general knowledge of the language was a prerequisite were it to fulfill its envisaged mediating role in Bukovina adequately. It merits therefore taking a closer look at the local population’s knowledge of German - even though an educated guess is most likely the most one can do in order to assess the situation at the time. To this end, some observations will be made about the level on which German language knowledge with the lesser-educated classes, in school, court and in regional politics.

In this respect, the most enigmatic segment of the population is the peasantry. While general claims are made that all inhabitants of Bukovina knew German to a certain extent,\footnote{Olaru and Purici 2002, p. 372.} some reports from the Habsburg era suggest otherwise. The Romanian nationalist press wished for all ‘foreigners’ to speak Romanian, so that ‘the poor peasant’ could communicate with the
‘chancery gentlemen’ in the ‘peasant’s language’ (*limba țăranului*). A Bukowinaer Journal reporter who decried the way Bukovinian peasant was treated by Austrian officials fumed:

> When he wants some information, it is not granted in most cases, most likely because the acting official does not understand his language. When he wants to pay his taxes at the cash register, the ‘monolingual’ official cannot even tell him how much he has to pay.

Whereas it not unlikely that Romanian nationalist periodicals would exaggerate limited peasant knowledge of German for political reasons, this should not be automatically assumed: in 1915, Ruthenian nationalists proudly reported in *Narodnyi Holos* how German soldiers had been pleasantly surprised by the good command of the German language they had found among the local (Ruthenian-speaking) population of Bukovina. When asked, children dressed in ‘village attire’ (в сільській одежі) told the soldiers how they had learned German in secondary school and at the seminary. Most likely, many village children first got acquainted with German in school. Folklorist Ion Sbiera recalled in his autobiography how, used to speaking only Romanian at home in the village of Horodnic de Jos, he was thrown in at the deep end when he went to school in nearby Radautz where he was addressed only in German. When a Romanian secondary school (Gymnasium) was founded in Kimpolung, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* welcomed its establishment, but deplored the decision to ban German from its curriculum since it would limit the possibilities for ambitious Romanian speakers. Next to their mother tongue, the students should learn German, ‘and to be sure, a competent, reliable exportable German, not this half-German, which only corrupted their own language without becoming something decent in its own right’. Apparently most children only started to really learn German once they went to school and the level of non-native German speakers in Bukovina was generally perceived as low. From the late nineteenth century, more and more teachers of German were of Bukovinian descent themselves. A result of this was, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* complained, that the quality of German language skills experienced an alarming decline and had deteriorated into ‘a bookish German acquired with difficulty by foreign-language teachers’, feared to ‘gradually degenerate and eventually stagnate without a live source’. Prominent Bukovinian Germanist Simiginowicz-Staufe on the other hand maintained that the language had developed one-on-one with written German since the different origins of the early German settlers had caused dialectal variety to disappear.

In any case, the Board of the Bukovinian Branch of the General German Language Association (*Vorstand des Bukowiner Zweiges des Allgemeinen deutschen Sprachvereins*), which aimed to promote German language purity, did definitely not regard colloquial Bukovinian German as a suitable ‘live source’. The Board, presided by Theodor Gartner, had
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published a brochure on Bukovinian German in 1901. In it, the Board explained that German owed its position in Bukovina to the Austrian state rather than to its small German-language minority and should therefore be considered ‘a mixed language’, a ‘stranger’s German’ (Mischsprache, Fremdendeutsch), while Jews among themselves resorted to a ‘Jewish German’ (Judendeutsch), incomprehensible to other German speakers. The title of the brochure, *Bukovinian German - Errors and peculiarities in the common and written German language of Bukovina*, reveals that its authors had little patience with dialectal diversity: originating from a 1892 Viennese school conference, where the suggestion had been made to compile a dialect dictionary for each Austrian crownland, the brochure was meant to ensure that every Bukovinian German speaker would know how to distinguish ‘good’ Austrian German from his own dialect in order not to be considered a ‘Slav’ from outside of the crownland. Simultaneously it aimed to protect families of German-speaking officials and teachers from ‘Bukovinian speech defects’. Especially domestic servants were blamed for the introduction of words from other languages into Bukovinian German, a phenomenon deemed ‘unpleasant’ to the non-Bukovinian German ear. In a review of the brochure, Max Reiner found it a very useful manual for Bukovinian schools and expected the authorities to introduce it in the official curriculum. Whether this eventually happened or not, the situation on site appears to have remained as before: by 1914, Heinrich Kippler still wholeheartedly recommended the brochure to his fellow-Bukovinians and hoped a revised edition would be printed.

Notwithstanding the official status of German, Ruthenian and Romanian in the crownland, in court German remained dominant. In *Apărarea Națională*, editor and lawyer Eusebie Antonovici scorned Romanian-language legal professionals for using German, a practice they apparently substantiated with the argument that they were unfamiliar with Romanian legal terminology because of their German-language education. Antonovici argued that they could easily and inexpensively have acquired the necessary books in the neighbouring Kingdom of Romania. In his description of life in the Hungarian colonies of Bukovina, Mihály László emphasised that ‘Romanian and Ruthenian officials had a better command of German than of their own respective languages’.

*Apararea Națională* also complained that for non-Bukovinian officials knowledge of only German sufficed, while native Bukovinians were expected to master all three official languages. In practice, the intention to appoint only those natives with a command of all three official crownland languages had been too ambitious anyway: as early as 1864, the
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regional diet had had to admit it could not even find staff with these qualifications to fill its
own ranks, since Romanian and Ruthenian speakers in general next to their respective native
language only mastered German.\textsuperscript{516} Whereas these sources confirm the position of German as
the lingua franca, the cliché that most Bukovinians easily communicated in several languages
should at least be reconsidered.

Regional diet deputies had the right to use Romanian and Ruthenian in debates. In practice
they resorted to German, with the exception of the monolingual peasant deputies in the early
years of Bukovinian autonomy.\textsuperscript{517} This also implies that a command of all three languages
was uncommon in Bukovinian high society. Even in 1919, when the Empire had ceased to
exist and Romanian Minister Flondor gathered the political leaders of prewar Bukovina to
discuss future arrangements, their meeting was held in German.\textsuperscript{518}

With the growing influence of nationalism, the German language was increasingly equated
with German nationalism. Although few contradicted its usefulness in daily life, its status of
‘alien element’ (\textit{Fremdkörper}) was well-remembered and instrumentalised by nationalists.
Knowledge of the language not only represented possibilities, it also implied risks: in the
early nineteenth century, Archbishop Andreas Aloys of Lemberg reported to Vienna that the
obligatory learning of German created fear with both parents and priests that those having
completed their education would be taken from their native villages and sent to far away
locations within the Empire as Habsburg army recruits.\textsuperscript{519} Throughout the existence of
Habsburg Bukovina, the urgency to defend the position of German surfaced and over time
intensified. When the position of German in Austria was put to a vote in the Austrian
Parliament, \textit{Bukowinaer Rundschau} felt obliged to recall that the German language was a
‘condition of existence’ (\textit{Existenzbedingung}) for the young crownland and that without it,
Slavisation and (re)unification with Galicia posed imminent threats. Not convinced that the
Bukovinian deputies would support the position of German sufficiently, the newspaper
assured them that siding with the Slavic fractions would not be rewarded in the next

\textsuperscript{516} “Es ist in der That die Schwierigkeit, daß die Beamten sämtlicher Landessprachen, wenigstens der 3
Hauptsprachen, der romanischen, ruthenischen und deutschen in Wort und Schrift mächtig sind, in der
gegenwärtigen Uebergangsperiode eine sehr große, denn es ist selbst dem Landesauschusse bei der geringen
Zahl von Beamten, die er hat, nicht gelungen, Beamte anzustellen, die sämtlicher Landessprachen in Wort und
Schrift mächtig sind, indem auch die Eingeborenen in der Regel nur der moldauischen und der deutschen, oder
der ruthenischen und der deutschen Sprache in Wort und Schrift mächtig sind, so daß die dritte Landessprache
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\textsuperscript{519} Iacobescu 1993, pp. 283-284.
A benevolent position was expected especially from the Romanian nationalists in Parliament, who were known for cherishing German culture next to their own. Indeed, to question the status of the state language was not unusual in Bukovinian nationalist circles. Ruthenian Bukovyna considered Romanian-language officials too lenient since the latter corresponded in German with the authorities because it was the state language. Bukovyna objected that in nearby Galicia, were Polish was the dominant language, nobody seemed to consider German the state language. Apărarea Națională noticed a similar flexibility with Romanian speakers in general and accused them of relinquishing their right to address the authorities in Romanian only because they knew German themselves and because they did not want to upset anyone. In 1898, the editors of Selyanin even ventured to use their congratulatory editorial at the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Emperor’s ascension to the throne to complain about the fact that Romanian and Ruthenian speakers in Bukovina could only correspond with the local authorities in German. Ten years later, Apărarea Neamului expressed outrage when Czernowitz schoolchildren were expected to sing songs in German to commemorate Franz Joseph’s sixty years as Emperor, maintaining that children from the suburbs were in the main of Romanian and Ruthenian nationality.

The Franz Joseph University had become a hothouse for nationalist confrontations. An incident with the German language as centre stage made painfully clear that nationalist circles no longer regarded German as the common language of mediation. Student associations in Czernowitz traditionally invited the academic board to their opening celebration of the academic year. Most of the time, the university dean himself would honour the invitation. The president of the association delivered a speech in praise of the alma mater, to which the dean replied with a word of thanks. In 1903, problems arose when a Romanian association addressed Dean Hörmann von Hörbach in Romanian, a language he did not master. The rector consequently abstained from attending similar occasions. While Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung expressed astonishment at the ‘ungrateful’ attitude of the students who should have realised that it was exactly the German tuition at the university which had enabled Romanian and Ruthenian speakers to enroll in official positions, it also considered it a matter of simple politeness to address a guest in a language he comprehended. This was in line with the reaction the Ministry of Culture and Education had been forced to give in response to an interpellation by Mykola Vasylko. Vasylko had blamed the appointments of radical nationalist German professors for the tensions at the university and had depicted the existing German character of the institute as a privilege the indigenous (Romanian and Ruthenian
speaking) population granted to a small national (German speaking) minority. In a draft reply, the Minister stipulated that first of all, he regarded participation in the ceremony in question a private affair and that second, it seemed a matter of common courtesy and tact to be resolved by the university staff and the students among themselves. Whether the obviously diminishing patience in Vienna with petty provincial quarrelling played a role here remains unclear, but a practical solution was swiftly found: Associations unwilling to deliver a speech in German could no longer expect a dean to attend their opening ceremony.

Hostile behaviour towards the German language and its position in Bukovina had started at the university, but it spread beyond Czernowitz to other institutions like schools and municipalities. In Kostestie, the district captain started investigations when it was reported that ‘when schoolchildren appeared in school with German readers and confirmed their presence with the German ‘hier!’, their use of German was prohibited and they were told that German was the language of pigs with the teachers imitating the grunting of piglets and an old sow’. German nationalists accounted indignantly how a head teacher named Kosmiuk had stated at an international teachers’ conference how he loathed the German language.

In numerous municipalities, Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists succeeded in banning German from the local administration. When this happened in Southern-Bukovinian Kimpolung with its Romanian-speaking majority, Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal wondered where this sudden aversion originated: Aggression towards Ruthenians would have seemed more logical.

In Northern-Bukovinian Hliboka, the introduction of Ruthenian as the language of administration in 1911 was accompanied by the replacement of the German shield on the municipal office with a Ruthenian one with a smaller, German sign in second position. The offended German-language community in Hliboka tore off the new sign, carried it into the village inn and spat on it. The mayor then decided the only way to prevent further public outrage was by removing the new shield.
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3.4 German Nationalism

As Jászi has concluded, there was never a serious German irredentist movement in Austria, since the force of the dynasty, of the Army and of the Catholic Church were simply too strong. Still, intensifying ethnic tensions in the Habsburg Empire challenged German cultural supremacy in Cisleithania and created German-Austrian nationalism as a byproduct. Like its counterpart in the German Reich it envisaged an ethnic-cultural ‘community of all Germans’. The goal was the strengthening of the German element in Austria-Hungary as a basis for German expansion in ‘Central Europe’. These efforts received organisational support from the ‘German National Movement’ (Deutschnationale Bewegung), which was formed in 1879 under the leadership of Georg Ritter von Schönerer in response to the crisis of German-Austrian liberalism. Schönerer was one of the authors of the ‘Linz Program’ of 1882, the programmatic basis of the German national movement. In addition to social and economic demands, the program called for the strengthening of Germanity in the lands of the Dual Monarchy formerly belonging to the German Confederation. It also advocated the cession from Cisleithania of non-German areas like Dalmatia, Galicia and Bukovina, which were either be ceded to Hungary or be made autonomous. German was to become the sole official state language of the remaining ‘rump Austria’. The German national movement split in 1885 after Schönerer had added an anti-Semitic paragraph to its program. By this time, his ideas had gone far beyond the ‘Linz program’. He wanted the German-speaking areas of Austria to be incorporated into the German Reich and urged the German-Austrians to renounce Catholicism. He further recommended to oppose the Slavic population and promoted radical anti-Semitism. While the followers of Schönerer - united in the ‘Pan-German Association’ since 1901 - clashed irreconcilably with the Habsburg state because of their irredentist stance, the majority of German nationalists remained loyal to the Austro-Hungarian political system. Their goal continued to be a closer economic and political alliance with the German Reich as a precondition for the consolidation of Germanity in the Habsburg Monarchy and Central Europe.

Logically, in Cisleithania with its German-speaking element of only 35.58% as opposed to 60.65% Slavic speakers, the argument of a ‘Slavic threat’ met with a positive response in a time of increasing nationalist sabre-rattling. With regard to the situation in Prague, Cohen concluded that the German-speaking middle and upper strata only transformed themselves into self-conscious German groups, distinguished by a sense of German ethnicity and
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exclusive social relations, in response to demands for power and status by insurgent Slavic elements. Similar dynamics could be observed in Bukovina.

Here, with its rivaling Romanian and Ruthenian nationalists, the anti-Slavic overtone of German nationalism created a momentum of its own for the Romanians. They showed little hesitation when opportunities arose to capitalise on tensions between German and Ruthenian nationalist politicians. Such was the case when Ruthenian politicians objected to the use of the German tricolour in Bukovina as well as to German preparation courses in non-German secondary schools. Romanian nationalists prided themselves on the support they had rendered to the German side and stated:

*Only now the scales fell from the Germans’ eyes and they recognised the role they were supposed to play (...): that of the Slavic train-bearer. The Germans have finally - if somewhat late - realised that their role was unworthy. They have recollected themselves, have reconsidered their national dignity and have prudently recognised that a nation on such a high cultural level, whose importance in Bukovina we fully recognise and appreciate should not serve its hereditary enemy (...).*[^538]

As long as large landowners had represented the political voice of Bukovina, German-speakers had only enjoyed limited influence: by 1910, the majority of German-speaking colonists lived off small-scale agriculture. The first of them to enter the political stage was Anton Kral, who co-edited the ‘Landespetition’ of 1848 and thus supported the call for secession from Galicia. After 1848, German periodicals like *Sonntagsblatt* and *Buchenblätter* were strongly influenced by liberalism. The German Liberal Party (*Deutsch-Liberale Partei*) reflected this spirit and regarded itself as meeting place for all democratically-inclined forces. At the Franz Joseph University, founded in 1875, with the exception of theology, tuition was in German and resulted in the arrival of substantial numbers of German-language professors from the western part of the Monarchy. In turn, they introduced German nationalism in Bukovina.[^539] Marie Mischler’s husband was among them and her worries that through assimilation, ‘real’ Germans would disappear in Bukovina altogether clearly reflected German ethno-nationalist thinking.[^540]

German nationalist ideology also introduced a diversification between ‘language Germans’ (*Sprachdeutsche*) and ‘ethnic Germans’ (*Volksdeutsche*). In 1897, the ‘Association of Christian Germans’ (*Verein der Christlichen Deutschen*) was established with the obvious goal to exclude Jewish Bukovinians, whose social mobility was perceived as a threat.[^541] In the Bukovinian press, hope was expressed that German nationalists would not use the ‘Christian’
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pretext in order to exclude the Jews, but to no avail: in *Bukowiner Boten*, the Association encouraged the reader to place orders with Germans only. When both Bukovinian German-speaking parliamentary representatives decided to join the Association, German ethnopolitical nationalism officially entered the political arena of the crownland, in turn this led to the establishment of a separate Jewish political association supported by deputy Benno Straucher.

In 1907, German nationalist Josef Wiedmann warned that the Franz Joseph University should only appoint Aryan-German professors in order to avoid the loss of its German character. *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* typified the university as an ‘Austrian university with German as language of tuition’ and reminded Wiedmann that he had kept quiet when non-German professors were hired in the past; only when Jews were concerned, Wiedmann seemed to speak up. Earlier, the Viennese anti-Semitic *Deutsche Volksblatt* ‘had summarily eliminated the Czernowitz University from the range of German universities because its German-Aryan students constituted such a small fraction of the total number that there was no German body of students to speak of’. In a similar way, German nationalists tried to use religious arguments to segregate German and Jewish schools. The attempt was ridiculed by *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, because without Jews, the German number of pupils would be too small to keep any ‘purely’ German school in business.

From German nationalists in Vienna little support was to be expected. As said, Schönerer’s German National Movement wanted to rid Austria of Bukovina altogether. When German Bukovinian deputy Arthur Skedl objected to this view in the Austrian Parliament on 11 December 1905, Schönerer’s party ally Franz Klein from Bohemia replied that ‘the vast majority of the population of Bukovina committed to the German community in those days consisted of Jews’ and that it should at last be clear to Skedl that

*we, from our national and racial anti-Semitic point of view will never take under the wings of the great Pan-German idea those electors of his who give him their votes but who are not of*
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our blood, and that in the economic, historical and national interest we will never, ever give up this demand just because there are some Jews who vote for professor Skedl.547

The German nationalist politicians from Vienna practiced what they preached: invitations to visit the crownland sent by Bukovinian German activists to Austrian ministers Derschatta and Prade were not accepted and even remained unanswered.548 As things stood, German Christian nationalists in Bukovina risked to fall between two stools: they were seen as a lost lot by Schönerer’s nationalists in Vienna, while their opponents in Bukovina dismissed of them as ‘foreign’ (fremdländische) Germans who wanted to prepare the ground for an alien nationalism based on intolerance and racial hatred.549 The new Christian-Social movement led by Karl Lueger therefore provided a much-needed lifeboat.

In Austria, liberalism had become increasingly unpopular and was associated with capitalism, an ‘atomised, selfish society’ and Jewry, which in turn led to an upsurge of political anti-Semitism. Schönerer and his German National Association were products of this development, but whereas Schönerer’s anti-Semitism ultimately failed to mobilise the masses, Karl Lueger’s Christian-Social Party (Christlichsoziale Partei) succeeded. The Christian Socials’ close connections to the Roman Catholic Church caused a rift between Lueger and the staunchly anti-Catholic Schönerer, who accused his rival of ‘baptismal font anti-Semitism’ (Taufbechenantisemitismus). In 1888, Schönerer disappeared from the political stage after a scandal and a subsequent prison sentence, thus paving the way for the Christian Socials. From the early 1900s, Lueger’s party dominated the Austrian Parliament and spread beyond Vienna and Lower-Austria. It eventually became a political force throughout the Austrian crownlands. In the interest of the multi-ethnic Empire, the Christian Socials opposed the dual system of 1867 and demanded a federal restructuring.550

In early 1907, the Christian Socials started to prepare the ground for a Bukovinian branch of the party. The German-language Bukovinian press watched the visit by Christian-Social prominent Albert Gessmann like a hawk. Czernowitz Tagblatt tried to play down the danger of the new party and declared that Bukovina had come a long way since the days of ‘Semi-Asia’ and therefore should be considered European enough to resist a Christian-Social hate campaign. Moreover, anti-Semitism was deemed unlikely to flourish in peaceful Bukovina, the same way Bukovinian-German nationalists were believed unlikely to embrace the new party since this would mean their complete isolation.551 Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung ventilated more concerns, for the Christian Socials had a few powerful tricks up their sleeves: first, supportive Catholic priests had prepared the ground for them, and second, their appeal
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was not limited to German nationalists alone, because not only Christian-Social anti-Semitism went down well with Romanian nationalists in Bukovina, but also a strong dislike of Budapest and its political manoeuvring - which for Romanian nationalists was strongly connected to the Magyar oppression of Romanian speakers in Transylvania. Gessmann’s speeches in Bukovina were received so well that not only German but also Romanian speakers cheered him, and, confusingly, Magyar colonists from Hadikfalva. “Those in Budapest will be flabbergasted!” Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung marveled. Both periodicals noticed that Gessmann had cunningly underplayed the usual anti-Semitic hysterics and had attacked the competing Bukovinian-German nationalists instead. The Bukovinian Ruthenian press declared that it regarded Christian-Social agitation as an internal matter of German nationalists and was only inclined to speak up when the latter trumped the ‘Slavic danger’ card.

When in 1908 the Bukovinian branch of the Christian Social Party was established, Wiedmann’s Association of Christian Germans had little choice but to join its ranks. The conciliatory tone of Gessmann’s Bukovinian speeches had quickly evaporated and Christian-Social anti-Semitism showed its habitual venom. In the party’s program, it was asserted that ‘if anywhere, [the party] needed to solve a great and difficult task in Bukovina, where the Jewish element had become a fearful and imminent danger for the people’. The German political leaders were said ‘to have been mostly been aiming for personal benefits so far under the hypocritical mask of benevolence, having abused the people as a means to achieve their selfish ambitions’. The fact that those local German leaders had cooperated with Jews was seen as their biggest crime. For the inflighting Romanian nationalist factions in Bukovina, part of the appeal of the Christian-Social Party was its opposition to the cooperation between ethnicities in Bukovina (the ‘coalition’) and thus the Romanian nationalists united under the Christian-Social flag. They declared themselves loyal to Emperor and Empire and adopted the program of the Austrian mother party. Bukowiner Volksblatt, the newly-established German-language speaking mouthpiece of the Christian-Social Party, provided a solid contribution to the anti-Semitic propaganda in Bukovina. As a result of the Christian-Social affiliation of Bukovinian Romanian nationalists, Apărarea Națională and Voința Poporului struck the same aggressive and anti-Semitic note as Bukowiner Volksblatt. Christian-Social aggression was not reserved for Jews alone, but also for the Young-Ruthenians who cooperated with them. Germans were told to be thankful to Mykola Vasylko, ‘the ultimate chauvinistic German-hater, together with his close friend [Jewish leader] Straucher, for the fact that it was increasingly difficult for German young men to get government jobs as well as for the fact that these positions now almost without exceptions benefited the Jews’. When at the municipal elections in February 1909 the anticipated victory failed to materialise, a small number of Christian-Social Romanian nationalists smashed the windows of Vasylko
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and Diet President Wassilko because of their alleged pro-Jewish stance.\textsuperscript{559} Christian-Social gatherings took place on a regular basis and often had the character of a procession of a small group, culminating in a meeting dominated by anti-Semitic speeches. Those unaware of the nature of the meetings often mistook the motley crew of participants for a funeral procession. In general, the public reactions to the rallies were less than lukewarm.\textsuperscript{560} However, for a Christian-Social meeting in the Romanian National House in Czernowitz organised by \textit{Bukowiner Volksblatt} editor Josef Wyslouzil and addressed by the converted Romanian Christian-Socialist Aurel Onciul, about four hundred participants were drummed up.\textsuperscript{561}

The Christian-Social movement in Bukovina was short-lived. As early as February 1909, the Romanian nationalists united in a ‘National Party’ led by Iancu Flondor and no longer called themselves ‘Christian-Social’.\textsuperscript{562} In the Empire at large, the movement’s popularity waned after Lueger’s demise and in Bukovina proper Wiedmann’s reputation suffered as a result of both his attempts to defame German political opponents and the continuous paranoid ranting in \textit{Bukowiner Volksblatt}. The combination of German nationalism and anti-Semitism seemed in certain cases highly unprofitable for Wiedmann’s party: since the new system of national cadastres did not distinguish between Germans and Jews, some fanatic anti-Semitic German speakers requested to be registered as Romanians or Ruthenians just to avoid having to share their curia with the Jews. In the words of \textit{Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal}, this unexpected ‘success’ risked turning Wiedmann into ‘a commander without soldiers’.\textsuperscript{563} In May 1911, the Christian Socials failed to have even one candidate elected in Bukovina’s regional diet, a result largely blamed on the personality of Wiedmann himself.\textsuperscript{564}

After Schönerer’s Pan-German nationalism which envisaged no role for Bukovina in the story of Germanity and after Lueger’s brand of Pan-Austrian, Catholic Christian-Socialism which had reserved a place for each crownland, a more confident, regionally oriented German nationalist movement seemed a logical next step. In 1911, Czernowitz university professor Raimund Friedrich Kaindl coined the collective term ‘Carpathian Germans’ (\textit{Karpatendeutsche}) for the German-language population of Galicia, Bukovina, Hungary, Slavonia, Transylvania and Romania, assessing their total number around three million.\textsuperscript{565} His ‘Carpathian German Movement’ regarded the Carpathian Germans as a ‘link in the chain from the Baltic to the Adriatic Sea’ an ‘outpost of the German people’, destined to ‘protect the motherland from the Pan-Slavic menace’. He called on the Germans from the west to support their fellow nationals by visiting this outpost, by financing investments there and by
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bolstering the German-language press in the area. Especially in Hungary, Kaindl stressed, German-language periodicals were subjected to censorship and law suits.\textsuperscript{566} Like other German nationalists, Kaindl distinguished between Christian and non-Christian (i.e. Jewish) Germans and as such he used religious terminology to advocate racial politics. In line with this reasoning, he criticised the Austrian census system which differentiated according to ‘language of conversation’ (\textit{Umgangssprache}) when according to Kaindl ‘ethnicity’ (\textit{Volkszugehörigkeit}) should be decisive.\textsuperscript{567} The political climate in Bukovina, which was liberal compared to those of Hungary and Galicia, provided a convenient base for Kaindl’s activities. From 1911 until 1914, the Movement held annual meetings in Czernowitz, Ruma (Slavonia), Vienna and Biała (Galicia) successively.\textsuperscript{568} 

Lastly, racist German nationalism in Bukovina had efficiently reduced its own support from the moment it had emerged. As prominent Jewish Bukovinians had predicted,\textsuperscript{569} anti-Semitism had ridded the potential electorate of German nationalists of the numerically dominant Jewish German speakers. The remaining ‘Christian Germans’ were divided between Schönerer’s Pan-German Protestantism and Christian-Social Pan-Austrian Catholicism and bitterly polemicised in the local press.\textsuperscript{570} Even when the German House (\textit{Deutsches Haus}) in Czernowitz was finally inaugurated in 1910, the opening ceremony was tainted by the rift between Catholics and Protestants.\textsuperscript{571}

\section{3.5 The Jewish Presence in Bukovina}

The earliest travel account referring to Austrian Bukovina already mentioned Jewish residents - and not much else - in Czernowitz just after the military occupation, when Swiss captain Franz Joseph Sulzer noted that ‘except for some very beautiful Jewish women, apparently nothing remarkable could be seen there’.\textsuperscript{572} A few decades later, Scottish ministers Bonar and
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McCheyne reported that the Jews he had met in Bukovina ‘were not accustomed to be kindly spoken to by anyone not of their own nation’. The Scotsmen were not impressed by the level of education they found with Bukovinian Jews. They called them ‘very ignorant’, observed that young people were not taught to read, but only to understand Hebrew and that by their own account, the only Jew who spoke that language was the rabbi. Then again, Bonar and McCheyne also mentioned that many Jews sent their children to ‘public academies’ were they learned Latin and Greek.

Solomon Kassner, member of the Jewish community council (Kultusrat) on Czernowitz was the first author to take it upon himself to write a volume on the history of Jews in Bukovina. Before that time, articles had been published by Johann Polek, Demeter Dan and Raimund Friedrich Kaindl, but these had been short and sketchy. Kaindl had simply stated that Jews should take it upon themselves to write their history. Although exact numbers cannot be given, there is enough written evidence delivered by such documents as acts of sale to counter assertions that Jews only came to the area after it had been incorporated by the Habsburgs. The number of Jews is estimated at 3,000 at the time of the Austrian occupation with Yiddish as their language of conversation and Hebrew as their language of worship. According to Germanist Peter Rychlo, next to two ‘indigenous’ ethnic groups - the Ruthenians and the Romanians - since the Middle Ages the Jews had been ‘more indigenous’ than the other inhabitants of the area. Splény, the first Austrian commander, noted that Wiznitz and Sadagora already had significant numbers of Jewish inhabitants before his arrival. Lawyer and journalist Salomon Kassner distinguished three groups of Jewish immigrants in chronological order: those who had been in Bukovina as long as people remembered, those who arrived after the Russian-Turkish War and, by far the largest group, those who had entered Bukovina after the Austrian occupation. Although Jewish communities in Bukovina did not have their own judiciary (kahal) like they traditionally had in Galicia, they did have their community judges in front of whom they pledged their loyalty oath to the Austrian Emperor in 1777. Once Austrian military rule was imposed, the military commanders actively interfered in the appointments of these judges. According to Splény, Jewish judges also exercised jurisdiction over non-Jewish cases since Jews sometimes leased entire communities.
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Although Splény did not allow Jews to own villages as a whole, the practice continued to persist under his successor Enzenberg. Admittedly, Splény had complained of the number of Jews in the newly-occupied area, but this had not stopped him from encouraging Jewish immigration.\(^{582}\) Enzenberg however, on behalf of Vienna as well as from his own conviction, sought to bring down the number of Jews to that of the pre-Austrian times, which was said to have been limited to 200 families. Hopefuls arriving from Galicia were thus forced to return and sporadic attempts to establish Jews as farmers were averted by settlement restraints and administrative reluctance.\(^{583}\) By 1786, Enzenberg reported a decline from 714 to 175 Jewish families during the preceding four years.\(^{584}\) On the other hand, the Austrians had to conclude that the Jews in their function as middle men were vital to both the farmers who needed to sell their produce and to the Austrian troops and functionaries who needed to be provided with nutrition.

However, albeit on a small scale, in the early years of the Austrian occupation Jewish farmers had been active. In the course of time they disappeared altogether. Information on Jewish agricultural activities remains sketchy: although their presence as landlords and landowners is undisputed, information on their occupation as ‘farm Jews’ (Ackerjuden) is contradictory. Lindner mentioned a number of 55 farmer families out of a total of 793 Jewish families in 1803.\(^{585}\) Joseph Rohrer, a professor of political science and statistic from Lemberg, had found ‘entire Jewish communities devoted to farming’ around Suczawa and Sereth, an estimate which was endorsed several decades later when Count Schirnding noted six- to sevenhundred Jewish farmer families in the same area.\(^{586}\) Rohrer deemed these communities ‘the most vivid example that the entire Jewish nation could be a farming nation, if only they abandoned their Talmudic principles of uncleanliness which made them dread manure more than the Vlachs dreaded the plague’.\(^{587}\) Kassner later argued that rather than for religious reasons, Jewish farmers left Bukovina because of the suffocating policies of the Church Fund which, he claimed, hampered the possibilities for medium-size farmers.\(^{588}\) As mentioned before, Jewish immigrants with farmer ambitions were also seriously thwarted by the military administration. Platter observed in the 1880s that Jewish activity in Bukovinian agriculture was limited to usury; while ‘in Galicia as a rare exception there were a few Jewish farmer families actually working the land themselves, in Bukovina one would seek similar cases in vain’.\(^{589}\)

In 1781, Joseph II had allowed Jews to lease arable land on the condition that they were long-term residents. Purchase of that land was possible after a lease period of twenty years and after the applicant had been baptised. Initially, Jews were not allowed to own real estate in the
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cities. Family names were forcibly Germanised. In 1789, the Emperor issued the Jewish Arrangement Edict (Judenordnungspatent) for Galicia and Bukovina, which allowed Jews to choose their professions freely. From 1812 settling restriction for Jews in Bukovina were lifted as long as the Jewish settlers applied for formal permission with the authorities. In comparison to Russia and Galicia, Austrian Bukovina was an attractive destination: for artisans and tradespeople there was no competition to speak of, taxes and costs of living were significantly lower and Bukovinian Jews were exempt from compulsory military service. Consequently, the unification of Bukovina with Galicia in 1786 was not welcomed by the Jews, who rejected Lemberg’s Polonisation politics and maintained a positive attitude towards Vienna throughout the turbulent times of the revolutionary year 1848.

For efficiency reasons, Joseph II had replaced Latin with German as the administrative language in Austria and had founded German-Jewish schools, while a court decree of 1786 demanded a primary school diploma from every Jew who applied for a marriage license. From the early 19th century, a rabbi or a Jewish official who headed his community was obliged to know German. Similarly, Jewish tradespeople were decreed to keep their books in German. After the 1848, the last limitations to the freedom of movement for Jews were lifted. As a result, the Jewish share of the Bukovinian population grew from 3.8% (1850) to 11.8% (1880). Although compulsory labour had been abolished and farmhands could now earn a much better living, labourers, unwilling to work for their former oppressors, were hard to find. Many landowners sold or leased their property to Jews to secure at least part of their assets. ‘Jewish speculators’ were blamed for the miserable state of Bukovina’s economy. They were said to be ‘without decent jobs or professions’ and their way of doing business ‘dishonest’.

Jews and the Local Economy

The arrival of large numbers of Jews in Bukovina brought economic stimulus, but also tensions which fuelled anti-Semitism. Between 1885 and 1894, 98% of the spirits trade was in Jewish hands as a result of the propination system: taverns and alcohol licences were usually
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owned by the landlords and rented to tavern-keepers. The latter were mostly Jews, who had a mediating position this way between the landlord and the peasants. As a result, Jews were often blamed when peasants - but also wealthy landowners - lost their property because of alcohol abuse and related loans. When property restrictions for Jews were lifted in 1867 the number of Jews who now not only leased, but also owned large estates in Bukovina quickly rose. By 1910, Jews either owned or leased 85% of all Bukovinian estates. Romanian nationalists publicly denounced Jewish economic power, but at the same time both the Bukovinian (Romanian-oriented) nobility and the Church Fund leased and sold their assets to Jews and thus promoted Jewish influence on the local economy. In the towns, Jews usually lived from small trade and crafts. Bankers and German-language newspaper editors were exclusively Jewish-owned and managed. By 1912, of the 1402 small businesses in Czernowitz, 1269 had Jewish owners. The capital market in Bukovina was almost completely in private (Jewish) hands. A mutual savings bank (Bukowiner Sparkasse) was established only in 1860 and branches of Viennese banks in Czernowitz were more than cautious in giving out loans in the impoverished crownland. As such, major investments and industrialisation did not materialise.

The growing number of secondary schools (Gymnasien) and the establishment of the university in 1875 allowed Jews to improve their social chances by means of education, an opportunity the overwhelming majority eagerly embraced. Before the 1848, Jews had refused to send their children to state schools for religious reasons. The fact that under Lemberg rule the language of tuition was Polish had not helped, either. Jews had paid the obligatory fees to the state schools, but had sent their offspring to Jewish schools (Talmudei Torah and Hadarim) instead. The first Jewish school, established in 1853, had more than 700 students by 1872. The German secondary school (Gymnasium) in Czernowitz only had non-Jewish students in its first years of existence. However, by 1895, at the commercial college 90% and at the Czernowitz main Gymnasium 42% of the students was Jewish. The fixation on higher education, enhanced by the different nationalist factions who saw segregated schools as key vehicles to distribute their ideas, created additional problems in the economically underdeveloped region. Czernowitzer Tagblatt deplored the ever growing number of Gymnasien and observed that every thousandth Bukovinian was a student at the Franz Joseph University. The situation was worst with the Jews, who sent their children en masse to law school in spite of the huge surplus of trained legal professionals. This ‘intellectual beggar’s proletariat’ (geistiges Bettelproletariat) was doomed to remain unemployed while the lack of trained craftsmen and farmers further undermined the crownland’s economy.
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Czernowitz law professor Eugen Ehrlich repeatedly addressed the problem and was supported by influential colleagues like Salomon Kassner. 605

Insofar they existed in Bukovina, production facilities were also largely in Jewish hands: six out of the seven breweries, most of the distilleries, a button factory, a brush factory, some of the brick-works, cement works, construction companies, a tile factory, a large sugar factory, tanneries and so on. 606 The political system which also allotted seats in the regional diet to representatives from the Chambers of Commerce converted the economic power position of Jewish business people into political weight. 607 At the same time, there was a large Eastern Jewish proletariat living in a state of absolute poverty. 608 The late 1800s were marred by a general economic crisis which had started in 1873. The completion of the railway line Lemberg-Czernowitz-Iași turned out to be disadvantageous for Bukovina, since its local industry could not compete with the influx of cheap consumer goods. 609 The situation got worse when a customs war between the Habsburg Empire and Romania broke out in 1886. The prohibitive import duties imposed by Romania hit Bukovina hard and companies from the west which had previously produced for the Romanian market now became each other’s competitors. Emigration rose steeply. Many Bukovinians, including Jews, left for the Americas. 610

Throughout the era of Habsburg Bukovina, the economic activities of its Jewish population were associated with spirits trade and usury and mutatis mutandis with alcoholism and poverty. Sources blaming Jewish inn-keepers for spreading alcoholism downplayed the fact that those inn-keepers (at least initially) were the agents of the non-Jewish landlords. Budai-Deleanu noted that in the early 1800s, landowners simply circumvented the ban on leasing alcohol permits to Jews by assigning these permits to a ‘Christian’ name. With the servitude system still in place, Jews were expected to inform landlords who were in need of manual labour but had exhausted their annual robot days about indebted serfs; these serfs were then made to work off their alcohol debit. 611 Still, the situation was better than in Galicia, where serfs were even forced to buy off a minimum of the landlord’s spirit production, 612 but the system of money lending for the financing of alcohol consumption proved to be ravaging just the same. Sonntagsblatt der Bukowina wrote in 1862 that Jewish usury, in combination with
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alcoholism in the countryside, produced a growing caste of homeless beggar families. That same year, Governor Martina reported to Vienna that the acquisition of property by Jews ‘at the expense of the non-Jewish population’ had reached such proportions that in time ‘public administration might need to interfere’. Several years later, his successor noted that ‘regrettably, it became inevitable that the needy peasants were more than ever surrendered to the usurious hands of the Jews who exploited this good opportunity’.

This ‘good opportunity’ was another aspect largely ignored by those who held the Jews responsible for the deplorable state of affairs. Even Julius Platter, whose book on usury blamed the Jews for rural poverty and who was quoted in anti-Semitic pamphlets by Mihai Eminescu and others, could not entirely exonerate the debtors from the misery in which they found themselves. He had to conclude that it was not ‘the borrowing itself, but only the reckless borrowing, the headless, aimless getting into debt’ that mattered, adding that, contrary to the peasant population, ‘Jews seldom or never ruined themselves only to parade at weddings and funerals’. In 1917, Bukovinian Franz Zach endorsed Platters statements, and although he lamented how ‘forty-three years ago only, the Jew was merely tolerated in this land, a poor devil who established a measly liquor store somewhere outside a town or a small village’ while now ‘this Jew’ basically owned everything, he also asserted that Bukovinian peasants mainly borrowed in order to drink. Then again, Bukovinian peasants were ‘a bunch of big children (ein Volk von großen Kindern): credulous, naive, trusting and unfamiliar with the trickery of usurers’. The Romanian nationalists from Apărarea Națională underlined that many of their nation’s habits were good and had a specific history, habits they had to support and nurture since they distinguish them from other nations, but also admitted that it was it is equally true that the peasants practiced a lot of bad habits, which had to be wiped out (trebuiesc stîrpite) before it was too late. Binge drinking and gambling were prominent among these vices.

It remained rare to hear Romanian nationalists criticise the landowning aristocracy who leased their property to Jews or hired them as mediators or to hear them condemn the local lifestyle: since a successful nationalist strategy required solidarity between the classes ‘of one nation’,
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lords and peasants rather inveighed against the ‘other’, the ‘stranger’620 than questioned each other’s lines of action. Jewish innkeepers and moneylenders met the demand for strangers and scapegoats more than adequately. Even as recently as 1996, Romanian historian Grigorovici maintained that Jews ‘had caused much harm in the countryside as leasers, innkeepers and usurers’.621

The Social Position of Bukovinian Jews

More than in competing nationalist versions of Habsburg Bukovina’s history, Vienna and the Empire are essential in Jewish historiography. In the words of British historian David Rechter, ‘the Habsburg state takes centre stage in the Jewish version of the Bukovina myth, and is lauded for its protective and even-handed engagement with Jewish concerns - an approach that shielded them [the Jews] from the excesses of anti-Semitism and the belligerent nationalism that grew apace among many of the Empire's peoples in the second half of the nineteenth century’.622 (...) When the young Emperor Franz Joseph visited the now autonomous crownland for the first time in 1851, Jews were prominently present with torah rolls and blessings to welcome him. Similar scenes could be observed during the Emperor’s visit in 1855. When the monarch’s arrival in Bukovina in 1880 coincided with the celebration of the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur), religious Jews even interrupted their religious ceremony to hail him.623 In 1867, five future Jewish members of the municipal council of Seret requested the form of the inauguration oath to be adjusted for them, to which the governor agreed as long as the character of the oath remained intact.624 The Imperial decision of 1874 to establish a university in Czernowitz was emphatically supported by the Jewish congregation and its gratitude and loyalty were communicated to the Emperor.625 Of the 188 students who registered for the 1875/76 winter semester, 48 were Jewish.626 Throughout the years, the wishes of religious Jewish students were taken into account in a practical way: in spite of the already numerous holidays, in 1914 it was left to the discretion of lecturers to
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judge whether the number of Jewish students in their groups was large enough to observe the main Jewish holidays as well. From 1905 until 1907, Eduard Reiss was the first Jewish mayor of Czernowitz and from 1912 until 1914, Salo Weissenberger was the second Jew to hold this position. Both mayors were considered assimilated Jews and as such reflected the opinion widely held in Vienna that Jews in Bukovina were more integrated than those in Galicia.

The history of Habsburg Bukovina’s capital Czernowitz is inextricably connected to its largely Jewish character, which in turn showed ample diversity. As Rechter put it, ‘Jewish society here was characterised by an uncommonly intense relationship between east and west, a familiarity born of proximity: small physical distances mitigated the effects of vast cultural differences’. Indeed, the assimilated, or at least integrated, Jewish bourgeoisie, the poorer Jews of the lower town and the Hasidic community in adjacent Sadagora all shared the same small space. Already in 1787, 90 of the 414 registered houses in the city had belonged to Jews. Those propagating ‘westernisation’ of Bukovina’s Jews such as Salomon Kassner underscored the striking variety - typically reduced to the ‘east vs. west’ dichotomy - and the cliché of the ‘western oasis in Semi-Asia’. This way, they favourably compared the Czernowitz city Jew to his antipode in ‘the miserable hamlet of Sadagora’.

Czernowitz had the highest proportion of Jews compared to other Austrian cities. Prior to the First World War, their number of almost 30,000 made up approximately 33% of the city’s residents. As such, it was it was the fourth-largest Jewish city in Austria after Vienna, Lemberg and Cracow. Czernowitz-born Israeli historian Zvi Javetz maintained that by 1918, Jews accounted for no less than 47% of Czernowitz. While Orthodox Jews resisted Germanisation and modernisation policies, the beneficial conditions in Bukovina attracted more and more Jewish hopefuls from outside the crownland. Czernowitz emancipated from a provincial backwater into a commercially and culturally bustling centre. Unlike West and Central European cities, it lacked a traditional Christian bourgeois upper class. This void was
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filled by the Jews. Their integration into society is aptly illustrated by the fact that the first stone for the new Czernowitz synagogue was laid by Chief Rabbi Lazar Igel and the second by Orthodox Metropolitan Eugenie Hacman. Apart from two Jewish mayors, the city’s university also had several Jewish deans.

According to Ukrainian Germanist Rychlo, the large number of Czernowitz Jews was the reason they were never ghettoised before the Second World War, while their social stratification assured they were spread all over the city. However, the lower town with its poor housing, unsafe drinking water and unhealthy living conditions was largely inhabited by proletarian Jews. Even if the neighbourhood was not a ghetto in the official sense of the word, it was often referred to as one. In 1942, the Romanian Ministry of Public Works and Communication described how in 1866, the ‘Jewish neighbourhood’ had been completely ruined by fire and how ‘its miserable and dirty wooden houses had been destroyed in such a way that the Jewish ghetto appearance of the commercial district had been altered, thus giving way to the creation of straighter and better-aligned streets’. In 1902, Czernowitz mayor Kochanowski, confronted with resistance from the Jewish side when it was rumoured that a police force reform was directed against the Jews, condemned the rabble-rousers and expressed his regret ‘that the suggestive power of the slogans had not been used in the better and nobler sense of bringing education and awareness where needed and of eliminating the partially still-existing ghetto’.

Whereas Czernowitz proper was often considered a byword for Jewish modernisation, assimilation and emancipation, its orthodox eastern mirror image could literally be found at its doorstep in the town (and later suburb) of Sadagora, where the Hasidic Friedman dynasty held court. The majority of the educated Czernowitz Jews could be seen as ‘progressive’, influenced by the Jewish Enlightenment (Haskalah/השכלה), and as such strongly integrated in the German cultural realm. Another side of the Jewish spectrum was embodied by the followers of the ‘wonder rabbi’ or ‘righteous one’ (tzadik/צדיק) of Sadagora. The first rabbi of the Ruzhyn dynasty (named after its original hometown of Ruzhyn in present-day Ukraine) was Israel Friedman, who had fled from the Russians and had found refuge in the Habsburg
Empire. According to Austrian emigration law, any person possessing a minimum sum of ‘ten thousand silver coins’ could obtain a residence permit. Friedman had been able to meet this requirement. After lengthy deliberations, the Emperor signed the decision that ‘the foreign Jew Israel Friedman be permitted to stay on in Sadagora as long as there was no reason to the contrary’. Although the Austrian authorities had ordained Friedman to settle near the Galician town of Kolomea, Friedman himself had meanwhile purchased property from Baron Mustatza in Bukovina and stubbornly refused to leave from there. According to a Viennese memorandum, this solution satisfied the authorities as well, since they reckoned that ‘Friedman would presumably have little lasting influence on the Jews of Bukovina, who were more educated than those of Galicia, where there were more ignorant, superstitious Jews’. Salomon Kassner shared this view, stating that Bukovinian Jews could not be classified as Eastern Jews because, unlike in Galicia, the power of the rabbis had always been limited in Bukovina. Some Jewish circles had expected the rabbi to adopt a more moderate way of life in Austria after the problems he had encountered in Russia, but this proved to be wishful thinking.

Although dressed in traditional caftans, the Hasidim (חסידים) were known to worship in a cheerful way and loved to sing and dance. Rabbi Israel Friedman, who died in 1850, believed that an aristocratic, luxurious lifestyle was necessary in order to instill pride in his followers to impress the non-Jewish populace; his son Abraham Jakob respected this tradition and built a new, splendid palace. In 1776, there were only 186 registered Jews in Sadagora; by 1873, there were 3,591. The lavish luxury of the Sadagora Court as well as the large number of pilgrims it attracted soon became widely known. In its Monthly Record, the Free Church of Scotland provided a vivid description of the situation in Sadagora in 1866:

In the streets nearly all the people you meet are dressed in long caftans, with Polish hair caps. They wear their hair long and curled, and their faces are almost all red and inflamed by the abuse of alcoholic drinks. Nevertheless, this town, obscure and nasty as it is, exercises over the Jewish population of that province and the surrounding country, an attraction as powerful as the most celebrated places of pilgrimage in Italy once exercised over the Polish population of that peninsula. Its prestige is due to this: that there dwells there a family of which, as the Jews of that region believe, the Messiah is destined to be born. (...) Sadagora has become for the Jews of Poland, Russia, Bukovina, Moldavia and Wallachia, the favourite place of pilgrimage.
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Within Orthodox Jewish circles, the excessive life-style of some Hasidic leaders and in particular that of those affiliated with the Sadagora dynasty led to a struggle in 1868 which caused the split of the Hasidic community into two opposing factions: the Hasidim of Neu-Sandez (Galicia) and those of Sadagora. Although the Sadagora dynasty proved to be the stronger one, a succession conflict within the Friedman family led to the establishment of a second Hasidic court in Bohan in 1883. Years earlier already, a Hasidic Court had been established in Wiznitz by Menachem Mendel, a son of the Kosów tzadik from Galicia, thus bringing the total of Hasidic courts in Bukovina to three. Sadagora thus lost its exclusive control and its influence gradually declined. Still, it remained the most powerful Hasidic force and Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung commented in 1906 how family matters in the Friedman household affected Orthodox Eastern Jewry as a whole.

The Sadagora Court and its tzadikim had been controversial from the start. The correspondent from the Free Church of Scotland had described the town as ‘small and excessively dirty’ and the ‘wonder rabbi’ (presumably Israel Friedman’s son) as a ‘wretched idiot’:

In the brain under his white hair there is no intelligence; in his look and in his mind there is nothing which announces mental life or suggests a thinking human being. Although not yet by any means old, he cannot walk without being supported, neither can he utter anything but inarticulate sounds, intelligible only to the members of his family and his secretaries. Everything about him, in short, indicates a state of complete idiocy.

The authors of the 1882 Illustrated Guide to the Eastern Carpathians, Hungary, Galicia, Bukovina and Romania were equally abhorred by the Sadagora rabbis, who were ‘unfortunately tolerated by the authorities, exploiting the poor superstitious Hasidic people in the most shameless way and enjoying almost divine veneration’. The Illustrated Guide expressed indignation that ‘such things were tolerated in the nineteenth century’. In 1918, Russian Jewish historian Simon Dubnow regarded the Sadagora dynasty ‘a serious handicap to modern progress’. Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung criticised the squandering of money at the Court, but also underlined how much of the wealth brought to Sadagora by the pilgrims was spent on charity and on providing room and board for needy visitors. According to Austrian Jewish feminist Bertha Pappenheim, not all tzadikim were necessarily ‘swindlers’,
but she charged that some, including the Sadagora tzadik, exploited the ‘superstition and limited intelligence’ of their followers in order to amass personal riches and even political influence. She demystified the so-called ‘miracles’ these leaders performed, claiming they were usually advice in business, medical or legal matters, whose efficacy [could] be explained by the rabbi’s experience in assessing the circumstances, or by psychological or suggestive influences.\(^{658}\)

Due to Sadagora’s mystic attraction and its large number of visitors it is not surprising that the phenomenon appeared in the memoirs of prominent authors. Galician author Leopold von Sacher-Masoch visited Sadagora in 1857 and although he recalled ‘narrow streets full of filth, streets with dark recesses that the sun’s rays never entered’, he also described the rabbi as a ‘miraculous man’.\(^{659}\) During the late 1800s, Galician-born Martin Buber, in later life an important Jewish religious philosopher, spent the summers of his childhood in Bukovina and recalled visits to the ‘dirty village of Sadagora’ as well as the ‘dark’ Hasidic crowd. The showy splendour of the rabbi’s palace repelled him, but he was at the same time impressed by ‘the genuine community and genuine leadership’ he witnessed there.\(^{660}\) The appeal of the Hasidic presence in Bukovina was not limited to Jews and those with a particular interest in Jewish life. Just like in Galicia,\(^{661}\) Hasidic specifics provided attraction to any curious visitor. In her 1893 Social and Economic Sketches from Bukovina, Marie Mischler provided four chapters on the towns, craft, trade and usury but then surprisingly added a fifth chapter on Hasidic Jews, a step which can only be explained by the author’s personal fascination. With the same enticement in mind, the local Czernowitz tourist association tried to lure its target group to Bukovina with brochures containing lengthy descriptions of the Sadagora Hasidic palace.\(^{662}\) The Vossische Zeitung from Berlin opened its Bukovina travel account with a romantic description of Wiznitz, ‘where on Fridays the peaceful glow of Sabbath lights still shone from the windows of low cottages and on workdays earnest men go around in caftans and with earlocks at their temples’.

Opposition to Jewish Enlightenment was not confined to Hasidic heartland alone: Czernowitz had its own internal struggle between between those in favour, the Maskilim (משמיעים) and those opposing it, the Orthodox Misnagdim (מתנגדים).\(^{663}\) Their power struggle intensified after 1848, when the crownland status of Bukovina attracted a new wave of Maskilim immigrants from Lemberg. It escalated when the Maskilim managed to hire a rabbi of their choice, the reform-minded Eliezer Igel, who was also from Lemberg.\(^{664}\) The style of Igel’s sermons, his
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approach of education and, later, the fact that he had started to preach in German further alienated the Orthodox members of the Jewish religious community. 665 In 1872, these tensions led to a schism and the establishment of two Jewish religious communities, 666 but the existence of two such entities in the same city was against Austrian law and the parties were forced to reconcile. They lived together in an uneasy truce thereafter. 667

Although their numbers were lower than in Czernowitz or other towns, the number of Jews in rural areas was still impressive. Jewish demographer Jacob Lestschinsky noted that ‘Galicia was the only land in the whole world where such a large percentage of Jews lived in the villages, except for Bukovina’. 668 In 1880, there were only eleven villages without a Jewish community in the crownland. 669 Jews in rural Bukovina were mainly orthodox. Not only in the Hasidic strongholds Sadagora, Bojan and Wiznitz, they generally resisted secularisation and in turn were kept at bay by their Christian neighbours. 670 Jewish Rosa Zuckermann (1908-2002), who still remembered Habsburg Bukovina from her childhood, confirmed the fact that village Jews differed ‘in every aspect’ from the fashionable city Jews, especially from those from Czernowitz. 671

Memoirs from Jews who experienced Austrian Bukovina first-hand tend to be nostalgic, for they inescapably compare those years to the hard times and the atrocities which were to follow in the post-Austrian years. 672 Therefore, it is hard to value statements like ‘before 1914, there was no anti-Semitism’, or ‘everybody was on friendly terms with each other’. Whereas American historian Keely Stauter-Halsted stated that ‘the Jewish presence in Galician villages was probably the strongest single source of ethnic tension’, 673, this was probably less overtly true for Bukovina and its (even) more diverse population. Still, as has been argued in connection with usury and spirits trade, such tensions did exist. Whether they were ‘ethnic’ is another question. Since the non-Jewish population mainly lived from farm work and the Jews from trade, there was more than just religion to create a barrier. ‘Living alongside of each other’ might in many cases have been a more adequate description than ‘living with each other’, as the memoirs of Adolf Katzenbeisser from the village Czudyn implied. At the same time, Katzenbeisser asserted that marriages between Jews and Catholics
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were not uncommon. Rosa Zuckermann had different recollections from the town of Wiznitz, which was for more than ninety percent Jewish. A local Jewish general practitioner who had married a non-Jewish woman was the talk of the town and his marriage was considered scandalous. Folklorist Ion Sbiera, who went to school in Radautz in 1845, claimed that the town was ‘completely Romanian’ at that time and that Jews adjusted to the use of the Romanian language in public. Then again, Sbiera focused on the language used for doing business and did not hint on any social relations between Jews and other groups. In 1912, Viata Noua complained that there was no such thing in Suczawa as a vibrant Romanian social life and that families and social classes lived to isolated from each other but that by contrast ‘almost only the Jews had ‘a true social life, lively and organic’. In his monography of the town of Sereth, Bukovinian theology professor Simeon Reli quoted an old man, Vasile Siretean, who claimed that bit by bit the town had been taken over by Jews and that the ‘Romanian element’, which had been in the majority until 1850, had been evicted to the edges of town by poverty and Jewish usury. From 1873, more and more property had been leased ‘to Jewish and other strangers’ according to Reli, whose clearly Romanian nationalist approach does not encourage the reader to take his observations at face value. German linguist Gustav Weigand visited Sereth in the early 1900s and noted the town was ‘completely flooded’ (ganz überschwemmt) by Jews.

Jewish Lydia Harnik, who was a contemporary and a friend of the earlier quoted Rosa Zuckermann, was from Sereth herself. Her memoirs of Habsburg Sereth are rosier and speak of harmonious interethic relations. Jews, Harnik recalled, sent their children to the local secondary schools and then off to either Czernowitz or Brünn to continue their studies at university. According to Harnik, even a town as provincial as Sereth had ‘a distinct intellectual character’ (eine ausgesprochen geistige Prägung). Rosa Zuckermann had witnessed a similar development in Wiznitz, where she knew ‘people who had studied, even abroad’. Apart from the fact that these last two ‘eye witnesses’ knew each other well and might have influenced each other’s memories, it should be noted that it was clearly the ‘assimilated’, German-oriented among the Jews who brought this sort of development to the rural areas. Indeed, the Jewish physician, pharmacist, lawyer and so on played a pivotal role in the modernisation of small-town Bukovina. The role of these smaller towns has so far been neglected by modern scholarship, which has regarded the history of Bukovina so far as one of ‘Czernowitz et le désert bucovinien’.
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3.6 Jewish Nationalism in Bukovina

Jewish identification with German-Austrian culture gradually shifted from functional adjustment to acculturation. Apart from the clear refusal to join this development shown by the - often small-town based - Orthodox Jewish communities, there were no obvious alternatives for Bukovinian Jews until the 1890s. A more assertive approach was offered first by Mayer Ebner and Philipp Menczel who headed the Zionist movement in Bukovina. The movement was particularly popular with the younger generation of well-to-do urban bourgeoisie. Ebner focused on strengthening Jewish identity, establishing Hebrew schools and preparing for emigration to Palestine because, with the massive unemployment among educated Jews, he insisted there was no future for them in Bukovina. The Bund, the Federation of Jewish Workers of Poland, Russia and Lithuania, had been established in Russia in 1897 to spread social values to Jewish workers. It also extended its influence to Bukovina. With similar agendas, the associations Poalei-Zion (Workers of Zion) and the Jewish Workers’ Association (Jüdische Arbeiterbund) emerged in Bukovina in the early 1900s. When the Austrian Social Democrats separated into national or ethnic divisions, their Bukovinian Jewish affiliates called themselves the Bund from 1908. In 1911 they associated with the Galician Bund.

Still, the undisputed key figure of Jewish politics in Bukovina was Benno Straucher. In 1888 he became a member of the Kultusgemeinde, in 1903 its vice-president and in 1904 its president. He tried to raise the political consciousness of Bukovinian Jews and played an instrumental role in the founding of the Jewish National House and the Jewish orphanage. Straucher’s brand of populism was successful mainly among the masses with a religiously orthodox and socio-politically conservative view. Bukowiner Nachrichten dismissed Straucher’s followers as ‘his electorate from Sadagora’, ‘the army of helots’ (das Heer seiner Hörigen), ‘the poor devils from the Jewish alley’ (die armen Teufel aus der Judengasse) who were all said to be ‘at his beck and call’. Not only was Straucher the unchallenged leader of the Kultusgemeinde, he also was a deputy in both the regional diet and the Austrian parliament. Straucher could not be bothered by ideologist debates and concentrated his views and campaigns on the central idea of a Jewish nation (Volk) and its proclaimed collective rights. He initially worked together with the German nationalists and as such, his views represented an exotic mix of German liberalism and Jewish nationalism. Anti-Semitism in Bukovina - for which he blamed the influence of nationalist professors attracted by the University of Czernowitz - and the resulting separatist Christian German movement ended.
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Straucher’s cooperation with representatives of German politics and helped to define his brand of Jewish nationalism. In the regional diet he declared in 1905:

*We are unconditional supporters of German culture, but we will not be merged into the Christian-German camp. We do not forget that the university unfortunately brought us this Graz colony. The gentlemen from Graz brought an institution into the land which was alien to us so far. I do not direct hatred, passion and jealousy towards the German people. What we Jews are fighting, however, is anti-Semitism which is spreading among Christian Germans.*

693

Straucher was certainly the most prominent Jewish politician in Bukovina, but his struggle for recognition of the Jewish nationality was by no means supported throughout the entire Jewish community. A large segment of Bukovinian Jews preferred complete assimilation into German culture694 while others ridiculed the very concept of Jewish nationalism since there was no one-on-one relation between Jewish nationalism and a ‘Jewish language’. If Jewish nationalists wanted to declare war on the German nationalists, they reasoned, it would be impossible to remain faithful to the language of the enemy.695 This obsession with language was not illogical: since the Austrian authorities desperately tried to keep Pandora’s box of nationalities closed, they refused to acknowledge nationalities as legal entities. Consequently, censuses only worked with the denominator ‘language of conversation’, and since Yiddish was not recognised as a real language, Jews were not accepted as a nationality.696 Jewish nationalists attempted to solve this problem by embracing *yiddishkeit*, or, in the words of historians Lichtblau and John: “As the destabiliising effects of the German host culture on their own identity became obvious in the wake of the mutually agreed-upon segregation, secularly acculturated Jews of Bukovina sought a new mainstay on which to base their Jewish nationality”.697 Yet, this segregation was not ‘mutually agreed-upon’: in his report to Vienna, Governor Bourguigon presented Straucher's Jewish nationalism as a product of Skedl's anti-Semitism.698 To complicate matters further, Straucher’s Jewish nationalism was not focused on the official recognition of the Yiddish language; he rather advocated expansion of Jewish minority schools with German as the medium of instruction.699
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Nuances aside, *yiddishkeit* was the core element of diaspora or *galut* (גולה, literally: exile) nationalism, a tendency widely neglected because of the general acceptance of the contrariness between assimilation and Zionism. The concept was developed and promoted by Nathan Birnbaum, a thinker and journalist from Vienna. Having been a Zionist first, Birnbaum came to Czernowitz after a conflict with Theodor Herzl. Instead of looking down on Yiddish as a mere dialect (*Jargon*), he actively promoted its official status and maintained that if Jews wanted to appear in Austrian census results, they would have to indicate ‘Jewish’ as their language of communication: Austrian censuses were conducted exclusively along linguistic lines, so this was the only way the put Jews on the map as a ‘nationality’.700 Whereas Eastern Jews had so far been broadly regarded as the impersonation of backwardness and hampering development by non-Jews and Jewish assimilatists, Birnbaum saw them as the stronghold of Jewish cultural integrity. With the central position of Eastern Jews as well as the status of Yiddish at the core of his program, Birnbaum irritated both assimilatists and Zionists.701 In socialist circles, however, he met with a positive response: Bundists, in spite of their international perspective and their opposition to all sorts of nationalism, had adopted a national position which rejected Zionism as a bourgeois attempt to deflect Jewish workers from their class interest but insisted that Jews in Russia had the right to national cultural autonomy.702 Members of ‘Poalei-Zion’ and the Jewish Workers’ Association actively promoted Yiddish, not in the least because this was the easiest way for them to reach the Jewish working class.703 Karl Emil Franzos did not live to see this development. He had only witnessed its first signs, which he had denounced since he saw a separate Jewish nationality as a weakening of the German position in Bukovina. For the same reason, he had disapproved of the seclusion of Christian Germans and had characterised German anti-Semitism as ‘suicide’ for the German position in Bukovina.704

Birnbaum’s ideas found a more than sympathetic ear in Czernowitz, where the young lawyer Max Diamant became a prominent defender of the *galut* cause. According to Diamant, the Jewish tribe (*Volksstamm*) was as much an entity as the Czechs, Polish, Germans or Ruthenians and Yiddish was as much a customary (*landesüblich*) language as the recognised languages of Bukovina, i.e. German, Romanian and Ruthenian.705 Together with Birnbaum, Diamant organised in Czernowitz the first-ever conference on the Yiddish language in 1908. The event attracted major authors from Galicia and Russia.706 Tellingly, opposition from the side of Bukovinian Zionists prevented the organisers from holding the conference in the Jewish House, so that - in true Bukovinian style - the first international gathering of
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Yiddishists was held in the Ruthenian House. Although a number of technical issues like grammar, theatre and press featured on the agenda, the conference would be remembered for the last agenda item, ‘Recognition for the Yiddish Language’. This caused controversy, also between delegates who espoused Hebrew as the only Jewish national language and those who considered Yiddish the living Jewish language and Hebrew the language of prayer and the past. The assembly found a solution by proclaiming Yiddish a (not the) national language of the Jews and demanded its political, cultural and social equality to other languages. Diamant carried on in the spirit of the Conference and in 1909 he caused a stir when his demonstrative application for the establishment of a Jewish Theatre Association in Czernowitz, written in Yiddish in the Hebrew script, was rejected by the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Vienna. The judge had reasoned that the Jews were a religious group and not a ‘nation’ (Volksstamm) and furthermore, that Yiddish was a ‘local dialect’ (Dialekt lokalen Characters) and not a national language. The Austrian authorities started to monitor Diamant and his activities closely: when the Theatre Association held its meetings in Yiddish, it was warned by the police in February 1910 that if this practice continued, the association would be dismantled. The Czernowitz police substantiated the warning not only by the fact that Yiddish did not have official status, but also with the more practical reason that the police was not able to overhear the contents of the discussions once they were held in Yiddish. This ban provoked an immediate reaction from Diamant and Birnbaum, who organised a meeting on ‘the ban of the use of the Jewish languages at meetings’, which attracted three- to four hundred attendees, including several women. At the meeting they lashed out at Bukovinian Jewish politicians, whom they accused of only going after mandates without having any understanding for the daily needs of the Jewish people. Local politicians were said to be ashamed of Yiddish and these politicians as well as Jewish intellectuals and students were deemed ‘slackers’. The police reasoning that they would not be able to understand what was said at the meetings was considered inaccurate, ‘since all inhabitants of Bukovina spoke
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better Yiddish than the Jewish leaders, because Bukovinan German was basically bad Yiddish’. 712

Whether the frustrations of the meeting’s participants were justified or not, the complaint that Jewish students in Czernowitz were passive in the Jewish nationality question was certainly unsubstantiated. In 1905 and 1906, several cases were reported of violent clashes between members of Jewish-nationalist or Zionist student associations and their fellow Jewish students who belonged to one of the a-national associations Austria and Alemania. 713 A similar radicalisation and growing tension between Jewish and other students inspired Zionist organisations to call upon their student members to demand to be registered as Jews in the university administration. 714 In an official letter to the senate, Jewish students insisted on being registered this way for the 1905/1906 semester. They underlined their hope for a peaceful solution while recognising the German character of the university as well the position of the German language in the academic world. As a compromise they asked to be allowed to register as Jewish/German. If not, so they warned, indignant Jewish students just might register as ‘Ruthenian’ or ‘Romanian’ to avenge the infringement of their national pride. 715 This creative form of blackmail failed to impress Governor Regner-Bleyleben, who, when asked by the University Senate how respond to the demand, stated that it should be ignored ‘since a Jewish nationality was out of the question’, and left it at that. 716 By 1912, Max Diamant addressed the issue once more. He called it outrageous that students whose mothers hardly spoke any German were obliged to indicate the language as their ‘mother tongue’ and that as such the authorities forced students to submit incorrect data. 717 Eventually,
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the nationalist student lobby proved to be a unique success: among all institutions in Cisleithania, only at the Franz Joseph University students were allowed to register as ‘Jewish nationals’ from the 1912-1913 semester onwards.\footnote{Hausleitner 2001, p.78.}

Other initiatives aimed at the recognition of a Jewish nationality and the Yiddish language remained fruitless. The 1910 general census with its much-debated ‘language of conversation’ criterion caused unrest in Jewish Bukovina after the Viennese authorities had once again rejected the inclusion of Yiddish in its list of recognised languages. Nationalist Jews, but also Zionists and Bundists launched the initiative for a private committee for the recognition of the Yiddish language at a meeting in December 1910, but the nervous Ministry of Home Affairs quickly prohibited any follow-up gatherings. A protest rally in Wiznitz with 3000 participants could not be forestalled, but did not lead to any government policy alteration.\footnote{Ibid.}

More urgent and fundamental for the recognition of the ‘Jewish nationality’ than the 1910 census were the complicated negotiations for a Bukovinian Compromise which was largely inspired by its 1905 Moravian precursor. The Compromise was designed to guarantee representation for each interest group in both the regional diet and the Austrian parliament. As such, an early draft presented by Aurel Onciul, Alexandru Hurmuzaki and Mykola Vasylyko\footnote{Corbea-Hoisie 2004, p. 64.} had proposed to divide diet seats among Ruthenian, Romanian, German, Jewish and Polish nationalists, while assuring representation also to large landowners, Greek-Orthodox monasteries, the Greek-Orthodox Archbishop, the Rector of the University of Czernowitz and the Czernowitz Chamber of Commerce. Local nationalist forces had supported the Jewish plea, even if only to limit the Jewish influence in their own respective registers-to-be.\footnote{Leslie 1991, p. 127; See also Torouțiu 1916, part 1.} However, since Vienna staunchly refused to acknowledge a ‘Jewish nationality’, a pragmatic solution was found by means of a compensation system of ‘electoral geometry’. In other words, gerrymandering Bukovinian voting districts was to guarantee that at least eight of the fourteen seats within the German register would go to Jewish representatives. For this reason, Austrian constitutional historian Gerald Stourzh later called the Bukovinian Compromise ‘the most subtle work under the old Austrian Nationality Law’.\footnote{Rachamimov, Alon, Provincial Compromises and State Patriotism in fin-de-siècle Austria-Hungary, in: Zuckermann, Moshe (ed.), Ethnizität, Moderne und Enttraditionalisierung, Wallstein Verlag, Göttingen 2002, 116-128 pp. 123-124.} Although this way out of the stalemate between Vienna and the Bukovinian Jewish nationalist could optimistically be regarded as a ‘de facto recognition of Jews as a national group’,\footnote{Stambrook 2004, p. 199.} the lobby of the likes of Straucher and Diamant had not produced the aspired result. Logically, most of the ensuing criticism came from Jewish and German nationalists, who now found themselves involuntarily tied to each other.\footnote{Leslie 1991, p. 130; Stourzh 2007, p. 200.} Assimilated Jews in Vienna and Galicia (the so-called ‘Jewish Poles’) on the other hand heaved a sigh of relief, since they had traditionally found themselves in a less advantaged position than the Bukovinian Jews and had feared that the
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official recognition of a separate Jewish nationality would annihilate the bitterly-fought equality between the Jews and other Austrian citizens.\footnote{Kassner 1917, p. 54; Leslie 1991, p. 128.} This sense of relief was shared by other Cisleithanian parliament deputies who badly needed the Jewish vote to support a precarious minority in their area, such as, for example, the Germans in the Czech lands and the Polish club in Galicia.\footnote{Everett, Leila P., \textit{The Rise of Jewish National Politics in Galicia, 1905-1907}, in: Markovits, Andrei S. and Sysyn, Frank E. (eds), \textit{Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism, Essays on Austrian Galicia}, Harvard University Press, Harvard 1982, 149-177, p. 162.}

The failure of Jewish nationality recognition weakened Straucher’s political position in Bukovina. In 1910, Zionists Mayer Ebner and Leon Kellner established the Jewish Popular Council (\textit{Jüdischer Volksrat}) and tried to break Straucher’s ‘political dictatorship’ while criticising his failed national mission. With regional diet elections still providing ten Jewish deputies, the now fragmented Bukovinian Jewish electorate managed to put only one Jewish deputy in the Austrian Parliament: Straucher, who had cunningly ran for the Hasidic Sadagora district of the Czernowitz constituency and therefore had been sure of his victory.\footnote{Kassner 1917, p. 55; Hausleitner 2001, p. 76.} Modest as this result may seem, the fact remains that Straucher was elected within the German register, on the specific ticket of the Jewish National Party. As such, he was the only ‘official’ Jewish deputy in the entire Parliament and a unique phenomenon in the western world as a whole.\footnote{Ceauşu 2004, p. 220, Heymann 2003, p. 39.} Staying true to his cause, he continued to appeal in parliament for recognition of the Jewish nationality until shortly before the collapse of the Habsburg Empire.\footnote{\textit{Das Schicksal der Bukowina}, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung/Czernowitzer Tagblatt (Gemeinsame Kriegsausgabe), 02.12.1917, pp. 2-3.}

A central question remains why Vienna so stubbornly persisted in refusing to grant Jewish nationalists their much-desired recognition. Historians tend to question the official motivation that the Fundamental Laws of Cisleithania defined the Jewish population of Austria as a ‘religious group’.\footnote{Stourzh 1995, p. 48; Rachamimov 2002, pp. 123-124.} In 1916, Romanian nationalist Ilie Torouţiu had already considered the official government position a mere excuse to use the Jewish electorate as a Machiavellian trump card which could be glued to any national group in order to weaken another. Naturally, Torouţiu feared that Romanian speakers in Bukovina would be the principal victims.\footnote{“... ca nu este popor, pe care iudovimea din Bukovina să-l urască mai mult decât poporul românesc” [... since there is no nation that the Jewry of Bukovina hates more than the Romanian nation]. Torouţiu 1916, part 1.} Rather than suspecting constitutional cautiousness or cynical calculation, British historian Leslie and his Romanian colleague Corbea-Hoisie tended to follow the opinions expressed by Mykola Vasylko in the regional diet in 1909. Vasylko had suggested that it was not so much anti-Semitism which explained the official position, but rather the opposite: a fear that the Jewish nationalist ambitions might play into the hands of the anti-Semites who would thus obtain their pursued racial segregation free of charge.\footnote{Leslie 1991; Corbea-Hoisie 2004, p. 65.} According to Austrian historian Gerald...
Stourzh, the official position was additionally motivated by the desire for further assimilation of the Empire’s Jews and by the reluctance to incommode Vienna’s traditional allies, the Galician Poles.\footnote{Stourzh 1995, pp. 46-47; Stourzh 2007, p. 201.}

Hard enough as it was to have a transparent debate on the complicated issue, the at times clumsy performance of local Austrian authorities was less than helpful. In his memoirs, former Bukovinian Governor Regner-Bleyleben complacently recalled how he had defended Vienna’s position in the regional diet. He decided to confront Jewish nationalists with a quote by Karl-Emil Franzos

\textit{who must be definitely close to you, and who wrote only thirty years ago: “The Jewish nation in the East is - I have to confess to my embarrassment - still a proper nation with its own habits, languages and customs”. And now you want this government to petrify a situation which has been characterised as disgraceful by Jews themselves?} \footnote{Cordon and Kusdat 2002, p. 25.}

The governor’s brave attempt to present to Jewish nationalists the ‘assimilationist incarnate’ Franzos as one of theirs betrayed, to say the least, a rather undeveloped understanding of the local disputes and sensibilities. However, Jewish nationalists found more obstacles on their path than ignorance alone. For Max Diamant, securing collective rights for Jews was the principal target. To this end, he had to apply the Austrian constitutional concepts of a ‘nationality’ (\textit{Volksstamm}) with its own distinctive language. Both the concepts of the ‘Jewish nation’ and Yiddish as its ‘national language’ presented fundamental difficulties, which clearly came to the fore when Diamant defended his case before the Imperial Court (\textit{Reichsrat}) in Vienna.

The most obvious stumbling block in the Jewish nationality debate was the fact that Jews had always been regarded as a religious community; another one was the question of assimilation. Could an assimilated and maybe even baptised Jew still be considered a Jew? Diamant tried to solve this matter by differentiating between Western and Eastern Jews. Only the latter, he argued, could claim nationality status in view of their compact settlement, their cultural traditions and their language. Even when, like in Galicia, Jews identified with Polish culture, they remained Jews ‘because of their particular character’, Diamant claimed.\footnote{Stourzh 2007, pp. 198-199.} ‘This line of argumentation was clearly flimsy, as \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung} pointed out, since ‘one could hardly recognise the Jews of Bukovina as a nation and treat the Jews of Lower Austria as a religion’. The newspaper agreed that there were reasons to regard Judaism as a ‘national religion’, but this did not mean that religion and nation were one and the same. The number of practical impossibilities would be manifold if Jews obtained nationality status. Would non-religious Jews still be registered as national Jews? Would a German who converted to Judaism stop being a German? Would Jews who assimilated generations ago be labeled Jews again against their will? A Romanian would always be a Romanian, \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung} sustained, no matter if he remained loyal to his religion or not.\footnote{\textit{Der nationale Kataster - II/ Von besonderer Seite}, \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung}, 10.08.1909, pp. 1-2.} Similar arguments
were invoked by Interior Minister Haerdtl when he sent home a Jewish nationalist delegation from Bukovina in October 1909 because ‘he could not meet the wish for the creation of a Jewish register since it could be seen as an act of hostility against the Jews, as if the government wanted to make the political rights of the Jews dependent on their religious affiliation, contradictory to the Constitution’.\textsuperscript{737}

The language problem was equally complex. Diamant persuasively argued that Yiddish was well-represented in modern literature, the press, political parties and the theatre, but he fell short of convincibility when it came to defend Yiddish as ‘the common language of one nationality’. Imperial Council member Count Piniński highlighted that there was not simply one Jewish language, since for instance ‘Zionists in the West’ spoke Hebrew. He also called Yiddish ‘a vernacular, spoken by the lower strata of the population’,\textsuperscript{738} and thus confronted Diamant with yet an additional, socially determined division next to the east-west partition which Diamant had conveniently applied himself. Indeed, the assimilated Bukovinian educated middle-class associated Yiddish with a part of society they did not consider themselves part of. Poet Rose Ausländer later recalled how Jewish parents made sure that their offspring did not mix Yiddish elements into their German (\textit{jiddeln}).\textsuperscript{739}

In short, the Austrian authorities were not inclined to experiment with the categories of ‘nationality’ and ‘religion’. Neither did they tend to attribute national language status to what they perceived as a local dialect. Political reasons may well have played a role in this decision, but the lengthy debates between Jewish nationalists and Austrian officials plainly showed that practical obstacles were more than merely disguised government reluctance.

\section*{3.7 Anti-Semitism and Bukovina: Attacks and Vindications}

Historians generally agree that anti-Semitism was relatively weak in Habsburg Bukovina. The obvious lack of parameters has compelled authors to nuance to their conclusions. It is stated that religious and racial anti-Semitism as well as the opinion that Jewish creditors and businessmen were to blame for peasant misery only spread to the Bukovinian peasantry in the 1930s,\textsuperscript{740} while Ezra Mendelsohn maintained that ‘so long as Habsburg rule was maintained, relations between Jews and non-Jews were as good as anywhere else in Eastern Europe, and

and a law which only applied the language argument. Still, while most of the dilemmas presented here were justified, the simplicity of the statement ‘a Romanian will always be a Romanian’ was surely helpful in the debate on the Jewish nationality problem, but largely ignored the complexity of the nationality issue at large. As has been argued before, it was exactly the one-on-one linkage of language and nationality which hampered an adequate understanding of identifications and loyalties in the Empire. As such, the system did not only fail to adequately register a Jew, but proved equally insufficient in offering the mentioned ‘Romanian’ the tools to register his adherence(s).

probably better'.\textsuperscript{741} Regional comparisons often lead to the conclusion that Bukovina was ‘largely spared the strong anti-Semitism of surrounding territories’,\textsuperscript{742} while it is also claimed that anti-Semitism only trickled in during the last years of the crownland’s existence, ‘influenced by the west’.\textsuperscript{743} These views largely reflect opinions held in Bukovinian circles during the Austrian years. The image of interethic harmony was carefully guarded, although a slip of the tongue (or pen, in this case) sometimes proved to be revealing: when Metropolitan Silvestru-Morariu had deplored the tensions in Bukovina in his 1889 \textit{Apologie}, he had insisted that ‘formerly in Bukovina, Greeks, Catholics, Protestants, Armenians, Lippovans and \textit{even} [emph. mine] Jews lived side by side in peace and harmony’.\textsuperscript{744}

The large number of Jews in Bukovina and their success in Bukovinian society were the inspiration for a range of epithets for the crownland, each of them interpreted both positively and negatively. Biderman observed in 1875 that ‘if the number of Ruthenians in Bukovina had grown considerably during the previous hundred years, the same was true to much greater extent for the Jews who had reason to worship the land as a second Canaan’.\textsuperscript{745} An anonymous author only identified as ‘Christian Social’ complained in the anti-Semitic Viennese \textit{Reichspost} that Bukovinian deputy Salomon Kassner had proudly addressed the Eight Zionist Congress in The Hague in 1907 with the comment that ‘one encountered a distinct Jewish nationalism in Bukovina, providing the land with a Jewish imprint which had given the land the nicknames ‘Little Jerusalem on the Pruth’ or ‘Austria’s Jewish Eldorado’. Whereas the author presented the case as if Kassner had seen those nicknames as compliments or at least as recognition for Jewish achievements in Bukovina,\textsuperscript{746} Kassner himself provided the opposite interpretation of the very same statement in his book \textit{The Jews in Bukovina} (\textit{Die Juden in der Bukowina}) almost ten years later:

\begin{quote}
\textit{In spite of everything, unlikely as it may sound, we have always been confronted with a strong nationalism among Bukovinian Jews, which has provided the land with a peculiar imprint, repeatedly emphasised by anti-Semitic authors with the mocking epithet on \textit{Little Jerusalem on the Pruth’ or ‘Austria’s Jewish Eldorado’}.}
\end{quote}

This ambivalence has prevailed in the historical interpretations of the Habsburg-era appellations attributed to Bukovina. German Historian Hausleitner qualified Czernowitz’ nickname of ‘Little Jerusalem on the Pruth’ as an anti-Semitic invention by German nationalists,\textsuperscript{748} while more recent historiography generally tended to regard the
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aforementioned labels more positively.\textsuperscript{749} Then again, as historian David Rechter concluded, the distorting mirror of the often unhappy post-Habsburg era has been at work for émigrés and historians alike, merging nostalgia with a touch of tunnel vision.\textsuperscript{750}

In 1902, Bukowinaer Journal quoted an anonymous ‘distinguished public figure’ (\textit{eine hervorragende, im öffentlichen Leben stehende Persönlichkeit}) who put forth:

\begin{center}
Our small homeland is a strange place: with its conglomeration of nationalities and denominations it is innately fertile ground for degenerations (...) because all these conflicting movements bitterly collide in this small space and neutralise each other. For the same reasons, a religious anti-Semitic movement of the kind that celebrates orgies in the ‘enlightened’ and ‘advanced’ West could not develop here and with a little caution it would not be difficult to save Bukovina from this disease entirely since it is also on the wane in the West.\textsuperscript{751}
\end{center}

\textit{Czernowitz Tagblatt} sustained in 1906 that the spirit of ‘liberalism’ (\textit{Freisinn}) would keep the Viennese anti-Semites from the Christian-Social Party at bay,\textsuperscript{752} but a year later \textit{Bukowinaer Post} admitted that anti-Semitism had now entered Bukovinian politics as well and blamed the activities of Catholic priests for this.\textsuperscript{753} Against the backdrop of the Romanian nationalists’ adherence to the anti-Semitic Christian Socials, \textit{Czernowitz Tagblatt} emphasised even in 1909 that ‘the Jews had always been living in good friendship with the Romanians in Bukovina’, that ‘the liberal sentiments of the largely Romanian priesthood were proverbial’ and that ‘the Romanian peasant was still no anti-Semite at this point’.\textsuperscript{754} Zionist politician Mayer Ebner came to a similar conclusion in when he upheld ‘that the Romanian and Ruthenian peasantry was almost free of anti-Semitism, that the clerics of these nations were highly liberal, that a friendly, cozy coexistence of all nationalities with the Jews was a good Bukovinian tradition and that only the imported high culture (university) from the West and some immigrants from Galicia had promoted anti-Semitism, not even methodically and purposefully (\textit{plan- und zielgemäß}) but in the way one cherished a custom from the homeland in the farthest corner of the earth’.\textsuperscript{755}

Again, it is impossible to measure degrees of anti-Semitism. Pogroms and other larger-scale outbursts of violence against Jews were unknown in the crownland, but anti-Semitic
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sentiments among the population were not. Stam brook already wondered if the picture was ‘quite as rosy’ as is is usually painted. He found numerous examples of day-to-day anti-Semitism, but concluded that there seems to have been little overt anti-Semitism among adults and suggested that passivity could legitimately be seen as a characteristic of Bukovina’s peasant population. As will be argued further on, anti-Semitism was at times more overt and Bukovina’s peasants were less passive in this respect than Stam brook proposed.\(^{756}\)

Anti-Semitism had never been completely absent in the crownland’s administration and would, as the influence of nationalism intensified, become more and more prominent in regional politics. Throughout the centuries, discriminatory laws had hindered Jews in Europe access to the majority of professions. They were therefore limited to some occupations which were generally deemed amoral and led to a profound popular mistrust from which ‘modern anti-Semitism’ would greatly benefit later on.\(^{757}\) Thus, forms of state anti-Semitism in fact existed already before the Habsburg occupation. According to traditional Moldavian law, Jews (and Armenians) were not allowed to own slaughterhouses, inns, bakeries or land; they were allowed to lease land only, not to own it.\(^{758}\) The second Austrian military commander, Enzenberg, had complained that Jews had leased entire villages and possessed almost all liquor licenses as well. He had vowed to do anything to prevent the rise of ‘that insect’ and had been horrified to learn that Christians worked as servants for Jews.\(^{759}\) As late as 1853, Jews were confronted by a Bukovinian regulation forbidding them to hire Christian servants.\(^{760}\) Special ‘kosher taxes’ doubled meat prices and forced poorer Jews to abstain from meat consumption altogether.\(^{761}\)

**Bukovinian National Movements and Anti-Semitism**

As national movements in Bukovina developed, German, the Romanian and the Ruthenian nationalists all dealt with the accompanying anti-Semitic tendencies in their own way. Each of these *modi operandi* were determined by developments in Austria proper, by German, Romanian and Ruthenian nationalist movements outside of Bukovina and by certain crownland specifics. In a time of growing ethno-nationalism, the strongest anti-Semitic trends were found with German nationalists. This was true of many parts of Europe where a strong Jewish presence identified with German language and culture, but makes Habsburg Bukovina a particularly interesting case. For a start, Ruthenian and Romanian nationalists were able to
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embark on their respective quests from the comfort zone of language: no matter how hard it was to tell, say, a Bukovinian Romanian peasant from a Bukovinian Ruthenian one, language duly served as a stepping stone to elaborate on cultural differences and separate ‘national destinies’. Bukovinian German ethno-nationalists lacked this luxury position since they shared their German linguistic and cultural identification with an overwhelmingly larger Jewish population segment. In order to establish a nationalist agenda persuasive enough to compete with Romanian and Ruthenian forces and their respective language advantages, German nationalists had to resort to another divisive tool. Religion seemed to serve this purpose. From the moment Bukovinian German nationalists qualified themselves as ‘Christian’, this terminology implied ethnic exclusion (of Jews) rather than religious inclusion (of Christians). The image of the ‘Jewish intruder’ appealed to the general imagination, and even Bukovinian teacher and author Simiginowicz-Staufe, who claimed to ‘have tried to treat each ethnic group with equal respect and equal patriotism’ in his ethnography of Bukovina and thus duly highlighted Jewish achievements in and for the crownland, maintained that ‘in Bukovina, the Jew tried to assimilate into Germanity’, and assessed this effort ‘certainly a very relative gain for the latter’. Some German nationalist leaders in Bukovina foresaw the possibly disastrous numeric outcome of the exclusion of the large Jewish electorate from their ranks. One of them, Arthur Skedl, stated in 1900:

In the question of nationality as well as in the matter of religion my principle is: tolerance. The same way I ask for respect for my church as a good Catholic, I pay full respect to any other religion. In particular, all Germans in Bukovina, both Christians and Jews, should go hand in hand with mutual respect for each other’s religions in order to maintain their common culture and language.

After Skedl had his ears boxed in Vienna in 1905 by Schönerer’s party for as much as wanting to be elected by Jews, the last bit of fertile soil for an integrative German-Jewish political union disappeared. Skedl swiftly joined the Christian Germans himself. In the eyes of German nationalists in Bukovina there was only one enemy, so they saw ‘absolutely no reason to intervene disturbingly in the healthy national development of the other Christian nations’, as Christian-Social Bukowiner Volksblatt put it.

Romanian nationalists in Bukovina primarily focused on the Ruthenian enemy, but by the end of the 1800s anti-Semitism became a prominent addition to their program. The establishment
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of the Franz Joseph University in 1875 had enabled many Bukovinian Jews to provide their sons with an academic education. In turn, these social climbers, often with a good command of several languages, proved to be tough competition for other Romanian graduates who sought to find employment as lawyers, professors or civil servants. Jews were also held responsible for the deplorable state of the peasantry. Peasant misery was often connected to alcohol abuse and debts, and since Jews were prominently active as innkeepers and moneylenders, anti-alcohol campaigns often had an anti-Semitic character. These ingredients made Romanian nationalism an explosive cocktail at times. In 1894, Governor Göess received a report from the police captain in the southern town of Gurahumora about the ill-treatment of a Jewish innkeeper’s family in the village of Berkischestie by farmers from nearby Kapukimpolui, in which the author directly linked the anti-alcohol campaign, anti-Semitism and the (Romanian) national movement. He argued that ‘the existence of an anti-Semitic movement was worrisome in any land, most of all in Bukovina, because with its low level of culture the population immediately drew the most extreme consequences, meaning they proceeded directly to raw violence’. Apart from unrest and occasional violence, some anti-Semitic abstention activists also turned against Empire and Emperor. Göess reported that one of the troublemakers had stated that ‘in Romania they had better laws than in Austria, because in Romania a man who served in the army received land and a liquor license while in Austria everything was in the hands of the Jews, because His Majesty the Emperor loved a Jewish woman and gave all the rights to the Jews and the Germans and Romanians were oppressed this way’. The man had added that ‘this had happened to the estate in Mardzina, which Romanians wanted to lease, but Jews had obtained it, because His Majesty loved the Jewesses’. The local authorities in Bukovina found themselves in a tricky position: once they acted against the subversive nationalist elements of the sobriety movement, its Romanian leaders would accuse the authorities of sabotaging their virtuous mission as such. And indeed, the alcohol problem in Bukovina was beyond question. Romanian nationalist periodical Deșteptarea played an instrumental role in the anti-alcohol campaign and tried to enthuse its readers with success stories of villagers who, abstaining from alcohol consumption, had thrown the local Jews out of employment and who had thus regained control of what was ‘rightfully theirs’:

Since our Romanians from Kotul-Ostritza have abandoned alcohol one by one, they are doing pretty well. The many Jews - since so many were born here, one could almost say this place was Jewish - are becoming more and more rare. Because they have no more business here, they sell their possessions and take to the road. Bon voyage to those patrons and good riddance. However, our Romanians bought the land off of these Jews. (...) Well done brothers!
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768 The philo-Semitic image of the Emperor as a reason for anti-Semitism in Bukovina is also found with one of historical anthropologist Florence Heymann’s (Jewish) respondents, Nelly S.: “Il existait un antisémitisme féroce, parce que François-Joseph avait protégé et favorisé les Juifs”. Heymann 2003, p. 39.
769 Göess, Leopold, Bericht an MI, 4603 Präs, 26 December 1894 (Brandakte)/ StOe, AVA, Ministerium des Inneren, Präsidiale Reihe, Karton 45, No. 4500/1894, Bukowina 1871-99.
Do all you can to reclaim the ancient estates, which have fallen into foreign hands because of the booze.\textsuperscript{770}

In the 1890s, occasional traces of the times preceding anti-Semitism in Romanian nationalism were still present in press sources. In 1893, Nicholas Mustatza, candidate for the Austrian Parliament (and the same Mustatza who would cause such indignation a few years later when he confessed to his German upbringin in front of the King of Romania), had publicly declared himself to be a candidate for all Bukovinians and ‘a stranger to all kinds of racial hatred, including anti-Semitism’.\textsuperscript{771} In 1897, \textit{Patria} expressed the conviction that once the Jews would understand that the anti-Semitic German nationalists were the wrong allies, they would automatically turn to the Romanian camp.\textsuperscript{772} A few years later, such views had disappeared from the Romanian nationalist press of Bukovina altogether. The editors of \textit{De\c{s}teptarea} did not limit their anti-Semitism to the sobriety campaign, but steadily provided their readers with rants against the Bukovinian Jews, ‘whose name alone filled them with disgust and bitterness (’\textit{ne umple de scârbă şi de amârăciune}’) and who were accused of ‘not being people like all people who live from labour and from the sweat of their faces, their livelihood being only the fleecing of people and fraud, the goal of their lives being feud and the destruction of Christian peoples’.\textsuperscript{773} Even the entertainment section of the paper hissed at the Jews with a fake dialogue between a Jew speaking broken Romanian and a Romanian peasant - smarntened by having read \textit{De\c{s}teptarea} - who no longer believed the mischievous ways of the Jews.\textsuperscript{774} Anti-Semitism was not confined to \textit{De\c{s}teptarea}, but became a common feature in all Romanian nationalist periodicals in Bukovina. In 1907, \textit{Apărarea Na\c{t}ională} fumed about the mayor of Alt-Fratautz, who had apparently set up a lucrative business with three other men sending migrant workers from his village to Moldavia, where they worked the land of the boyars. A significant part of the earnings was split between the mayor and his partners. “If Jews had done something like this”, the paper continued, “we would understand, because everybody knows that they live off our backs, but that even the chief of the village resorts to such thing is a major source of shame for the village as a whole”. Evidently, opportunities for anti-Semitic defamation were found even where there was no Jew in sight.\textsuperscript{775}

Once Romanian nationalists turned to Lueger’s Christian-Social Party in 1908, both \textit{Apărarea Na\c{t}ională} and its opponent \textit{Voinţa Poporului} followed suit. Before that time, some Romanian nationalists criticised their own target group as well for not doing enough to strengthen the Romanian position in Bukovina. Especially Aurel Onciul, who blamed his conservative rivals in the Romanian nationalist camp for being blinded by nationalist symbolism such as the right to wave the Romanian tricolour, had called upon the readers of his \textit{Voinţa Poporului} not to cry foul but to work if they wanted to be more than ‘the laughingstock of the world’
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“Jews do not get intangled in tricolour playgame,” Voința Poporului had warned in 1904, “instead, they pursue material results with iron perseverance.”

The turn to the Christian-Social movement by Romanian nationalist forces in Bukovina replaced former self-criticism with rants against Jews and ‘external dangers’. Apărarea Neamului, a short-lived pamphlet and a product of the Romanian nationalist fling with the Christian-Socials focused solely on the Jews as the source of all evil. When a fire had started in a Jewish home in the village of Kostina which also destroyed several non-Jewish houses, Apărarea Neamului appealed to the regional authorities ‘with the request that in order to avert disasters like the one in Kostina, they order the district captains to prohibit Jews to settle among villagers and to send them to edge of the village like the gypsies instead’. In order to exist, Romanian nationalist organisations and publications relied heavily on financial support from Romania. With this assistance also came a steady flow of anti-Semitic propaganda. Prominent Romanians such as Nicolae Iorga and Mihai Eminescu produced a constant stream of pamphlets in which they blamed Vienna for the Jewish power position in Bukovina and the Jews themselves for the dire straits of the Bukovinian peasantry. Romania, known for infringing the rights of Jews, was presented as an example country for protecting its citizens from evil Jewish influences. On top of this, Iorga and his ‘Liga Culturală’ advocated the inclusion of Bukovina in the Romanian Kingdom. The Austrian authorities were obviously not eager to have Iorga visit the crownland. However, pushy interference from Romania was not always appreciated by Romanian nationalists in Bukovina, either. In 1908, Iorga’s periodical Neamul Românesc pointed its arrows at Metropolitan Repta, who was accused of ‘flirting everywhere with the Bukovinian Jews’, since Jews habitually took part in welcoming ceremonies for the metropolitan on his visits in Bukovinian towns and would bring the torah with them on these occasions. To the taste of Neamul Românesc, Repta had been too cordial towards this gesture. Viitorul, the mouthpiece of the Bukovinian Orthodox Church loudly objected to Iorga’s allegations and stated that the events only showed how well respected Repta was among the other confessions in Bukovina. Neamul Românesc and Transylvanian Tribuna, which had also published the article, were reproached for their lack of knowledge and were requested to leave the Metropolitan in peace. When Iorga’s visit to Bukovina was cancelled in 1909, Bukovina’s freshly-launched Christian-Social newspaper Româul claimed that it had been the Jews who had conspired against the trip. However, according to Bukowinaer Gebirgs-Journal, it had been ‘influential Romanians’ (einflußreiche Rumānen) from Bukovina who had asked Iorga to stay away ‘since he might have caused the local loyal-minded Romanians unpleasant embarrassment with his temperamental nature and his well-
known anti-Austrian inclination’. In the end, it became clear that pressure from the Austrian authorities in the person of parliamentary deputy for Kimpolung, Count Franz Bellegarde, had caused the association ‘Școala Română’ to revoke Iorga’s invitation. This made no difference to the local anti-Semitic press like *Bukowiner Lehrerzeitung*, which now exclaimed in its headlines: ‘Count Bellegarde - a Protector of the Jews’.

District captain Count Bellegarde, who was originally from Ischl (Upper-Austria) but represented the Southern-Bukovinian district of Kimpolung in Vienna, had found himself increasingly at odds with the newly-found Romanian nationalist unity under the Christian-Social flag. Although he was popular with his Romanian-language peasant electorate and had to remain on speaking terms with the Romanian nationalists, the anti-Semitic direction the nationalists had chosen was uncomfortable for him, and not for him alone: The Bukovinian Orthodox Church, which had traditionally maintained good relations with the Jewish community as Iorga’s criticism of Metropolitan Repta had aptly illustrated, was equally forced to perform a political balancing act in order not to alienate the significant number Romanian nationalists among its flock. To this end, *Viitoriiul*, mouthpiece of the Church, cooked up the following language:

*The new party, being anti-Semitic, has declared outright war against the Jews. Although we priests will join this party, we can not commit to such an outright battle. Our calling is to preach peace and not war and hatred. We should continue what we have done so far, which is to hold sermons against drunkenness, against land sale, against unlimited debts, against borrowing money from usurers and so on, but these sermons should not be diatribes against those who caused the sad state our land is in, they should not be dominated by hatred against the Jews, because this might have harmful effects. We believe that if we seek by word and deed to guard our people from inns, moneylenders, land sales and so on, we work entirely in line with the Christian-Social Party (...)*.

This cunning declaration killed two birds with one stone: first, by issuing it in name of the priests, church leaders had been kept out of the matter and second, Jews were clearly blamed as ‘those who caused the sad state the land was in’, but would not be specifically mentioned.

Lueger’s party seemed an appropriate vehicle at the time to unite the divided Bukovinian Romanian factions, since its anti-Semitism was conveniently consistent with the zeitgeist and with the dominant voices from Transylvania and Romania. On the other hand, as Jewish politician Mayer Ebner underlined, the Christian-Social movement was a rather ill-fitting shoe for Bukovinian Romanians: first, as a minuscule national minority their interest in Viennese power politics was very limited. Second, the newly-adopted anti-Semitic line would estrange them from the Jews and thus - since Romanian-Ruthenian cooperation was an obvious
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impossibility - leave them isolated in the Bukovinian regional politics which was dependent on coalitions. Third, Ebner remained utterly unconvinced of Romanian anti-Semitism at the grassroots level and maintained that relations between (Romanian-speaking) peasants and Jews had always been good.\textsuperscript{788} Indeed, uniting all Romanian nationalists of Bukovina was not easy. Especially democratic leader Aurel Onciul had in the past readily cooperated with Jewish politicians in the \textit{Freisinniger Verband} and was therefore mistrusted by the others.\textsuperscript{789} Onciul’s position towards the Jews remained nebulous. In an essay in \textit{Voința Poporului} in January 1908, he stated that Jews had proven their animosity towards the Romanian people by meddling in Romanian nationalists’ internal political affairs, but mostly they had done so by declaring themselves a nation instead of a religion; by doing so, they had automatically joined the ranks of competing nationalities in Bukovina and were therefore seen as enemies.\textsuperscript{790} At a Christian-Social meeting a year later, however, Onciul seemed to have forgotten his theory of ‘competing nations’ and based his anti-Semitism on the differences between ‘the Christian and the Jewish doctrines’.\textsuperscript{791} When the municipal elections of early 1909 provided a disappointing result for the Christian-Socials led by German nationalist Wiedmann and Romanian nationalist Flondor, the (Jewish) liberals of \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung} did not hide their contempt for the movement and its leaders who had mistakenly counted on the popular appeal of their anti-Semitic program:

\textit{The Christian-Social program of the two champions of yesterday did not draw a Romanian cat from the woodwork, let alone a Romanian voter. The few dozen votes, which yesterday were seized in the true sense of the word come from those suburban craftsmen and cottagers which can also be found on the outskirts of the city and whose nationality is just as unclear and confused as their German language mixed with Slavicisms, Romanisms and Judaisms. They are usually people who for two strong drinks and a few sholent\textsuperscript{792} leftovers light the fire for the neighbouring orthodox Jews on Sabbath - commonly known as ‘Sabbath goyim’, and have some moral kinship with Wiedmann, who in the liberal era begged the Jews for votes. These people have never reflected a political conviction.}\textsuperscript{793}

The electoral defeat instantly ended the Romanian Christian-Social adventure. Iancu Flondor became the leader of the united Romanian Party. The hope expressed by Arnold Schwartz in \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung} that the Romanian nationalists would break with anti-Semitism as well\textsuperscript{794} proved to be vain: after the scandal following the refusal to let Nicolae Iorga enter Bukovina, the Habsburg authorities were not keen on creating new martyrs for the
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Romanian nationalist cause. This basically gave the Romanian nationalist movement a free hand in the distribution of anti-Semitism. Interestingly, one of the congratulatory messages to Flondor - of the few found in his private correspondence - upon his appointment as the leader of the Romanian Party came from Jewish Aron Theiler. Theiler, who lived on Flondor’s estate of Storozynetz, welcomed the appointment ‘with great joy and gladness’, deemed it ‘of great importance and most important concern not only for his [Flondor’s] own nation, but for all inhabitants of the crownland’. The question remains if the author only wheedled to remain on good terms with his landlord or if Flondor was less of an anti-Semite in daily life than his political reputation suggested.

In contrast to its Romanian equivalent, Ruthenian nationalist rhetoric in Bukovina showed ambivalence towards anti-Semitism. According to Hausleitner, xenophobia was a rare phenomenon among Bukovinian Ruthenian nationalists, since the Ruthenian politicians had to cooperate with their German and Jewish colleagues in order to hold their own against Romanian dominance. This appears to have been only partly the case, since this cooperation did not consolidate before the early 1900s, and then exclusively between Ruthenian and Jewish factions. This coalition had been the prequel of the short-lived supranational framework of the ‘Freethinking Alliance’ and had lived on as an association by default once the increasingly anti-Semitic Romanian nationalists (who obviously could not side with the Ruthenians either) had joined the equally anti-Semitic German nationalists, the only viable option for Ruthenians and Jews was to join forces. Before coalition politics had made anti-Semitic strategies a risky enterprise for Ruthenian politicians, it had been an element of Ruthenian Bukovinian nationalism as well.

Nationalism was an imported commodity in Bukovina (the German variety imported from Vienna, the Romanian one from the Kingdom and Transylvania, the Ruthenian one from or at least through Galicia) and, as has been argued in the German and Romanian cases, the established routes transported blossoming anti-Semitism as well. Attacks against Jewish usurers and innkeepers had found their way into the Ruthenian press in Galicia and these sentiments were only enhanced by the fact that Jewish politicians in Galicia and these sentiments were only enhanced by the fact that Jewish politicians in Galicia often made pacts

---

797 Ibid., p. 68.
with the Poles and thus were seen by the Ruthenian nationalists as siding with the oppressors.799

In Bukovina, the establishments of Young-Ruthenians were generally seen as clearing houses for anti-Semitism. In 1893, Isak Dörfler and a number of his co-villagers in Luzan complained to the crownland administration that in the local Ruthenian reading room inflammatory speeches were held, encouraging the audience to violently rid themselves of their Jewish, Romanian and German neighbours. Dörfler claimed some Jews (mosaische Leute) had already been mistreated by incited peasants.800 In 1897, Bukowinaer Post accused the Young-Ruthenians of introducing racial hatred in Bukovina and of ‘seeking to divide the Ruthenians, to destroy their cohesion with the native Romanians and to incite against the land’s children and inhabitants of other denominations, the Jews’. 801

The Bukovinian Young-Ruthenians denied being anti-Semites, but simultaneously blamed the Jews for ‘having ripped bare almost all Ruthenian villages by means of usury and swindle’ (лихвою і шахрайством). Ruthenians could therefore not be expected to ‘kiss the hands of their robbers and burglars’, who ‘did not want to live among the nationalities than as parasites’. The situation in Galicia ‘where Poles had vainly tried to turn Jews into ‘Polish citizens of the mosaic confession’ (polskich obywateli mojżeszowego wyznania) was said to have led to disappointment and intensified anti-Semitism. Bukovyna accused Bukovinian Jews of bonding with Old-Ruthenians and Romanian nationalists by scaring them with alleged Polish-Ruthenian plans to reincorporate Bukovina into Galicia. At the same time Jews were held responsible for creating divisions within both the Ruthenian and the Romanian camps. Bukovyna threatened that ‘unless the Jews adjusted, anti-Semitism among Ruthenians would spread like fire’.802 This aside, Young-Ruthenians claimed to oppose a unification of Galicia and Bukovina: since they expected the large Jewish share of the Bukovinians to side with the Polish in case of such unification, they did not envisage a significant improvement in the situation of Ruthenian speakers.803

When Young-Ruthenian leader Mykola Vasylko and Jewish nationalist Benno Straucher decided in 1903 to join forces - Vasylko would even refer to Straucher as ‘my personal and political friend’804 - this development naturally met with suspicion in certain Bukovinian Jewish circles. It was less than helpful that the Ruthenian nationalist network of ‘Sich’ (Cicj) associations with its uniforms and anti-Semitic reputation805 had spread from Galicia to
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800 Dörfler, Isak et al., Luzan inhabitants on Ruthenian agitation, 1893/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5992.
802 Буковинські жиди, Буковина, 08.06.1897, pp. 1-2.
805 The anti-Semitic reputation of Bukovinian ‘Sich’ associations seems to have been undeserved at least in some cases. Regarding the opening of a new ‘Sich’ association in Waschkoutz in 1903, Ruthenian sources mention: “At the Ruthenian celebration there also appeared a delegation of the Jewish Zionist Association, whose speaker
Bukovina. *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* grumbled that ‘the Jews had been forced out of their hitherto impartial position into a party which for many years had been practicing unbridled anti-Semitic propaganda on the plains and which of late organised its anti-Jewish rallying points in the ‘Sich’ clubs which had sprung up like mushrooms’. 806 In 1905, it still deemed the decision a ‘wrong track’ (*Irrweg*), claimed that ‘the pact between some individual Jews and the Young-Ruthenian leaders had never been sanctioned by the Jewish people’ 807 and maintained that Young-Ruthenians ‘swallowed anti-Semitism with their mother’s milk’. 808 The Young-Ruthenians of *Bukovyna* had their own reasons to be unhappy with the blossoming friendship. Although they had come to terms with the arrangement as such because they valued a front against the anti-Semitic Romanian-German coalition, they were outraged when in 1908 they met with Jewish resistance against their lobby for a Ruthenian-language Gymnasium in Wiznitz. They fumed about the despicable Jewish solidarity with the German language and culture in spite of rampant German anti-Semitism, wondered if the Jews did not realise they were ‘dependent on the assistance and benevolence of the Ruthenians’ (здани на поміч і ласку Русинів) and asked how, under these circumstances, Ruthenian politicians could possibly explain to their peasant electorate that the Jews were not their enemies. 809

One of the more remarkable results of the decision by Jewish and Young-Ruthenian politicians to join forces was their united representation in *Bukowinaer Post*, the same newspaper which a few years earlier had blamed the Young-Ruthenians for basically everything wrong in Bukovina. This co-dependency soon proved to be uncomfortable and when Straucher established his own Jewish-national organ *Volkswehr* in 1909, Governor Regner-Bleyleben observed that this decision was partly inspired by the wish to gradually free Jewish politics in Bukovina from Ruthenian influences. “The Jewish National Party”, he wrote to Vienna, “was and still is closely tied to the Ruthenian National Party in Bukovina, while the parties share the locally appearing periodical *Bukowinaer Post* as their journalistic institution. As a result, the leaders of the Jewish people even had to adhere to the Ruthenians when their own interests might have dictated a different approach”. 810

---

809 *Ми і Жиди*, Буковина, 05.08.1908, p. 1.
Logically, increasingly politicised anti-Semitism provoked angry reactions from the Jewish side. The dominant Jewish position in the German-language press of Bukovina assured the necessary attention for cases of obvious and less obvious anti-Semitism. The authorities did not always appreciate Jewish criticism in this respect. In 1890, *Bukowinaer Rundschau* fell victim to the censorship authorities when it accused the jury trial system of being prejudiced against Jews.⁸¹¹ forwards substantiated its claim with the case of a peasant who had robbed a Jew and was nonetheless acquitted by his Christian jurors. Ironically, the public prosecution department accused *Bukowinaer Rundschau* of exactly the evil the newspaper had tried to expose: inciting racial hatred between Christians and Jews.⁸¹² Irrespective of the accuracy of the mutual accusations, issues related to anti-Semitism had now officially reached the Bukovinian public sphere.

Jews spoke up at political meetings of others, such as when in 1898 George Popovici campaigned for his Romanian National Party and ‘a Jew from Radautz named Kaswan’ stood up and declared that the Romanian periodical *Deşteptarea* ‘would not leave the Jews alone, and if they did not change their ways, the Jews would no longer stand by the Romanians’.⁸¹³ Romanian anti-Semitism was also countered by the German-language press. When *Gazeta Bucovinei* blamed the Jews for ruining the countryside with their trade practices, *Bukowinaer Nachrichten* fulminated that the authors were apparently unaware of the fact that most Jews lived in the cities, that their trade activities mostly took place among themselves and that whoever wanted to accuse the Jews of getting rich at the expense of others should first of all acknowledge that the overwhelming majority of Bukovinian Jews lived in poverty.⁸¹⁴ In 1901, the Jewish religious community in Czernowitz publicly thanked ‘the liberal press’ in Bukovina and more specifically *Bukowinaer Nachrichten* for opposing the defamatory articles and verbal assaults uttered by ‘some of the locally published non-German language newspapers’ and encouraged the editors to continue in this way.⁸¹⁵ With the establishment of the Bukovinian branch of the Christian-Social Party and its party organ *Bukowinaer Volksblatt*, defamation flourished to such extent that, supported by his Young-Ruthenian allies, Benno Straucher felt obliged to launch an official protest against the visit to Bukovina of Christian-Social Minister Albert Gessman, whom he held accountable for the wave of anti-Semitism which had hit the crownland after Romanian and German nationalists had joined the Christian-Social ranks and their newspapers *Bukowinaer Volksblatt*, *Apărarea Neamului* and
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⁸¹² “Daß in dem beanstandeten Artikel eben der Raßenhaß, den der Verfaßer bekämpfen zu wollen vorschützt, gepredigt, daß durch eine derartige feindliche Gegenüberstellung der christlichen und jüdischen Geschworenenen, aber diese beiden Volksstämmen beziehungsweise Religionsgemeinschaften zu Feindseligkeiten gegen einander aufgefordert und zu verleiten gesucht werden, ist aufliegend”. Staatsanwaltschaft, *Note an das löbliche k.k. Landes-Präsidium*, Zl. 4415, 23 December 1890/ DACHO, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5787.
⁸¹³ “Și un șiud din Rădăuț anume Chasvan a fost la adunare și s’ a deplâns, că gazeta noastră ‘Deșteptarea’ nu li dă jidanilor pace și că cât ‘Deșteptarea’ nu li-a da jidanilor pace, n’or ține ei cu Români”. *Dr. George Popovici în Rădăuț, Deșteptarea*, 6, 15.03.1898, p. 47.
⁸¹⁴ *Also doch!* Bukowinaer Nachrichten, 18.08.1898, pp. 1-2.
⁸¹⁵ *Letter to the editor*, Bukowiner Nachrichten, 3672, 03.01.1901, p. 3.
Voința Poporului acted as Christian-Social mouthpieces. A few months later, appalled by both the content of the publications and the lax attitude of the Habsburg authorities, Straucher addressed another interpellation to the Austrian parliament in which he implicated ‘some Romanian-language newspapers’ but mainly the German-language Volksblatt. Straucher’s initiative was backed by an impressive number of quotations from Volksblatt: Jews had been dubbed ‘snakes, destroyers of nations, crown and altar, enemies of the Imperial House, infidel, dirty, a misfortune for the crownland’. Anti-Semitism and the persecution of Jews were condoned as ‘manifestations of the struggle for existence’. Volksblatt had tried to convince the public that ‘this plague-spot needed to be removed with a sharp cut from the life of the Christian nations’ and that ‘the locusts that ravaged and polluted the land had to be exterminated root and branch’. Russian anti-Semitic policies were presented as a shining example and sterilisation as an adequate way to rid the world of the Jews.

At a meeting attended by four hundred people, Straucher appealed to the Jewish community in Bukovina to remain alert and unified. At the same time he expressed astonishment that the Germans, who were closest to the Jews, now had turned into their worst enemies. Jewish social-democrats in Bukovina also gathered to discuss the Christian-Social threat and declared the gap between exploited workers and exploiting bourgeoisie bigger than the one between different nationalities. Some regarded the tense situation as an opportunity for Jewish politicians like Straucher. Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, not a big fan of Straucher’s, saw yet another downside to anti-Semitic agitation and blamed Wiedmann and his Christian-Social campaign for ‘driving the Jews by force into the Straucher camp from which they had already yearned to escape for many a year’ and wondered ‘why, of all things, anti-Semitism should have been the answer, this hostility towards a category of citizens who through hard work had turned Czernowitz into a city and who themselves were suffering under the terror of its so-called leader’.

---

Popular Anti-Semitism

The fact that political anti-Semitism had obviously been imported to Bukovina does not mean that anti-Semitism as such was a novelty among the population. In 1839, Scottish priests Bonar and McCheney had already noted how Jews told him they were not being treated well by non-Jews.\(^2\) The Czernowitz Casino, founded in the 1840s, had apparently fallen apart swiftly after some of its members objected to membership for Jews.\(^3\) During the tumultuous days of 1848, when cash had become a scarce commodity in Czernowitz, speculators trading in cash money and Jews in particular were the object of popular outrage.\(^4\) At the occasion of Crown Prince Rudolph’s visit to Bukovina in 1887, the usual requests from the population also contained a letter from an under-aged brother and sister from the southern Kimpolung district, who affirmed to be ‘Romanian by nationality’ (de națiune Români) and asked the Crown Prince for financial aid since ‘Jews had robbed them blind and left them poor’.\(^5\) In 1892 a group of emigrating peasants from the Habsburg Monarchy heading for Russia were held by the Russian border guards. Some of them turned out to be from the northern Bukovinian border village of Onut. The reason for their emigration, they declared, was ‘the way they were fleeced by the Jews without being protected by the authorities’.\(^6\) István Fazekas, a descendant of Bukovinian Széklers, recalled how his grandmother told a story in which a Jewish salesman was blamed for bringing cholera to the community (there were cholera epidemics in Bukovina in 1848 and 1866):

"From Czernowitz came a Jewish traveling salesman, selling little things from door to door: needles, threads, colored tape, peacock feathers, beads. He went around the village for three days and in the evenings he returned to shopkeeper Herskowich's stable to sleep. After three days he moved on to Andräșalva or Istensegits. On Sunday however, Léti, the shopkeeper's"

\(^2\) Bonar 1839, pp. 428 and 482.
\(^5\) “(...) că sântem copii sârmani, din cauza că neau jupit Ovrei, și neau lăsat sârmani casa și puțin loc ce avem lângă casă stâ în vindâri și în puțină vremi vor să ne vándă gospodâria și să ne scătă pe drum (...).” Erhan, Veniamin and Paraschiva, Letter to Crown Prince Rudolph (via Governor of Bukovina), Sadova 1887/ DACOh, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5059.
\(^6\) “Unter diesen Auswanderern sollen sich auch einige kaiserliche Familien aus der Gemeinde Onut in der Bucowina befinden (...). Die Auswanderer selbst führen als Ursache ihrer Auswanderung die Übervortheilung, die sie in Oesterreich seitens der Juden, ohne von den Behörden beschützt worden zu sein, an”. Tarangul, Bezirkshauptmann, Report on emigration to Russia, Nowosielitza, 11 October 1892/ DACOh, Viddil 1, Fond 3, Opis 1, spr. 5986.
only daughter, fell ill. (...) A few days later, the girl died. (...) Some days after the departure of the Jewish traveling salesman, he was found dead near the neighbouring village of Fratautz. The people took him for the importer of the infection and established that he was Satan’s emissary, for his face looked devilish too.827

Tales of superstition made it well into the 1900s. The ‘blood tale’ (Blutmärchen), which claimed that religious Jews needed Christian blood to prepare their Passover matzos was found throughout Europe and at times it had ignited pogroms. It surfaced in Czernowitz in 1905, when a maidservant maintained that she had seen how a Christian boy’s blood had been pressed from his finger in a matzos bakery under the supervision of a rabbi. The police was called to trace the originator of the rumour.828 At the local soupkitchen however, the poor did not seem to mind sharing table and food with Jews, Bukowinaer Post observed in the heydays of Christian-Social agitation. Even more, the Post bitterly added, the overwhelming majority of donations necessary to keep the soupkitchen in business originated from Jewish charity.829

Anti-Semitism was not confined to the lesser educated. Lite Olszewska, wife of the painter Karl Olszewski, wrote to her brother-in-law how her husband in his student days had made a portrait of university professor Adler. Later, a conflict arose on whether the artist’s work had been paid for or not. In her personal letter, Olszewska claimed that ‘the baptised Jew’ had refused to buy the painting since it had come out too well and clearly revealed the ethnicity of portrait’s subject. As the conflict dragged on and more people were involved, the anti-Semitic argumentation brought forward by Olszewska faded into the background.830

Shortly before Easter 1907, panic struck in the mountain area around Putilla, which was mainly inhabited by Hutsuls and Jews. Rumours claiming that ‘peasants would slaughter the Jews at Easter’ caused a number of Jewish families to flee from their homes. Although the authorities believed most of the uproar was only caused by hearsay, they promised representatives of the Bukovinian Jewish community to send extra troops to the region. Four fearmongers were arrested.831 The news also reached the Viennese Press.832 Ruthenian leader Mykola Vasyylko urged Hutsul peasants to refrain from violence, but simultaneously blamed police officers for spreading the rumours in order to vilify the Ruthenian ‘Sich’

827 Fazekas 2005, p. 48. This tale is consistent with the distinction made by Polish cultural anthropologist Ludwik Stomma between orbis interior and orbis exterior in peasants’ world views, according to which Jews were seen as mediators between these two spheres and also as representatives of the devil. (Stomma, Ludwik, Antropologia kultury wsi polskiej XIX w., Pax, Warsaw 1986, as quoted in relation to the Galician peasantry by Struve, Kai, Gentry, Jews, and Peasants - Jews as Others in the Formation of the Modern Polish Nation in Rural Galicia during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century, in: Wingfield, Nancy M. (ed), Creating the Other: Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe, Berghahn Books, New York 2003, 103-126, p. 106.
828 Vor Ostern, Czernowitzter Allgemeine Zeitung, 25.03.1905, p. 4.
829 Was auch eint, Bukowinaer Post, 20.08.1908, p. 1.
830 “Das Bild wurde gut, nur zu gut, und der Typ des Herrn Professor Adler (als getaufter Jude) war famos getroffen. Das war aber gerade der Fehler, die zu grosse Aufrichtigkeit”. Olszewska, Lite, Brief der Frau Lite des akademischen Malers Karl (Lolo) Olszewski an dessen Bruder Finanz-Offizial in Czernowitz Otto Olszewski, 20 March 1913/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernmântul Bucovinei’, MC LXXXVIII/11.
831 Die befürchteten Bauernunruhen im ruthenischen Gebirge, Bukowiner Volks-Zeitung, 05.05.1907, p. 3.
832 Besorgnisse wegen drohender Exzesse, Neue Freie Presse, 30.04.1907, p. 5.
associations. Governor Bleyleben concluded after a number of investigations that the Jewish community had responded ‘with the usual anxiety’ to empty threats by a handful of farmers and should be reassured, while on the other hand, they should be told not to ‘provoke’. Clearly visible police presence and Sunday rest for inns should do the rest. A delegation of 120 peasants led by a priest thereafter visited the district captain to reassure him that nothing would happen. Matters then quietened down, but anti-Semitic sentiments remained. When farmer Malayko used a Ruthenian gathering in Waschkoutz in 1908 to address the ‘corrupting ado of the Jewish element of the population’, the audience ‘expressed their consent by stormy heckling directed against the Jews’. In December 1912, Governor Meran reported to Vienna that ‘alleged anti-Semitic and contemptuous remarks by two Orthodox theologians’ at the funeral of the popular Czernowitz rabbi Benjamin Weiss caused such commotion among the 10,000 attendees that security guards had to interfere in order to protect the two from the angry crowd.

In 1913, Governor Meran sent an analysis to his superiors in Vienna in which he linked the persistent popular anti-Semitism in northern Bukovina to the general economic malaise and the pro-Russian agitation in Bukovina. According to Meran, peasants found the large percentage of Jews in the local administration and the lower military personnel ‘unpleasant’. These complaints were uttered more often: a few years earlier, clerical Viitoriul had portrayed court cases with peasants as passive objects waiting for the verdict in court rooms dominated by Jewish judges, clerks and lawyers. In the Wiznitz district, several times ‘vigorous interventions’ had been required against individuals who had incited against Jews. A farmer and a lower cleric were sentenced to three months in prison for anti-Austrian remarks since they had claimed that ‘under Russian rule, the Jews would soon be chased away’. A priest
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833 Die jüdisfeindliche Bewegung im ruthenischen Gebirge, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 05.05.1907, p. 5.
837 Corespondente, Viitoriul, 22, 15.11.1908, p. 169.
named Vasili Welehorski was arrested in an inn in Kotzman in January 1913 for ranting against the Empire and the Jews. Welehorski repeated in court that he regarded the Austrian government ‘a Jewish affair (eine jüdische Wirtschaft)’ which would swiftly end once the Russians had marched in’ and that he considered the government influenced by the Jewish press. In the end the man only received a mild sentence for public intoxication. In the matter of Welehorski’s anti-Semitism, Governor Meran informed the Orthodox Consistory of the accused’s statements, emphasising ‘that these may lead on the one hand to strongly questioning his loyalty as an Austrian citizen, but on the other hand, through its provocative content, to a justified charge of intolerance towards people of another religion and especially against the Jewish nationality’. Meran declared Welehorski’s behaviour ‘degrading to the whole priesthood’ and, without specifically giving orders, the governor made clear that he expected the Consistory to act in the matter and to report back to him afterwards.839

Nationalist, irredentist phantasies about the ‘brother nation’ moving in to remove the Jews were not limited to pro-Russian Bukovinians from the northern section of the crownland. Once the war had started, prisoner of war Artemie Bran wrote to his brother Mihaiu in southern Bukovinian Uidestie, wishing for ‘God [to] help our Romanian brothers, that they free us from the Hungarian and Jewish yoke’.840 Still, the number of recorded incidents of popular anti-Semitic unrest was higher in the northern, predominantly Ruthenian-speaking areas of Bukovina. This might have had a demographic reason: in the northern area there were a large number of villages with a population of Jews and Ruthenian speakers (mostly Hutsuls). In the south, communities of almost exclusively Jews and Romanian speakers were as good as unknown.841 Tensions of a specific anti-Semitic nature on the local level were therefore less likely to occur in the southern part of Bukovina. In 1898, Bukovyna assessed würden”. Meran, Rudolph an k.k. Minister des Innern, Russophile Bewegung - Stand im 1. Quartal 1913, Zl. 380/7 Präs., Czernowitz, 22 April 1913/ ANR, Fond ‘Guvernământul Bucovinei’, MCİ I/7, p. 166v.


that of a total number of 82,717 Bukovinian Jews, 63,894, dwelled in ‘purely Ruthenian or in mixed districts’ and only 18,823 in ‘purely Romanian districts’. The north-south divergence may also be explained by the Ruthenian-Jewish cooperation on a political level and the subsequent absence of anti-Semitism in the Bukovinian Ruthenian press: since anti-Jewish frustrations were no longer ‘channeled’ by the nationalist movement, they surfaced on the village level.

It was not always possible to identify anti-Semitic instigators, since intimidation also came in the shape of anonymous pamphlets. In January 1882, two identical leaflets were left at ‘The Golden Lamb’ restaurant and in front of the Roman-Catholic church in Czernowitz, summoning Christians to annihilate the Jews and predicting that ‘the hardworking peasant would not be rewarded for his diligence before the last Jew had gone up in smoke and flames’. The notes announced a campaign on 10 February and claimed similar notes had been distributed to all parishes in the suburbs of Czernowitz. Police investigations in other towns only resulted in confirmative responses from Rosch and Sereth however, while in Suczawa, Storozynezet, Wiznitz and Kimpolung no such threats had appeared. In 1908, Czernowitz Tagblatt reported a similar incident from the German colonist town of Jakobeny where leaflets were spread among Jewish residents, prompting them to leave the town within fourteen days ‘in order to avoid bloodshed’. The newspaper received originals of the pamphlet from many anxious readers, but concluded that it was either a ‘knavery’ (Bubenstreich) or ‘the product of a sick mind’ (der Ausfluß eines krankhaft überspannten Gehirns). Nevertheless, it underlined the risk of such incitement amidst ‘narrow-minded and uneducated villagers’ and blamed both the hateful language of the Christian-Social press and the passive attitude of the local authorities.

Some time before, Jewish deputy Benno Straucher had called Governor Regner-Bleyleben’s

---

842 Русина, Німці і Волоха – І, Буковина, 14.01.1898, p. 2.
attention to similar agitation in the Kimpolung district. Indeed, in the villages of Stulpikany, Dorothea-Plotonitza and Negrilassa brochures had surfaced but, again, since these had failed to excite the Jews as well as their envisaged assailants, charges had only been filed for ‘unauthorised book-peddling’ (unbefugte Kolportage). Still, the governor hastened to add that he would remain alert to ‘the more and more radical forms of anti-Semitic disturbances’ in the crownland and that he would take action whenever necessary. Still, the ‘passive attitude’ regarding anti-Semitic threats for which Czernowitzer Tagblatt had criticised the local authorities in the case of the Jakobeny pamphlets was indeed government policy: as long as Jews did not feel too seriously threatened and peasants did not really respond to (anonymous) instigators, incidents were largely ignored.

The end of the war brought no end to anti-Semitic incidents. When Austria-Hungary recognised the sovereignty of the Ukrainian People’s Republic in February 1918, festivities were organised in Wiznitz. It came to a confrontation between the housekeeper of Baroness Wassilko and a number of peasant women who shouted at the man that at these celebrations they would not be commanded by a Jew. In June 1918, Governor Ezdorf reported ‘a strong current’ among peasants against Jews because the latter did not work the fields. When food was distributed among those in need in northern Bukovinian Kadobestie, the mayor had also handed out corn to a Jewish repatriate. A bystander then snatched it away and encouraged the crowd to rally against the Jews. Similar resentful sentiments are reflected in the posthumously published memoires of Ion Nandriş from the village of Mahala close to Czernowitz:

It is maybe not uninteresting to recall that the hatred and enmity of the villagers toward strangers, sometimes accompanied by violence, was quickly felt. The intruders (venetici) who had seized fields and farms in a dishonest way realised it was healthier to sell their loot to the

---

846 “(…) dass ich der hierlands auftretenden, allerdings immer radikalere Formen annehmenden antisemitischen Agitation nach wie vor volle Aufmerksamkeit zuwende und in jedem einzelnen zu meiner Kenntnis gelangenden Falle einer angeblich ungesetzlichen Betätigung dieser Agitation ungesäumt Erhebungen einleite und die nach dem Ergebnisse derselben geeignet scheinenden Verfügungen treffe”. Ibid.


villagers and go than to face the risk of defying an entire village. At the end of the First World War only one Jewish family remained in the village.849

849 Nandriș, Ion, Satul nostru Mahala din Bucovina, Tribuna, Sibiu 2001, pp. 177-78.