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Once Bukovina was firmly established as an independent crownland, matters of presentation and representation quickly came to the fore: Highlights of Habsburg history obviously needed to be celebrated, or at least commemorated, but it soon became clear that history was a tricky subject in the era of nationalism. On top of that, there was a growing tendency of regional identification which had to be taken into account. A number of those occasions serve here to illustrate how these elements at times competed with each other or complemented each other, with a focus on how Bukovinians actively strove to distribute their auto-image. As Joep Leerssen concludes in relation to national historiography: “The notion that myths and history merely underpin and rationalise a given national identity is a simplification. The rivalry and mutual counterpositioning of different national groups begins in, and relies upon, reconfigurations and divisions, retrievals and appropriations, of the past”.

The centenary of hundred years of Habsburg Bukovina was a first test for Czernowitz in dealing with this sensitive subject matter. Whereas regional identification was not so much debated here, but rather Habsburg cultural superiority vs. Romanian nationalism or Austrian centralism vs. Romanian irredentism, the way in which the issues eventually escalated into the ‘Arboroasa’ treason trial provided a valuable lesson. The early 1900s offered ample opportunity to address celebration and representation questions: in 1901, there was the 200th anniversary of 41st Infantry Regiment (the ‘Bukovinian’ regiment) in Czernowitz, in 1904 the 400th anniversary in the Bukovinian village of Putna of the death of Stephen the Great, in 1906 Bukovina participated in the Bucharest Jubilee Exhibition in the Romanian capital, and in 1908 in the Emperor’s Jubilee Parade in Vienna. These events and the way Bukovinians debated their participation in them will be discussed in the following section.

6.1 Inverted Images of a Historical Event: Hundred years of Habsburg Bukovina

In Bukovina, the first occasion for a large-scale official celebration was the centennial of one hundred years of incorporation into the Habsburg Monarchy, with the establishment of the university as its undisputed highlight. That is, to those who regarded the centenary as a reason for celebration at all. Opposing the public fundraising, the adulatory books by Hermann Bidermann, Adolf Ficker and Andreas Mikulicz and the festivities surrounding the new

---


773 See paragraph 3: The Empire, the Nation and the Region: Competing Identifications in Bukovina/3.3: Cracks in the Layer of Loyalty.

university were Romanian nationalists who equalled Austria’s acquisition of the territory to
theft. In turn, they did not escape severe criticism by Karl Emil Franzos, who asserted:

But who today, in the year of salvation 1875, earnestly aims for German culture to be
eradicated in Bukovina, for the land to be ceded to Romania is not a traitor who deserves
punishment, but a poor fool because this little land is like an oasis in the desert of Eastern
barbarism.775

In Franzos’ view, the inhabitants of Bukovina had been ‘liberated’ from a Turkish-Moldavian
yoke back in 1775. To counter this claim, Romanian nationalists revamped the figure of
Grigore Ghica III, the Moldavian prince who had ruled the territory for the Ottomans until the
Habsburgs took over. Ghica, who had actively opposed the transaction, had eventually
annoyed the Porte to such extend that he was unceremoniously beheaded. His Phanariot
family was probably from the area of today’s Albania. Phanariots, named after the
Constantinople area of Panar, were Greek-speaking administrators who were deployed to
rule on behalf of the Porte in the Danubian principalities. Rulers like Ghica had to assure that
the Ottomans duly received tax profits from their domains.776 In view of this background,
Ghica seemed a less than likely role model for Romanian nationalists who admittedly did
little to deny their hero’s uncomfortable background.777 Still, his symbolic value as an
opponent of the Austrian ‘occupation’ was hard to resist. In the Romanian city of Iaşi, the
festive opening of the Franz Joseph University in Czernowitz was countered with the
unveiling of a Ghica bust by mayor Nicolae Gane, who described Ghica as ‘a man who loved
the country and in return was loved by it, and whose single vice had been his wish to defend
his ancestral soil’.778 Prominent poet and nationalist Mihai Eminescu depicted Ghica as a
modern ruler who explained the benefits of taxes to the people and who turned corrupt
officials into genuine servants of the state, a modest man who in the few years of his reign had
managed to bring peace and prosperity to Moldavia. Anachronistically, Eminescu assessed
how Ghica ‘had worked for the integrity of his fatherland until the last moment of his life’.779

Thus, whereas the Austrian centennial celebrations were meant to stress the transition from
medieval Ottoman rule to modern Austrian administration, Romanian nationalists did their
best to invoke an inverted image by representing Ghica as the enlightened regent overthrown
by a conspiracy between Ottoman and Austrian oppressors. The portrayal of a national leader
fighting for the integrity of his country clearly suited the irredentist nationalist celebration of
the late 1800s better than the eighteenth century administrator it was meant to honour.

It was not so much the imaginative interpretation of history and the role Grigore Ghica III
played in it which worried the Austrian authorities, but rather the implication that Bukovina
should not be Austrian but Romanian instead. Though opinion makers such as Franzos
asserted that ‘only a few dozen set the secular celebrations against the commemoration of
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some dark Dacian man of honour’. 780 Suzcawa school teacher Wilhelm Schmidt abhorred ‘the unprincipled selfish chauvinism of neighbouring Romania, intoxicated by megalomania’. He accused the country of ‘fantasising about some inexcusable theft committed against Moldavia with newspaper pages framed in black during a general day of prayer and repentance while the loyal population of Bukovina organised a grand centennial celebration at the occasion of the Austrian occupation of the land’. 781 Shortly after the centennial celebrations, the Ghica commemorations led to the ‘Arboroasa’ case, which made Romanian nationalists suspect of treason and irredentism for years to come.

In circles of Bukovinian Romanian nationalists, the polarisation between the Austrian centennial and the Romanian Ghica commemoration caused unease. By 1899, folklorist and academic Ion Sbiera recalled how Bukovinian Romanian nationalists had been ready to join in the Austrian celebrations if some room had been created in it for a ‘Romanian element’. Now, they had felt isolated by those wanting only to proclaim German cultural superiority without understanding how one could be a loyal supporter of the Monarchy and a national patriot at the same time. 782

In Romanian historiography since ‘Iaşi 1875’, the debate continued to focus on the question of the legitimacy of the Habsburg takeover in 1775, on exactly how independent the Moldavian principalities had been from their Ottoman rulers 783 and on the perceived injustice done to Ghica in the process. In 1907, Bukovinian-Romanian historian Dimitre Onciul repeated the claim that Ghica had been fighting ‘a violation of the country’s integrity’, 784 and this still resounded in 2000. 785 Ghica was seen as ‘Bukovina’s last legitimate regent’ 786 who was not even consulted by the Ottomans concerning the upcoming land transfer. 787 Historians from the German cultural realm continued to underline Ghica’s ‘non-Romanian’ roots and the harshness of his rule, maintaining that ‘precisely Ghica had been the Phanariot who had loaded large farmers and small peasants alike with high taxes in favour of the landowners’ and that ‘therefore it had been primarily the farmers, who after the occupation had unambiguously opted for incorporation of Bukovina into Austria’. 788 No matter how diametrically opposed their views, neither the Romanian nor the German sources have withstood the temptation of applying terms of governance and democracy to a time and place where they do not belong: the Romanian nationalist version speaks of ‘political independence’ and decision-making powers on the part of the Ottoman vassal Ghica who
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apparently fought ‘for the integrity of his state’ - its German counterpart suggests that the opinions of Bukovinian peasants actually played a role in the territorial takeover of what was to become Bukovina.

6.2 The 200th Anniversary of the 41st Infantry Regiment in 1901

The 41st Infantry Regiment of the Austrian Imperial Army, known as ‘the Bukovinian Regiment’ was significantly older than the crownland itself: it was established in 1701 and as such one of the oldest regiments in the Monarchy, but from the year 1863 its ranks were filled exclusively by Bukovinian recruits. By 1905, 11,000 men served on active duty while 17,000 were registered as members. After having had lower noblemen as commanders,789 the appointment of Archduke Eugen and the subsequent renaming of the Regiment to ‘Bukovinian Infantry Regiment Archduke Eugen No. 41’ were seen as a sign of appreciation for the Regiment, but also for Bukovina as a whole.790 The Emperor himself was said to have publicly praised the Regiment when he visited Bukovina in 1880, calling it ‘the most brilliant one in Bosnia’791 and ‘a regiment the city could be proud of’.792

Between 1855 and 1882, the Regiment had been stationed outside of Bukovina. When it returned to the city, large numbers of citizens attended the welcoming ceremony at the Czernowitz railway station. Mayor Klimesch commented how ‘after twenty-seven years of absence, the native Regiment returned to the regional capital’ and how ‘like a mother lovingly pressed the long-lost child to her chest, Bukovinians opened their arms to warmly welcome their sons’. Newspapers mentioned ‘tumultuous enthusiasm’ (eine stürmische Begeisterung) and the mayor’s analogy was reportedly brought to life quite literally when, upon seeing the arrival of the troops in the streets, a peasant wedding party forgot all about the wedding and started to hug and kiss the surprised soldiers.793

Nationalist Bukovinian periodicals devoted equally warm words to the Regiment, emphasising the all-Bukovinian makeup of its troops and the love for the native Regiment.794 When Galician Ruthenian nationalist and Sych pioneer Kyrylo Trylovsky had allowed himself derogatory comments regarding the 41st Regiment, a veteran of the Regiment angrily responded in a public letter defending what he called a ‘Romanian-Ruthenian regiment’ and
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adding that by attacking the virtue of the Regiment, Trylovsky had attacked his fellow Ruthenians as well.\textsuperscript{795}

The 200 year anniversary of the Regiment on 25 April 1901 was reason for extensive, patriotic celebrations in Czernowitz. The presence of the commander of the Regiment himself, Archduke Eugen, added to the excitement. The entire Bukovinian high society welcomed him at the railway station: the Orthodox Metropolitan, the mayor of Czernowitz, the members of the regional diet, lots of civil servants plus a large number of other invited guests.\textsuperscript{796} The specific nature of multilingual Bukovina asked for creative solutions in order to make the event a success. Practicality prevailed:

\begin{quote}
The nature of such an anniversary celebration calls for the most outstanding military feats of the Regiment and its heroes to be presented to the troops. Such a representation must be made with oratorical verve in the mother tongues of the men, clearly audible to each and every one of them and free from disturbing influences, which is completely unfeasible in front of such a large number of troops with its multitude of languages. It seemed most appropriate to transfer that presentation to the houses of worship and entrust to the clergy to devote a homily to the glorious deeds of the Regiment after a solemn mass.\textsuperscript{797}
\end{quote}

As such, services in the Roman-Catholic and protestant churches as well as in the synagogue were held in German, in the Uniate church in Ruthenian and in the Orthodox Cathedral in both Romanian and Ruthenian.\textsuperscript{798} The consecration of the flag was treated in the same way: although regulations demanded that the new flag be consecrated according to the Catholic rite, the Emperor had allowed for once for it to be blessed the Orthodox way as well since most of the troops were Orthodox.\textsuperscript{799} In spite of the elaborate preparations and the mentioned exception to the Austrian regulations, the local press adopted a rather deadpan attitude towards the pomp. It was reported how ‘the festivities on Thursday had started with the usual festive services which had been attended very well since there was never a lack of gawkers eager to see who showed up’.\textsuperscript{800} The authorities had clearly meant the Regiment’s anniversary to be a demonstration of popular adherence to Austria and the dynasty and had therefore sought active public participation:

\begin{quote}
There was (...) no doubt that the Regiment will find the whole land at its side for this meaningful and rare celebration, all the more so as the much hoped-for presence of Archduke Eugen offered Bukovina the opportunity to express its dynastic sentiments and simultaneously its sympathies towards the native Regiment. Under such felicitous auspices one could be sure of the most heartfelt interest of the entire land; yet this obliged the Regiment to organise its
\end{quote}
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celebrations in a way that would also enable the population at large to participate in one way or another.”

Apart from the consecration of the flag, which was deemed ‘particularly suited to promote the patriotic and military sense of the population’, the celebrations aimed at enthusing mainly Bukovinian schoolchildren: the officers of the 41st Regiment offered to donate portraits of the Emperor to Bukovinian schools at the occasion of the anniversary, and Bukowinaer Post expressed its surprise when after dinner, the Archduke went to greet the gathered schoolchildren of Czernowitz rather than the lined-up Regiment. “It will be hard to find any correlation between the Regiment’s celebration and schoolchildren, apart from the fact that both have eager beavers wanting to stand out at all costs”, Post snubbed, and then went on to decry how the scantily-dressed children had to wait outside for hours and how even the poorest of them had to pay for black-yellow sashes out of their own pockets.

Naturally, the official part of the festivities was marked by the inevitable speeches about Bukovina’s multi-ethnic harmony and devotion to the Emperor. Governor Bourguignon maintained in his address to the Archduke that ‘the population of Bukovina saw the Army as the embodiment of the unitary state concept and honoured it as the guardian not only of their material, but also of their highest and most important spiritual capital’. Then it was the turn of the troops of the 41st Regiment to show their best:

National songs and dances alternated with each other. Swabians, Romanians, Ruthenians, Poles, Hungarians, Jews, Gypsies and Lippovans, all in their distinctive costumes, vied with each other to demonstrate their national peculiarities to their best abilities and joy and had the pleasure to excite His Imperial Highness’s approval and interest. A downright life-threatening throng developed around the groups where His Imperial Highness lingered a bit, just because everyone wanted to be near to His Imperial Highness - a wish which should be granted to everyone.

Unfortunately, the stories which surfaced in the local press once the celebrations were over gave a different impression of the univocal sense of well-being the official sources had so ardently tried to disseminate. Bukowinaer Rundschau depicted scenes which obviously clashed with the harmonious image of joint civilian and military merriment:

One expected entertaining national dances, fun and games - and saw or even received rifle butt blows instead! Things got so wild that around five o’clock, the crowd panicked as a result of the attack by the ‘order-creating’ troops and while they ran from the rifle butts, they fell and all ended up on one big heap. Only when the loud wails of women attracted an officer, the persecution of ‘civilians’(!), as the military contemptuously put it, was abandoned. There were repeated scenes between military and plain clothes attendees, and - it must be said - many people were sorry to have come to Austria Square only to be hit with rifle butts. When His Imperial Highness appeared on the square and left his vehicle, the audience respectfully created space by forming rows. This seemed not enough for the soldiers, for zealously they
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punched right and left in the masses with their fists and elbows. One of them captured a peddler’s soda water trolley, dashing its lurching owner to the side and rolling it with such force into the middle of the dense crowd that it was a miracle that no disaster occurred. A sergeant gave a soldier who had come too close to him such a slap in the face that blood spouted from the poor guy’s mouth and nose. One officer slapped a corporal because he had not pushed back the audience ‘energetically’ enough. These and many more turbulent scenes which we will not describe here because it would go too far, contribute to a less than rosy picture of the troops’ festivities, even if their intentions may have been the best.805

A tangible irritation caused by the insistent government propaganda stressing the harmony between the military and civilians had preceded the reported disappointing turn of events and, Bukowinaer Post commented, ‘had bordered on servility’. Moreover, Post argued, with all the rigmarole of the role of Bukovina’s native sons in the army some more attention might have been given to the dire position of its native sons in the local civil service, who were still being ignored in favour of candidates from outside the crownland.806 Another critic of the festivities also chose a broader perspective: Radazt lawyer Ferdinand Chomed argued that the entire affair was superficial, that the Bukovinian bourgeoisie was ‘Byzantine’ and its patriotism ‘obsequious’ (Hurrah-Patriotismus), focused only on the figure of the Emperor. On top of this, Chomed took the opportunity to decry what he saw as appalling living conditions in the Imperial Army, with physical abuse sometimes resulting in death and related suicide cases. According to figures presented in parliament, the suicide rate in the Austrian army easily topped those of other European armies. It would have been a true act of patriotism, Chomed maintained, if the all the money spent on decorating Czernowitz for the anniversary had been allocated to a fund for ‘the victims of militarism’.807 The reference to army suicides must have struck a sensitive chord with the Austrian authorities, for the phenomenon had not been unheard of in the 41st Regiment, either: in 1890, Bukowinaer Nachrichten had been confiscated because it had reported on the numerous cases of suicide among the 41st - more precisely because it had connected these cases to the way the men were treated by their superiors and as such there was ‘little doubt that such slander and revelations of facts could lead to hatred and contempt for the regimental superiors in question’.808 However, only one year later Bukowinaer Rundschau devoted its editorial to the fact that, again, within only six days no less than three soldiers from the 41st Regiment had taken their own lives. The newspaper held the military leadership responsible, because Bukovinian peasants, and therefore Bukovinian recruits, were simply not the type:

For our peasants can endure and tolerate a lot, they are passive by nature and the respect for the educated classes in general and for their superiors in particular is deeply rooted.
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circumstances must already be most extraordinary in order to bring these children of nature - who have hardly ever heard about suicides - to such a step, prohibited to them by the religion they deeply honour and deem sacred.\textsuperscript{809}

Next to the anniversary festivities, the Regiment’s officers claimed a more permanent memorial ‘to redound to permanent embellishment of the regional capital, to promote the patriotic military sense of the people and to deepen and maintain in all circles of this land the feelings of reverent gratitude to the brave men who in loyal devotion to duty died heroically for Emperor and Fatherland’. A committee was established to plan and design a monument and to ensure the necessary fundraising. The regional diet readily contributed 10,000 crowns, the Orthodox consistory 5000, the city of Czernowitz 3000 plus the necessary construction site, the Bukovinian Savings Bank 5000 and an additional 14,000 crowns were gathered by the joint communities of Bukovina. As the collectors proudly added, ‘all communities without exception had been involved, even those which for years had ceased to be part of the territorial recruiting district of the Regiment’.\textsuperscript{810}

The jubilant tone of the Regiment’s chronicler Karl Dvořák, who claimed that ‘the success of the appeal had justified all expectations brilliantly’, carefully hid the fact that raising the necessary means had actually been quite a headache: for instance, the contribution by the consistory came from Church Fund resources. As such it was merely a subsidy granted by the Austrian Ministry of Culture and Education and not ‘yet another example of the excellent way the Orthodox Church Fund performed at all patriotic occasions’.\textsuperscript{811} A note from the ministry to the governor in Bukovina shows that the governor had actively requested Vienna to allocate Church Fund means for the monument. Although Vienna was willing to grant the request, from the figures the Governor had presented regarding the funds raised so far it had become painfully clear that, even when Church Fund means were applied, there was still a considerable gap to be filled. As a result, the unveiling ceremony of the monument would be taking place well after the official anniversary festivities. This also gave the ministry in Vienna the time to allocate extra means to the 1902 Church Fund budget, which in turn would ensure the completion of the project.\textsuperscript{812}
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The object itself required little participation from Bukovina proper: the seven-meter high granite obelisk was designed by Viennese sculptor R. Marschall, while the bronze was cast by the equally Viennese Beschorner firm.813 Cunningly, the monument committee had specifically requested granite from Archduke Franz Ferdinand’s stone quarry in Bohemia. The official reason was the outstanding quality of the material, but of course, with regard to the specific purpose of the order, the Archduke was asked to provide a discount - which he did.814 In German, Romanian and Ruthenian, the text on the pedestal read: ‘From the grateful Bukovina for the members of the 41st Archduke Eugen Regiment who fell on the field of honour’.815

On 2 December 1902, the monument was finally ready to be revealed. Again, like a year earlier, the festivities were not free of blemishes. Whereas the officialdom as well as the public at large gathered once more in their respective houses of worship and on the site itself, the management of the city theatre had decided to attract the local bourgeoisie ‘regardless of their social standing, nation or religion’ with a soiree ‘fully suited to sustainably satisfy their patriotic spirit’ (vollauf geeignet den patriotischen Sinn nachhaltig zu befriedigen). However, apart from the governor, the chief magistrate and the officers of the 41st Regiment hardly any of its representatives showed up:

As such, the officers were absent, as well as the higher civil service (...), the official representatives and all those men from public life who always act as if they alone have a unique claim on patriotism. Also missing were those elements who think they need to prove their patriotism by supporting blindly and on command each and every government action, whether these are elections or appointments of honorary citizens; that certain ‘tout Czernowitz’ was lacking, those who want to be everywhere where it matters to be seen. And summing up all absentees, the shameful and distressing result is: the Austrian spirit was missing!

Bukowinaer Post blamed the toxic influence of nationalist politics in Bukovina for this mood swing. Just like Ferdinand Chomed had done before, the editor criticised the superficiality of Bukovinian patriotism and the servilism of local politicians. “They raise hurray-bawlers, not patriots,” Post concluded.816
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The battles of the World War brought the 41st Regiment back in the Bukovinian spotlights once more. Their contribution to the Austrian successes against the Italian army in the infamous battles of the Isonzo was widely praised. In 1917, Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung published a poem of praise by Grete Sölch which read:

_On the tenth day of the Isonzo battle/ As they furiously grappled with the enemy/ As they accomplished the impossible - not even then the flag slipped from the brave hand / The flag which now everybody knows/ From the 41st Regiment Archduke Eugen._

In November 1917, the 41st Regiment was sent back to Bukovinian soil. Emperor Karl, inspecting the Austrian troops at the Bukovinian front near Storozynetz in December of that same year, declared that it had been ‘only thanks to the brave endurance of the division and especially to that the 41st that the twelfth battle of the Isonzo had been possible at all’ and that he had sent the Regiment to its home region as a token of gratitude. For the greater part of the war and during all three times Bukovina had been besieged by Russian troops, the 41st Regiment had been deployed elsewhere, leading to frustrations with its troops. Homesickness and the desire to defend their native region had plagued many a soldier. Once the Regiment had returned, expected defense tasks proved to be obsolete and time was spent on the necessary reconstruction activities.818

6.3 The 400th Anniversary of the Death of Stephen the Great in 1904

Southern Bukovina, with its rich monastic history dating back to the days of the Moldavian princes, has played a central role since the early days of Romanian nationalism. In this respect, Putna is its pre-eminent lieu de mémoire. The small village is home to the monastery with the tomb of Stephen the Great (Ștefan cel Mare) and thus symbolises both worldly and saintly power. Stephen III (1433-1504) ruled over Moldavia for no less than forty-seven years and during this period, he fought to maintain the territory’s independence against Hungary and Poland (but in fact was a vassal of the King of Poland).819 Most importantly, he succeeded in keeping the Ottomans at bay - at least temporarily - and was honoured for this by Pope Sixtus IV.820 With the emergence of Romanian nationalism in the nineteenth century,
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Stephen the Great swiftly became a leading national symbol and the personification of the collective identification with the Romanian nation. Once the Romanian state had been established, an official Stephen cult developed with processions, commemorations and masses.\textsuperscript{821}

Habsburg authorities were well aware of the sensitivities connected with having such a prominent place of pilgrimage for Romanian nationalists within the confines of the Austrian border. In the mid-1850s, the authorities had already initiated a program of restoration and new building works at Putna which saw the precincts enlarged, the walls rebuilt and extended and the monastic buildings augmented, although at the cost of Stephen’s residence, which was demolished. This, and especially the fact that Stephen’s grave had been opened during the works, was seen as desecration by Orthodox believers. Austrian architect Karl Romstorfer, appointed by the Central Commission for Arts and Historic Monuments in Austria-Hungary, subsequently carried out extensive renovation work on the church and monastic buildings in 1902.\textsuperscript{822}

When in August 1869 two Bukovinian students called for a festive commemoration to honour the monastery’s foundation 400 years earlier, the war between France and Germany soon demanded all attention. The manifestation was thus postponed until August 1871, but matters were complicated by the change of government in Vienna: the conservative-autonomist Potocki government had been replaced by the liberal-centralists of Hohenwart, who had considerably less patience and consideration with nationalist initiatives.\textsuperscript{823} The organisers this time were students Mihai Eminescu and Ioan Slavici, who would become a leading nationalist and anti-Semite as well. They planned to combine the Putna commemoration with a meeting of Romanian youth to establish a strategy for the future and to this end, they called upon students from Romania, Transylvania, Bukovina and Banat to attend.\textsuperscript{824} In a solemn appeal they declared:

\begin{center}
\textit{The celebration of Putna will bring together the Romanian nation in commemoration of the past, in the high spirits of the present and in hope for the future. (…) There, where the almighty shadow of Stephen the Great appears, we want to gather at his grave in his memory, to join hands and let the whole world know that we had a past and we will have a future, too.}\textsuperscript{825}
\end{center}
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Indeed thousands participated, but the Bukovinian aristocrats decided not to put their cordial relations with Vienna to the test and stayed away. Romanian nationalists from Bukovina had the unpleasant task of explaining this situation to their high-ranking visitors from abroad, as Bukovinian folklorist Ion Sbiera recalled when he was confronted with the outrage of political heavyweight Mihail Kogălniceanu from Romania:

*Only after I told him the reason for their absence, and after I had asked him with tears in my eyes to save them from his biting criticism - for they are so bitter in their soul because of the unsuccessful political battles they put up on a daily basis - he calmed down and promised me to remain silent.*

The celebrations surrounding the 400th anniversary of Stephen the Great’s demise in 1904 did not have a character remarkably different from their predecessors with its meetings, masses, prayers and receptions. The initiators as well as the scale however were: instead of a group of passionate students from Vienna, the 1904 organising committee was dominated by exactly those who had stayed away thirty-three years earlier, the Bukovinian boyars. Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki headed the committee of forty Romanian nationalists from Bukovina which made sure that in every Romanian-language periodical in the Monarchy and beyond, a convocation was published. In Bukovina proper, only officials received a personal invitation: the general public was invited through the local press. Extra trains were reserved for attendees and a sum of 10,000 crowns was requested from Vienna out of Church Fund means. Telling for the atmosphere of tolerance was the excitement of the local Jewish community of Putna and the fact that Metropolitan Repta welcomed the high-ranking Jewish representatives holding the torah. Meanwhile, the German-language local press showed only limited interest for the Putna events and was largely preoccupied by the upcoming diet elections - with the Freethinking Alliance as exciting newcomer - as well as with the death of Zionist leader Theodor Herzl.

It is illustrative of the increased permissiveness of the state authorities regarding nationally-flavoured gatherings that the local noblemen felt safe enough to embark on an adventure their enemies could easily brand as ‘hostile towards Austria’. With the memory of 1875 with its Austrian centennial, Ghica commemoration and the subsequent ‘Arboroasa’ trial still relatively fresh, the ‘Putna 1904’ committee did not take unnecessary risks and decided that their celebrations would have an Austrian as well as a Bukovinian character next to the obvious Romanian one. To this end, Hurmuzaki and Metropolitan Repta first of all sent a telegram to the Emperor, stating that ‘the Bukovinian Romanian community (*Rumänenschaft*), gathered for the celebration of Prince Stephen, gratefully remembered the glorious deeds the Church owed to Prince Stephen, Emperor Joseph II and His Majesty’.  
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826 Sbiera 1899, pp. 257-59. Kogălniceanu coined the term ‘theft of Bukovina’ (*răpirea Bucovinei*) a few years later.
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This wording contributed to the Austrianisation of a local and national hero and would make the Stephen cult more palatable to the Viennese taste.\textsuperscript{830}

\textit{Czernowitzer Tagblatt} underlined that Stephen had fought against Tatars and Turks on what was to become Bukovinian soil and as such had played a decisive role in its cultivation and -through the establishment of monasteries and churches - in its institutional development. Therefore he should be regarded as a hero by all Bukovinians. Yet, \textit{Tagblatt} overstretched its creative historical interpretation when it maintained that Stephen had founded the Orthodox Church Fund, which had clearly and detectably been a Habsburg invention. Now, the revered Prince was adorned with ‘the creation of an institution which had become a source of economic and cultural blessings for the whole of Bukovina’.\textsuperscript{831} \textit{Bukowinaer Post}, firmly aligned with the Freethinking Alliance, cried foul since it regarded the festivities hijacked by the Alliance’s political enemies, the Romanian conservatives. Similar criticism was ventilated by Iancu Dolinski from student association ‘Bucovina’, who complained how his organisation in spite of its a-political nature was ignored by the organising committee.\textsuperscript{832} \textit{Post} expressed outrage that the conservatives who collaborated so closely with Polish landowners in Bukovina claimed Stephen as their own hero, while in his days the prince had been battling those very Poles. \textit{Post} furthermore highlighted that during the reign of Stephen the Great, Romanians and Ruthenians had been living together in peace. This was yet another striking contradiction with the Romanian-conservative line of thinking. \textit{Post} predicted furthermore that the entire move would not help the ‘boyar party’ anyway, since ‘the remembrance ceremony for Stephen the Great would be their own funeral’. Governor Hohenlohe’s presence was seen as a gesture towards all Bukovinians, a sign that they were no longer seen as irredentists and now the conservatives tried to abuse that gesture for their own personal gain. Apart from party politics, \textit{Post} also offered a more general analysis:

\begin{quote}
\textit{In Bukovina they have neglected so far to arouse and maintain a sense of history of the homeland in school and at home. (…) Bukovina becomes one with Austrianness. This way everything is seen in and perceived as ‘decently Austrian’ (gutösterreichisch) and therefore the general public left unchallenged that a significant historical event of the land was converted to one of just one group.}\textsuperscript{833}
\end{quote}

In spite of all the efforts to represent Stephen as a Bukovinian and even some sort of Austrian hero, the undeniable Romanian-national character of the Putna celebration was accentuated by the arrival of large groups of Romanian nationalists from abroad and especially from the
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neighbouring Romanian state, where the Stephen cult was firmly embedded: when Alexandru Ioan Cuza was elected ruler over both Wallachia and Moldavia and as such the formal process of Romanian unification had started, Mihail Kogălniceanu had announced that ‘Cuza had ascended to the throne of Stephen the Great’. After the Putna celebrations of 1871 and the centennial celebrations of Habsburg Bukovina in 1875 which Romanian nationalists had perceived as a provocation,\(^{834}\) the Stephen cult was increasingly instrumentalised to juxtapose ‘Habsburg occupation’ and ‘Romanian historical rights’.

At the 1904 Putna event, historian and prominent public figure Nicolae Iorga put the tolerance of his hosts to the test by holding a speech at Putna in which he advocated the goal of uniting all Romanians in one state.\(^{835}\) Politicians from Romania were more tactful and made conciliatory remarks such as: “The alliance of Romania with Austria has received the consecration of the people in the days of Putna and our admiration for Austria and its Emperor has no limits.”\(^{836}\) It was these words which found their way into the local press. Comments like Iorga’s were carefully ignored. *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, however, also seized the opportunity to emphasise how well-off the Bukovinian members of the ‘Romanian tribe’ actually were:

> The Romanian people in Bukovina have developed mightily in recent decades, they have worked with restless pursuit towards their cultural completion and have always found sympathetic support with the Austrian government. When today politicians and scientists from the Kingdom of Romania will make the pilgrimage to Stephen’s grave, they will be able to convince themselves that their brethren within the black-yellow boundary posts abide by the traditions of their people, they have remained true to their nation and have been allowed to and that the bones of Stephen the Great do not rest in foreign soil.\(^{837}\)

While the Putna festivities had progressed in harmony, the different elements of the historical discourse continued to play a role in the public debate in the following years. A year after the festivities when the Czernowitz town council had to produce new street names, council member Wallstein invoked Stephen the Great and the events of 1904 to show that Bukovina could boast its own history. He stated that ‘even if Czernowitz and Bukovina were not old enough to let the historic moment take centre stage, even if the number of great men in the land was not that large, yet the Stephen celebrations in Putna had shown that Bukovina had historical memories as well’.\(^{838}\)

In 1914, when Iorga and his Cultural League intensified their campaign from Romania to decry the ‘oppression’ of Romanian-speaking Bukovinians, Romul Reut, member of the Austrian parliament for Onciul’s newly-erected Rural Party, specifically recalled the Putna
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celebrations to debunk the allegations. He mentioned that ‘in 1904, on the occasion of the commemoration of the Romanian national hero Prince Stephen the Great, the Austrian government had allowed the organisation of that celebration at the Putna monastery and had lent special lustre to the national commemoration of all Romanians through the official presence of the then governor, Prince Hohenlohe’. In this context, it obviously seemed more opportune to accentuate the Romanian-national character of the 1904 festivities.839

6.4 Bukovina and the Bucharest ‘Jubilee Exhibition’ of 1906

Inspired by the very successful 1900 ‘Exposition Universelle’ in Paris, which had included the opening of the first Parisian metro line and the building of three new railway stations (Gare d’Orsay, Invalides, Gare de Lyon) and which had attracted over fifty million visitors,840 the young Romanian Kingdom decided to organise its own ‘Grand Exhibition’ in 1906. It was baptised the Jubilee Exhibition (Expoziţia Jubilară) since it celebrated ‘Carol I’s forty years on the throne of which twenty-five as king as well as the 1800 years since Emperor Trajan arrived in Dacia’841 and was meant ‘to present the evolution of Romania's achievements in the economic, social, political and cultural spheres’ in the forty years of the King’s reign.842 It was planned between 6 June and 23 November.

World fairs, great exhibitions or ‘expositions universelles’ had long been restricted to the grand capitals of Europe and in the large cities of the United States of America. Their crucial role in communicating ideas about the identities of the exhibiting nations (and their relation to other cultures) and in showcasing contemporary art and design was not wasted on nationalists. Thus, in the heyday of these spectacular events, smaller cities and regional centres worldwide, staged their own ‘great exhibitions’ modelled on those held in the national (or imperial) centres. These smaller shows usually had large ambitions and tried to engage not only the local population but also national and international audiences and exhibitors.

While nation-states in western Europe as ‘large’ public spheres had created the prerequisites and conditions for success of large exhibits already two generations earlier, most of the free development of national public spheres was missing in eastern Europe, where the political landscape was dominated by multi-national monarchies. In Prague, a Bohemian exhibition had been planned in 1891, but the tensions between the Czech and German national movements eventually led to a cancellation by the German-language exhibitors. As such, the event became a celebration of the Czech national movement instead of a crownland-patriotic

839 Reut, Romulus, Die rumänische Kulturliga und die österreichischen Rumänen, Czernowitzter Tagblatt, 12.04.1914, p. 1. Especially Aurel Onciul and his political circle vehemently opposed the grim picture Romanian nationalists from Romania painted of the situation of Romanian-speaking Bukovinians argued that general conditions in Romania were far worse.
A similar attempt in Galicia in 1894 to host a crownland exhibition had also put a central focus on Galician patriotism, but in reality turned out to be dominated by Polish national sentiments, while the Ruthenian element in Galicia played second fiddle. The crucial question at the Lemberg event seemed to be to what extent the Polish nationalists were entitled to represent Galicia as a whole and how such a representation could coexist with the Polish-national principle. Meanwhile, Ruthenian exhibitors presented their ‘non-dominant nation’ as a cliché of the crownland’s agrarian-traditional element. Because of this discord, the exhibit had precisely the opposite effect of what it had sought to achieve. Instead of a proud presentation of local upturn and the dazzling spectacle of local history, ‘Lemberg 1894’ was perceived as a reality check of Galician nuisances: low levels of investment and industrialisation compared to the high population density, technological backwardness in agriculture, the lack of a rural middle class and a continuation of feudal patterns due to the dominance of aristocrats.

In comparison, the first Bukovinian crownland exhibition in 1886 had been a harmonious and less ambitious affair. Although the local press had complained that the exhibition hall had looked more like an ordinary market or a fair where local shopkeepers had tried to rid themselves of shelf warmers, it had basically offered a pragmatic overview of Bukovina’s agricultural and (modest) industrial production. It had lasted a month only. Talks of a next exhibition in 1906 or 1908 were already going when the Romanian government announced the plans for the Grand or Jubilee Exhibition in Bucharest in 1906. In Czernowitz, a clear sense of proportion and reality prevailed: a ‘miserable fiasco’ was predicted were a crownland exhibition to be held in Czernowitz in the same year as a large National Exhibition in the capital of neighbouring Romania, the booming and glitzy ‘New Paris of the East’:

_The Bukovinian Romanians, which we particularly need to take into account here, would find themselves in an awkward situation: national exhibition or crownland exhibition? This question, which would be hard to answer for the participants in question, could not only lead to very unpleasant misunderstandings and complications, but could also greatly jeopardise the success of the Bukovinian crownland exhibition. Let us consider just how many Romanian large landowners and local notables, who are expected to be active collaborators or supporters of our second major crownland exhibition, would have either to flitter away their energies or to stay away from both events. Just ask Transylvanian Romanians once which of the two concurrent exhibitions would interest them more or would be closer to their hearts? And the foreigners from the West? If they have the choice between the embryonic metropolis of Czernowitz with its still rather bad reputation in the West and the proud residence of the_
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845 Von der Ausstellung, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 12.09.1886, p. 3.
Indeed, the plans for a Bukovinian exhibition were postponed and all attention was from then on focused on ‘Bucharest 1906’. However, the dilemma of ‘national’ versus ‘regional’ reappeared on the agenda once the Bukovinian Diet had to decide on the crownland’s participation in Bucharest. Ruthenian politician Mykola Vasylko, who supported Bukovinian participation, brought the idea to a vote. It was initially accepted and the diet allocated 10,000 crowns for the preparations. However, the fact that the Freethinking Alliance had collapsed not long before worked against Vasylko: His former ally Aurel Onciul and his Romanian faction blocked the resolution in the diet’s executive council - which was to decide on the budget allocation - without explaining why. Remarkable enough for a Ruthenian politician in Bukovina - and a ‘deserted Romanian’ on top of that - Vasylko thereupon received letters and telegrams from Romanian politicians and newspapers in Bucharest to support his initiative and to decry Onciul’s narrow-mindedness (Kleinlichkeit). It was equally obvious how little popularity Onciul enjoyed with the Romanian authorities: in June 1906, when he traveled to Bucharest as a member of the Viennese committee assigned to congratulate the Romanian king on his forty years on the throne, all delegates were officially received - only Onciul was denied an audience with Carol I. In Bukovina proper, Bukowinaer Post did its share to depict Vasylko as the true defender of the Freethinking spirit and of the crownland as a whole and as the living example of a man able to serve Bukovina without depriving his own nationality.

An explanation by ‘the Onciul Romanians’ - as they were dubbed by the local press - behaviour followed a few days later: executive council assessor Ioan Volcinschi declared how the diet had incorrectly assumed that the Bucharest exhibition would be an international agricultural exhibition and participation would lead to stronger ties between Romanian and Bukovina in this particular area. Ample study of the program, however, had revealed that the event would be a purely national one, aimed showing the world what Romanians inside and outside of the borders of Romania had achieved in economy, science and culture. This way, those from the Kingdom could boast their development under the forty years under King Carol I, while those from Bukovina would be able to show how much development sixty years under the Emperor had brought. Since the only pavilion to which foreign nations were admitted was the one for agricultural machinery, a branch utterly absent in Bukovina, Volcinschi continued, participation on crownland level was ruled out. Moreover, bilateral relations were a matter between Bucharest and Vienna and therefore not to be decided in
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Czernowitz. The executive council thus encouraged private initiatives from Romanian Bukovinians for a delegation of their own.851

A committee of Bukovinian Romanians was duly formed by Romanian nationalist aristocrats like Modest Grigorcea, Florea Lupu and Nicu Flondor and set about its task energetically, forming subcommittees to prepare contributions to the different sections of the exhibition.852 But, as it turned out, at least one argument in Volcinschi’s reasoning had been correct: decisions on participation in international events were not taken on the level of crownlands, but on that of the state. Once the organisers in Bucharest had revised the purely national character of the exhibition and changed into a truly international one, it became a topic on the agenda of the Austrian central authorities.853 Apart from France and Hungary, Austria was the only participating foreign nation; next to Bukovina, the other represented regions outside of Romania with a significant Romanian-speaking population were Transylvania, Bessarabia and Macedonia. The participation of both parts of the Dual Monarchy involuntarily highlighted an ongoing issue between the Monarchy and Romania: In order to protect its own - in practice the Hungarian - agricultural sector, it kept its borders largely closed for Romanian produce.

Vienna had thus decided that Austria was to be represented in Bucharest and that each crownland had to form a preparatory committee, which in turn was to send representatives for the umbrella state committee. As such, further local discussion was made redundant. In Bukovina, where the overall feeling was that the crownland was generally ignored on state level, the explicit invitation (or rather, the order) to become involved only added to the ardour in Czernowitz - all the more since a specifically Bukovinian pavilion was to be erected.854 Bukovina’s special position with regard to Romania was acknowledged by the formation of a separate Romanian section within the Bukovinian preparatory committee in which the Bukovinian Romanians could continue their preparations for a historical-ethnographical display in an equally separate pavilion.855 With this display, the local press expected, the Bukovinian Romanians could pride themselves on their achievements under the Austrian flag, but, like their co-nationals in the Kingdom, they would also have to admit that one central element in their development was lagging behind: a middle class.856

The feeling that Bukovina was finally taken seriously took a severe blow when it became publicly known that the strict Romanian border controls had been lifted for the duration of the Jubilee Exhibition, with two exemptions only: Russia and Bukovina. Apart from the anger that Bukovina would miss extra income since the Berlin-Bucharest railway passed Bukovina and all the extra passengers would now surely travel over Hungary, Bukowinaer Post felt humiliated by Bucharest and again treated as the ‘poor cousin’ by Vienna, where this

852 Bukarester Ausstellung 1906, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 08.12.1905, p. 4; Die Beteiligung der Rumänen an der Bukarester Ausstellung, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 17.01.1906, p. 3.
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855 Bukarester Jubiläumsausstellung, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 20.03.1906, p. 3.
856 Die Bukowiner Rumänen auf der Bukarester Ausstellung, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 25.03.1906, p. 1.
announcement had apparently been received without protest. Adding insult to injury, Bukovina had been compared to ‘barbarian’ Russia. According to Post, a general boycott of the exhibition was in order. However, when the exhibition opened its gates on 17 June 1906, travel restrictions for Bukovinians had neither been eased, nor had the call for a boycott been honoured.

In any case, travel restrictions at the Bukovinian side of the Austro-Romanian border had not deterred one particular prominent traveler. The Christian-Social mayor of Vienna and well-known anti-Semite Karl Lueger had decided to attend the opening of the Bucharest exhibition and made the journey by train - via Czernowitz. There he was greeted by a delegation of Bukovinian Romanian students who, much to the dismay of Jewish circles in the crownland, cheered him for being ‘a true friend of the Romanian nation’. It was more than his participation in the Bucharest festivities that had brought about the student’s enthusiasm for Lueger, though: Vienna’s mayor was also a sworn enemy of the Monarchy’s Hungarian half and shared this enmity with Romanian nationalists who felt humiliated by the way Budapest treated Romanian-speakers in Transylvania. His attendance of the Jubilee Exhibition’s opening, the fact that he was received by King Carol I in Bucharest and that a Bucharest street was named after him at the occasion of his visit were closely connected to the message he wanted to send to the Hungarian government. Not only in Bukovina, but also at railway stations in Romania Lueger and his delegation were ardently welcomed. Those popular gestures met with warm words from Lueger, who repeatedly declared his love for Romania, and culminated in a pompous reception in Bucharest.

In June 1906 the exhibition premises were opened for to press and public. The Bukovinian contribution with regard to art history consisted mostly of religious art from the Putna, Suczewitza and Dragomirna monasteries. Bukowinaer Rundschau expressed contentment with the results of the Bukovinian preparations: especially the estate administration of the Church Fund elaborately displayed its activities on sections about agriculture, forestry, mining and logging, embellished with photo exhibits, hunting trophies and promotion for spa retreats at Dornawatra. The representation of the commercial sector was seen as disappointing, for which the short notice for participation was blamed. The solo effort of Bukovinian Romanians generated the byproduct of the somewhat peculiarly named residual section ‘Cottage industry products of non-Romanian ethnic groups of Bukovina’. Ironically, this separation of exhibits

---

857 Nur die Bukowina!, Bukowinaer Post, 20.05.1906, pp. 1-2.
858 Rüschen! Bukowinaer Post, 17.06.1906, pp. 1-2.
859 Lueger in Czernowitz, Bukowinaer Rundschau, 17.06.1906, p. 1.
862 Primarul şi consilierii Vienei în Bucureşti, Familia (Nagyvárad/Oradea), 22, 11.06.1906, pp. 263-264.
only accentuated the similarities between what was presented as ‘Romanian’ handicraft on one side – collected by Eric Kolbenheyer who would be the jury of the folk costume competition on the Kapri estate in Jakobestie four years later - and ‘Ruthenian’ on the other.\(^{864}\) The resemblance was not lost on the visiting Romanian royal family, either.\(^{865}\)

_Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung_ abundantly praised the way the Romanian section of the Bukovinian pavilion had been equipped,\(^{866}\) but in Bukovinian-Romanian circles disappointment was voiced over the less-than-ambitious way the progress made my Romanians in Bukovina had been represented: the Orthodox Church and the Church Fund dominated completely, while other Romanian national institutions were almost absent. The focus on very old religious art and artifacts also seemed to implicate that Romanian national pride in Bukovina was based on little more than ancient history, while contemporary achievements and literature were barely acknowledged. A critic remarked that a good deal of the display would have looked exactly the same fifty years earlier and as such did not do justice to what Bukovinian Romanians had accomplished.\(^{867}\)

Even though the Romanian government had put aside the idea of a purely ‘Romanian’ exhibition, this did not mean the event was not fully used to promote ‘Romanian solidarity across the borders’. To this end, two thousand Bukovinian farmers and peasants were invited to the agricultural section of the exhibition. Their trip was paid for by the Romanian state and a large crowd warmly welcomed the Bukovinian delegation in Bucharest with patriotic song and exclamations like ‘long live the Bukovinians!’ The next day, the entire group was marched to the exhibition premises accompanied by military music, while they were sure to yell a ‘long live our Emperor Franz Joseph’ when passing the Austrian pavilion.\(^{868}\) The Bukovinian press saw it as a sign of less tense times that the Romanian government had such a big share in the (financial) organisation of the visit without the ‘anti-Romanian’ press crying foul against ‘irrendentism’. _Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung_ stated that with calm and self-confidence, the Bukovinian visitors could take pride in both the achievements of the Kingdom of Romania as well as of those reached under the rule of the Habsburgs.\(^{869}\)

Indeed, in Bukovina under Austrian rule the matter of participation in ‘Bucharest 1906’ was discussed in a tone very different from the one heard in Budapest when the involvement of Transylvanian Romanians in the event was discussed. In December 1909, Transylvanian-Romanian nationalist (and later prime-minister in Greater-Romania) Alexandru Vaida-Voevod noted in his reports to the Chancellery of Archduke Franz Ferdinand:
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While the Austrian government was doing everything to enable the Bukovinians a worthy demonstration of their culture, the Hungarian government was preparing all imaginable trouble to keep [Transylvanian Romanians] from this ‘irredentist’ operation. As a result of the fact that a contribution was sent to the exhibition anyway, the Romanian representatives were frequently was accused of ‘treason’ (‘Vaterlandsverrat’) in the Hungarian Parliament.\[870\]

In later Romanian nationalist historiography, the subtleties of regional versus national participation, the differences between the Austrian and the Hungarian debates and issue of Bukovinian-Romanian loyalty to the Habsburg Emperor were briskly swept aside to make room for another interpretation of events: the large delegations from Transylvania and Bukovina which had come to visit the Jubilee Exhibition of 1906 were portrayed as masses demonstrating their wish for unification with Romania.\[871\] As such, the absence of irredentist motives which had enabled Bukovinian participation first of all was turned upside down in order to represent the 1906 event as a prelude to the 1918 Romanian unification.

6.5 Bukovina and the Emperor’s Jubilee Parade of 1908

Emperor Franz Joseph’s fifty years on the throne in 1898 had been meant to be the occasion for a splendid celebration, but the assassination of Empress Elisabeth in Geneva on 10 September of that year largely overshadowed the festivities planned for 2 December. There were the obvious speeches, religious commemoration ceremonies and public merriment, but the Emperor himself spent the day in Wallsee with family members.\[872\] In Bukovina, the official period of mourning resulted in equally solemn commemorations. Some employers granted their personnel a day off, but public celebrations did not take place.\[873\] Instead, a ‘nursing home for incurable mental patients’ was inaugurated to mark the occasion.\[874\]

It was obvious that a decade onwards there was all the more reason to make an extra effort. As early as from May 1907, a committee carefully developed plans for a jubilee parade in Vienna, but it took them almost a year to convince the reluctant centre of attention - the Emperor himself - of the merits of the project. The argument that it would strengthen the sense of Austrian patriotism had apparently won him over.\[875\] However, the press assessed that
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‘the damages which would be caused to tourism and business if the parade was cancelled had made the gracious Monarch decide to allow it to continue’. The event was set for 12 June 1908.

In Bukovina, 1908 was a year of multiple anniversaries: a hundred years earlier, the first state Gymnasium had been established and, more importantly, the city of Czernowitz was to celebrate its five hundred year existence. Probably inspired by the preparations in Vienna, the Czernowitz city council had come up with the idea of a parade of school children in festive costumes and black-yellow sashes in May 1908, culminating in the performance of a festive hymn at the Austria monument.876 The provincial celebrations with their focus on the Austrian state formed an interesting contrast to the parade planned in Vienna, where the crownlands were expected to present themselves in all their ethno-national diversity. To this end, nationalist leaders were to inspire their communities to participate and, as the Romanian nationalists from Apărarea Națională experienced, sometimes encountered downright apathy. They warned their constituents that ‘if the Romanian nation did not participate in the festival, the general public would not even know that in Bukovina a Romanian population existed and those who did know of its existence would take them for disloyal and anti-dynastic irredentists, so that in both cases irreparable damages would be caused’. The newspaper hastened to add that most of all, participation was required in order to demonstrate ‘feelings of love and veneration for the old Monarch’. Still, it had addressed sensitive issues: next to the obvious pressure to participate in the 1908 Jubilee Parade, to many outside of its borders Bukovina was still terra incognita.877

Yet the discussions in Bukovina were easily dwarfed by the nationalist issues which confronted the Viennese organisers. It had soon become clear that an all-encompassing Austro-Hungarian manifestation would be illusory. The Transleithanian part of the Empire only started counting from the year of the Compromise 1867 in which Franz Joseph had been crowned King of Hungary. According to this logic, Franz Joseph would have to wait for quite a few years more to celebrate sixty years on the throne and thus Budapest abstained from participation. Then there was the Czech question: part of the planned jubilee festivities had been a number of guest performances in Vienna by the Czech National Theatre, but German nationalists had campaigned against the idea and had been backed by Vienna’s mayor Karl Lueger: he had declared that performances in Czech ‘did not suit the German character’ of the capital. In reaction, the Czech nationalists did not only call off their drama performances, but withdrew from the anniversary activities altogether. The two cornerstones of the fragile harmony in the Monarchy, the Hungarians and the Czechs, were therefore conspicuous by their absence. On top of that, the history of the Empire as depicted by the parade led to furious reactions from different national groups. Especially the representation of the revolutionary year 1848 caused discord: Tyrolean Italians objected to the way Radetzsky’s crushing of the Italians in that year was celebrated, while Croats refused to be depicted as looters in the 1848

reenactment. It took the organisation in Vienna many lengthy discussions and adjustments to keep all participating groups on board. ⁸⁷⁸

It was in exactly this respect that the Bukovinian organisers thought to provide a unique asset to the royal display of complete interethnic harmony. The day before the parade, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung noted:

> Of course it will also be noticed in Vienna that some are not there. First, the Magyar gentlemen who have been calculating with the assistance of their ever so complex constitutional law calendar that the ‘King of Hungary’ does not celebrate any anniversary. But Bukovina, this stand-by reservoir of all nationalities of the monarchy outsparls even these ‘Éljen-patriots’. ⁸⁷⁹ Even ‘Éljen’ cheers will be heard in Vienna tomorrow. Real Magyars adorned with black and yellow rosettes will produce them, the Magyars from Hadikfalva, Andrásfalva and Istensegíts. Black-and-yellow decorated Hungarians in Vienna are certainly not a bad answer to the calendar tricks of the Transleithanian Magyars. ⁸⁸⁰

The coordinating committee of the Jubilee Parade had decided that the two sections of the event were to reflect both the glorious history of the Habsburg Empire and its contemporary ethnic diversity. As such, the first section included groups depicting the early years of Rudolf the Founder, a tournament from the time of Frederick II, the double marriage between the Habsburgs and the Jagglons, the first siege of Vienna by the Turks and the Thirty Years’ War. The second section represented the second siege of Vienna by the Turks, the troops of Prince Eugen, the era of Maria Theresia, *tableaux* from the Seven Years’ War and life under Joseph II, the war against the French Republic, Archduke Karl, The Tyrolean *Landsturm* of 1809, a *Praterkorso* form the time of the Vienna Congress, street scenes from the early 1800s and finally Radetszky’s troops in 1848. ⁸⁸¹ The historical overview strongly focused on the Habsburg dynasty and the German-speaking nobility and devoted little attention to non-German elements. Oddly enough, it did not feature any achievement from Franz Joseph’s six decades on the throne either, which had been, after all, the reason for the festivities. ⁸⁸²

The contemporary part of the parade started off with a representation of Viennese society after which the elaborate ‘nationalities parade’ commenced in order of listing in the Emperor’s title; the Bohemian Woods, Budweis, Dalmatia, Galicia, Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Silesia, Bukovina, Moravia (minus its Czechs), the Austrian Littoral and Tyrol (minus its Italians). ⁸⁸³ The fact that the ‘nationalities parade’ followed the structure of the famous ‘Kronprinzenwerk’ (*Die Österreich-ungarische...


⁸⁷⁹ ‘Éljen!’ is the Hungarian equivalent of the exclamation ‘Long live!’
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Monarchie in Wort und Bild), the big patriotic project managed by Crown Prince Rudolph before his death in 1889, was no coincidence: the parade’s honorary chairman, Count Hans Wilczek, was a coeditor of this series. In the spirit of ‘black-yellow liberalism’ the idea of the sacram imperum prevailed, with the Empire as the mediator between all groups within its borders.\textsuperscript{884} In the volume of the ‘Kronprinzenwerk’ dedicated to Bukovina, the crownland and its inhabitants were discussed strictly divided along ethno-national lines. In his correspondence with the volume’s editors in 1893, Bukovinian diet president Ioan Lupul had underlined how Bukovina with all its ethnic diversity was in fact a miniature version of the Empire. Both this ethno-national division and the image of ‘little Austria’ were reflected in the Bukovinian parade contribution.\textsuperscript{885}

The setup of the crownland part of the parade provoked a wave of self-confidence in Bukovina. No matter how often the Bukovinian press had complained about the way Vienna consistently ignored the smallest crownland, when the zenith of the Emperor’s jubilee year was to display a kaleidoscope of ethnic diversity, Bukovina was hard to beat. The coordinators in Czernowitz decided to exploit this element to the fullest and left the detailed organisations to national committees, thus turning the Bukovinian part of the event into a national competition. As Bukowinaer Post commented, ‘it was understandable that they had made an effort to select only beautiful people’ and that all groups had made sure to pick only their most athletic menfolk. Each group was directed by a designated folklorist who often, like Erich Kolbenheyer, had been involved in earlier representative events such as the Bukovinian contribution to the Bucharest Jubilee Exhibition of 1906. The resulting lineup was headed by a group of horsemen representing all nationalities and carrying the Bukovinian coat of arms, followed the Romanian section, depicting bucolic sheepherding and forestry scenes while finishing with the reenactment of a village wedding with live music. Next, the Magyars from the five Magyar settlements near Radautz rode their horses dressed in white lined and adorned with the Hungarian tricolour. The rural Germans portrayed a homely scene accompanied by brass music. Poles marched in their national costumes and a small assembly Old-Believers or Lippovans, ‘guaranteed to cause a sensation in Vienna’ showed their abundant equestrian splendour. Ruthenians, divided into sections of ‘Ruthenians from the plains’ and ‘mountain Ruthenians’ (Hutsuls) closed the Bukovinian performance, those from the plains enacting harvesting scenes and the Hutsuls with - again - a wedding scene which stood out because of the large number of female participants.

There was more than self-confidence in the air; in a way, Bukovina saw the opportunity to not only mesmerise arrogant Vienna, but also to baffle the audience with a multi-national variety which would turn the spoiled inhabitants of the state capital into astonished provincials for a change. Bukowinaer Post predicted that ‘hardly any province would be able to present such a multi-coloured picturesque image in the parade of the nationalities’ and that ‘one could be

\textsuperscript{884} Ibid., p. 68.

curious as to what impression the march would make on the Viennese, to whom the different types from Bukovina were not an everyday sight and who were not yet insensitive to this colourful beauty'.\textsuperscript{886} It can be questioned if the carefully staged abundance was such an ‘everyday sight’ for Bukovinians themselves: when the separate groups arrived in Czernowitz for the big dress rehearsal prior to their departure for Vienna, the local press compared the public excitement and awe to the days of Buffalo Bill’s Wild West performance which had enthralled Czernowitz two years before.\textsuperscript{887} \textit{Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung} had high expectations of Bukovina’s success in Vienna:

\textit{When Bukovinian farmers stayed in the capital city a few weeks ago on the occasion of the cattle show, the Viennese could barely hide their surprise at the appearance and clothing of these ‘strange characters’, as the newspapers put it. Now, what will they say when they see the subgroup of Lippovans pass by in the ceremonial procession, on horseback and in costumes which are extraordinarily dazzling even to native Bukovinians! Or the symbolisations of a Romanian and a Ruthenian wedding, with the women and girls with their ornate hairstyles, the men in their typical festive clothing, the original cymbal music and the colourful details which can only be fully captured on this very occasion. (...) The Lippovan group will undoubtedly be one of the biggest ‘hits’ (Schlager) of the procession.}\textsuperscript{888}

Once the different groups of participants had arrived by train in Czernowitz from all over Bukovina for the big rehearsal, they were hosted according to a nationally segregated scheme remarkably similar to the electoral register system which was being developed in that same period: the performers were met at the railway station by a committee of their ‘co-nationals’, who were also responsible for distraction in the capital. All groups had their own nationally-specific excursions, spent the evenings in the respective National Houses and were lodged in the same ill-fitting clusters which would provoke critics of the register system a few years later: Romanians and Magyars were accommodated in the Romanian boarding school for boys, Ruthenians, Hutsuls and Lippovans in its Ruthenian equivalent, while Germans and Poles had boarding schools of their own to find shelter.

On 9 and 10 June, the transfer of the 617 participants and 140 horses took place by special trains from Czernowitz to Vienna.\textsuperscript{889} Consistent with the entire operational sequence so far, the carriages were separated along national lines, provoking the obvious bickering:

\textit{Whoever will watch the train on its long journey will recognise at once that it comes from ‘Little Austria’, the land with the colourful mixture of peoples. (...) In two cars of the first and second class, the leaders of each group are seated, followed by Hungarians, Romanians,}

\textsuperscript{886} \textit{Die Bukowina im Jubiläumsfestzuge}, Bukowinaer Post, 11.06.1908, p. 2.  
\textsuperscript{887} \textit{Die Bukowiner Gruppe}, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 07.06.1908. pp. 6-7. Buffalo Bill's Wild West show from the United States had performed in Czernowitz on 24-25 July 1906, causing widespread excitement - and outrage because of the steep prices of the entry tickets. For a detailed account on Buffalo Bill's tours in this part of Europe, see Ionescu, Adrian-Silvan and Stroe, Aurelian, \textit{Buffalo Bill printre Români}, in: \textit{Muzeul Naţional}, Vol. 12 Bucharest 2000, pp. 151-212.  
\textsuperscript{888} \textit{Die Bukowiner Gruppe}, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 07.06.1908. pp. 6-7.  
\textsuperscript{889} \textit{Ibid.; Die Bukowina im Huldigungsfestzuge}, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 11.06.1908, p. 4.
Germans, Ruthenians, Poles, and in the last carriage the Lippovans. (...) Everything seemed just fine, when the Germans left the train and flatly declared that they would not leave unless they got another carriage for the trip. Soon the matter had become a political crisis. Deputy Diet President Dr. Smal’-Stotsky and commissioner Zachar came to the German group and tried to intervene. “We will not stand for this,” the Germans shouted at him, “the other nationalities are partly seated in first and second class and in this box we will not be able to endure the entire way to Vienna”. One word led to another. Dr. Stotsky replied curtly: “Then you stay here!” Finally, a compromise was reached, and the Germans boarded the carriages once more.890

Upon arrival in Vienna, the groups were lodged in Red Cross barracks and divided their time between rehearsals and the marvels of the state capital, which most of them had never visited before. Neue Freie Presse enthused about the exotic appearance of the Bukovinian section as well as about the large number of participants from the most distant crownland,891 but in this respect Bukovina was not alone: the payment and conditions were far more attractive for participants from the poorest and remotest parts of the Empire and thus Tyrol, Dalmatia, Galicia and Bukovina were overrepresented compared to the Austrian ‘heartland’ crownlands such as Lower Austria. The policy for all participants to wear folk costumes plus the fact that the industrially-developed Czechs refused to take part presented by 1908 a rather distorted view of an empire solely inhabited by picturesque, premodern peasants.892

If this was what the Bukovinian organisers had seen as a the ultimate occasion to build a reputation in Vienna and to do away once and for all with Bukovina’s persistent standing of a corrupt, Byzantine and provincial backwater, they had been sorely mistaken. First, as said, by following Vienna’s orders to send a delegation in bucolic costumes, the image of backwardness was only enforced. Second, by leaving the contributions’ logistics to local nationalist leaders, the local government missed the chance to present the crownland as a whole and now only came up with a sum of its parts. Parts, that is, as they were perceived by the dominant ethno-segregationist discourse of the time. Other significant parts of Bukovinian life were strikingly absent. The Orthodox Church was one example, although with some creativity one could argue that this segment was covered by the Romanian/Ruthenian section of the parade. Urban life was ignored altogether and as such, so was a prominent part of its representatives, the Jews.

Interestingly, this peculiar omission was not even debated in the – exclusively Jewish-owned – German-language press in Bukovina. Some educated guesses as to the reasons why are not hard to make. Formally speaking, the second part of the parade was called a ‘Parade of the Nationalities’ and obviously, Vienna refused to recognise the Jews as such. Then, it is hard to

890 Die Bukowiner Gruppe im Huldigungsfestzug - Die Abfahrt von Czernowitz, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 10.06.1908, pp. 3-4.
891 Die Kronländer im Nationalitätenzuge, Neue Freie Presse, 13.06.1908, p. 3.
imagine how Bukovinian Jews could be represented in a parade focused on folk costumes: assimilated urban Jews did not have any and in the case shtetl Jews or the followers of the Sadagora rabbi had been willing to participate, they could be assured that assimilated Jews would strongly oppose to be represented by them. Another matter was the anti-Semitic atmosphere in Karl Lueger’s Vienna: in order not to provoke an angry reaction from the crowd, the Jewish element of Austrian society was wise not arouse any attention during the parade.

The day itself was unanimously considered a big success. The weather was nice, there were no incidents and, in spite of previous fears of chaos because of the disorderly organisation, everything went remarkably well as the 12,000 participants marched past the 200,000 spectators. Crowds cheered and the Emperor expressed his satisfaction. There had been a particularly unfortunate situation with Ruthenian peasants from Galicia, who had been transferred from Lemberg to Vienna in substandard carriages only to find their rations far too small and of appalling quality, while they were told more or less to spend the night in the open air. As Viennese satirist Karl Krause acidly remarked, ‘the fact that they still showed up for the parade was only proof of the invigorating effect of patriotism’.

Bukovina indeed impressed the audience with it colourful contribution, and the Czernowitz press made sure all newspaper reports from Vienna regarding the Bukovinian section were meticulously quoted. Still, not all evaluations were limited to prettifications of Bukovina being the culmination of Austria’s multi-national feelgood festival. The Social-Democratic minority in Vienna’s municipal council had wondered if all the sad events which had happened during the Emperor’s reign were reason for celebration and if the personal and material dominance of the Austrian high nobility invited charges of social elitism. Bukowinaer Post bitterly criticised how the organisers in Bukovina had carefully selected the few available prosperous and healthy-looking peasants for the event, while the rest of their miserable lot was kept hidden from the Franz Joseph’s view:

Do the prosperous figures of Bukovina in Vienna tell of the worries of their own land? Each nation strove to appear with greater pomp and splendour before the Emperor, in order to enlarge the lie about the condition of their lot. Can the gentlemen from Vienna, on whom our weal and woe depends, guess the misery of the Bukovinian peasantry from those pretty equestrian troops? Do they realise that each year hundreds of peasants end up in hospitals and mental institutions because their miserable food takes both power and mind away, and that they waste away miserably from the horrible consequences of pellagra? Can they imagine that thousands of peasants squander their last belongings each year under the

894 Der Huldigungsfestzug, Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, 14.06.1908, p. 3; Die Bukowina im Jubiläumsfestzuge in Wien, Bukowinaer Post, 16.06.1908, p. 2; Die Bukowina im Festzuge, Czernowitzer Tagblatt, 16.06.1908, p. 1.
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Apart from what Post saw as a hypocritical distraction from gloomy Bukovinian reality, there was dissatisfaction with the way Vienna had responded to the Bukovinian presentation. Czernowitzer Tagblatt complained that ‘obviously, the troops from Bukovina had appeared like something exotic and novel, something previously unknown and misunderstood and something which had refused to be understood’. Bukovina was still such an obscure quantité négligeable, that the Emperor had felt compelled to correct the president of the parade committee when the latter confused Bukovina with Silesia. For most of the audience it was a novelty that the Empire harboured such exotic species like the Hutsuls. The Viennese audience was reproached for having failed to acknowledge the real Bukovinian qualities:

*They knew nothing of this breed of people, emerging in a rapid upturn, toiling under circumstances twice as hard to obtain their share of the cultural blessing of the whole Empire. They knew nothing of the centripetal force which is inherent in this mixture of peoples, of their sincere and genuine loyalty to the Emperor.*

It seems odd to blame the audience for having an impression of Bukovina which the Bukovinian parade organisers had very much instilled themselves. In hindsight, the presentation of Bukovina at the Jubilee Parade was in perfect concordance with the cliché of ‘Little Austria’, cherished in Bukovina as well as in Vienna. Peculiar flaws in the grand scheme of the event found their equivalents in the Bukovinian contribution and led in both cases to the obvious question why the occasion had not been used to paint a more accurate picture of the state of affairs. On the state level, the glaring omission had been any reference at all to what the Emperor had achieved himself during his sixty years on the throne. The entire transition from the dynastic, German-speaking world to the constitutional and multinational state which had developed during the reign of Franz Joseph had been left unaddressed. As such the parade itself remained an empty shell. A parade with a prominent role for Franz Joseph’s reign and achievements seems to have been the initial plan, but this was dropped for unknown reasons. It is suggested that every possible depiction of those decades would have led to endless bickering over the appreciation of the period’s history: the aftermath of 1867 alone would have led to discord between different nationalist groups in the Monarchy, while more recent exploits such as the annexation of Bosnia were still too controversial.

The Bukovinian part of the parade struggled with similar shortcomings. In principle, the parade might have offered an excellent opportunity to combat the prejudices from which the
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crownland so often claimed to suffer: corruption, feudalism, backwardness could have been countered with a glorious representation of a growing Bukovinian (urban) society with as its most obvious treasure the university, conveniently named after the celebrated Emperor himself. Instead, the local organisation had delivered the perfect picture material to back the persistent cliché of the colourful backwood peasant bunch somewhere far away. The question just to which extent this result had been ordained from Vienna or had been the outcome of local deliberations remains unanswered.