

New Europe College Yearbook
Europa Program
2008-2009



Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Andrei PLEȘU, President of the New Europe Foundation, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Bucharest; former Minister of Culture and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania

Dr. Dr. h.c. Valentina SANDU-DEDIU, Rector, Professor of Musicology, National University of Music, Bucharest

Dr. Anca OROVEANU, Permanent Fellow, Professor of Art History, National University of Arts, Bucharest

Dr. Katharina BIEGGER, Consultant, Eastern European Projects, Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin

Dr. Constantin ARDELEANU, NEC Long-term Fellow, Professor of Modern History, The “Lower Danube” University of Galați

Dr. Irina VAINOVSKI-MIHAI, Publications Coordinator, Professor of Arab Studies, “Dimitrie Cantemir” Christian University, Bucharest

Copyright – New Europe College, 2023

ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College

Str. Plantelor 21

023971 Bucharest

Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro

Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



JEROEN VAN DRUNEN

Born in 1969, in Nijmegen, Netherlands

Ph.D. in Cultural History, University of Amsterdam/Huizinga Institute for Cultural History (2013)

Dissertation: *“A Sanguine Bunch”*: *Regional Identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774-1919*

New Europe College Fellow, *Europa* Program (2008-2009)

Visiting Ph.D Candidate (DSP Programme), Central European University, Budapest (2008-2010)

Employed by the diplomatic service of the Netherlands with postings in The Hague, Kyiv, and Berlin (1998-2007)

Researcher, Research project on Romanian-Dutch relations 1945-1989, University of Bucharest (1994)

Currently (2023) working on his second monograph, *Fellow Travellers and Captive Diplomats – Western Eyes on Stalinist Romania*, expected to appear in 2025

Several scholarly contributions in edited volumes

Book:

“A Sanguine Bunch”: *Regional Identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774-1919*, Pegasus, Amsterdam, 2015

TALKING IDENTITY IN HABSBURG BUKOVINA: VOICES FROM IMPERIAL AUSTRIA AND GREATER ROMANIA

Abstract

The article provides a literature survey exploring written sources on the history and identity of Bukovina, a province that was part of the Habsburg Empire and later incorporated into Greater Romania. The region's diverse population, resulting from significant immigration, is examined in the context of interactions between different ethnic groups during the Habsburg period and the interwar years. The author critically analyses key works that have shaped the understanding of Bukovina's identity and highlights the influence of nationalist discourse, emphasizing the need for alternative perspectives.

Keywords: Habsburg Bukovina, identity, identification, literature, nationalism, regional identity, German, Romanian, Jewish, historiography, Dual Monarchy, Austria-Hungary

Bukovina

The area from then on known as Bukovina was established as a province under the Habsburg Empire in 1774. To encourage the development of the sparsely-settled land, the Austrian emperors subsidized the immigration of colonists to Bukovina. After the end of these official immigration programs colonists would continue to arrive at their own expense. As a result, by the census of 1910, the population of Bukovina had risen to over 800,000. People of many different ethnic groups took part in this immigration, including Armenians, Hungarians, Jews, Poles, Romanians, and Ukrainians.

When the Empire collapsed in the aftermath of the First World War, Bukovina was incorporated in Greater Romania and underwent a process of Romanization: its citizens were to swear loyalty to the King of

Romania and the Romanian language was from now on the language of administration and education.

After the Second World War, Bukovina was split in two: the northern part was annexed by the Soviet Union while the southern part remained Romanian territory. The aftermath of the war did not only end the former status of the territory itself, it also had a devastating effect on the ethnic diversity of its population: The majority of the Jewish population had been deported and often murdered under the Nazi regime and its allies, while large segments of the German population had either left by their own free will or were deported after the war by the communist authorities on account of alleged Nazi collaboration. During the communist years the northern and southern parts of the Bukovina territory effectively lost contact. Neither the Soviet authorities nor the Romanian nationalist-communist regimes promoted ethnic diversity, thus further diluting the traditional make-up of Bukovinian society.

A multi-ethnic melting pot

When the Austrians occupied the Northern part of the (Ottoman) province of Moldavia and renamed it Bukovina in 1774, they acquired a feudal territory, with a power base divided between the Orthodox Church with its vast estates and the big landowners, the boyars. The rural population mainly lived in conditions of servitude. The first reports by Austrian government officials indicate, roughly, a population mainly consisting of Ruthene (Ukrainian) and Moldavian (Romanian) peasants. Later, when Habsburg colonization efforts have led to a massive influx of mainly German, Jewish, Galician Ruthenes, and, to a lesser extend, Polish and Magyar immigrants, the question of 'indigeneity' obsessively occupied both Romanian and Ukrainian nationalists.

Shortly after the Austrian occupation, Vienna decided to unify Bukovina with the Crownland of Galicia. The emerging Bukovinian elite, still mainly consisting of Moldavian boyars, saw its position endangered by the much bigger and Polish-dominated Galicia and feared for losing its proper identity. For the first time, in petitions addressed to the Austrian powers, a specific Bukovinian identity is emphasized to realize independence from Galicia.

Once this goal was achieved in the slipstream of the 1848 Revolution, political life in the independent Crown Land took its shape. Although

economic progress was desired by all, opinions on how and for whom diverged significantly. Growing nationalism, influenced in general by developments in Europe and more specifically by those in the neighbouring regions (Czarist Russia, the Romanian Principalities, Transylvania, etc.) threatened to poison the inter-ethnic community. At the same time, a pacifying current tried to combine liberalism with federalist realism, creating a platform for cooperation between Romanians, Ukrainians, Jews, and Germans (*Freisinniger Verband*). Was this in the end a genuine example of a functional regional identity, or nothing more than a friendly divorce settlement, ultimately leading to a new franchise code, divided along ethnic lines?

Over the years, numerous studies have appeared on the ethnical composition of the Austrian Crownland Bukovina, often focusing on the situation of its various ethnical groups. However, less attention has been devoted to regional identity and forms of geographic patriotism in Bukovina.

More than national identities alone?

Between 1848 and 1914, the structures Vienna had provided in Bukovina enabled the ethnic communities to live in relative peace with one another and to develop their cultural life freely. Radical nationalism and aggressive anti-Semitism were still largely absent. While the elites of all nationalities passionately debated ideological and nationalist questions, the identity question among the rural population remained a mystery. Although all parties – in this case, mostly the Romanians and Ukrainians – claimed ardent nationalist feelings among the respective rural populations, it is questionable to what extent these assumptions were correct. A general lack of education, mixed marriages, a shared religion (Romanians and Ukrainians were on the whole both Orthodox) and more immediate social-economic worries make it less likely that nationalism was very prominent on the average peasant's list of priorities. Moreover, who can claim that national identity requires exclusivity? One can feel equally attached to one's religion, village, ruler, capital, and so on. These sentiments can be weaker and stronger depending on the conditions people find themselves in: away from the village, the village identity might grow stronger, in an environment where only foreign languages are spoken, people will feel more strongly attached to their mother tongue. Among these various

identities in their various intensities, in this paper the regional component will be studied.

Have the favourable conditions enabled by the Austrian authorities led to the development of a Bukovinan identity? Did inhabitants of Bukovina feel 'Bukovinan'? In the words of a German author of Bukovinan descent,

the eight nations in this little land, which was a true miniature image of the nationally pluriform Austrian Empire, had lived almost an entire century in peace and harmony from the moment the territory was joined with Austria in 1775. They were first of all Bukovinans and Austrians and national ambitions were rarely found among them.¹

The complicated patchwork of religions and languages in Austrian Bukovina poses problems when models for collective identity are applied: For instance, Leerssen² has designed a model for the 'cultivation of culture' which might be a useful tool in this case, but already the first defined field within this model, that of '(one) language', is obviously empty here. Re-reading the established sources on the Crownland through 'regional eyes' may be a first useful step towards deconstructing the so far exclusively nationalist discourse.

This paper focuses on the interaction of the different ethnic groups of Bukovina as reflected by secondary literature from the Habsburg period as well as that from the interwar years, when Bukovina was an integral part of Greater Romania. The sources discussed here have been selected because their authors have taken – or in some cases claim to have taken – a historian's approach and have considered matters such as multi-ethnicity and/or identity. They can be considered representative for the times and the political climates in which they published their views. Central to the approach chosen here will be 'de-ethnification' when defining identity in autonomous Austrian Bukovina. In the words of Brubaker et al.:

Ethnicized ways of experiencing and interpreting the social world can only be studied alongside a range of alternative, non-ethnicized ways of seeing and being. To study ethnicity alone is to impose ethnicity as an analytical frame of reference where it might not be warranted; it is to risk adopting an overethnicized view of social experience. "If one goes out to look for ethnicity", wrote anthropologist Thomas Eriksen, "one will 'find' it and thereby contribute to constructing it". To study ethnicity without inadvertently contributing to its reproduction, it is necessary to situate ethnicity in the context of "that which is not ethnic".³

Imperial glorification, Bidermann style

By stating “We only wanted to highlight part of the successes and the apparent run of events through facts, which in turn explain the gratitude with which the commemorating population these days solemnizes the centenary of the country’s linkage with Austria”,⁴ legal historian Hermann Ignaz Bidermann completed his *Bukovina under Austrian Administration 1775-1875*. By 1875, many of the conditions in Bukovina described by the previous authors had changed dramatically: The aftermath of the 1848 Revolution had accelerated the process of Bukovinian disengagement from Galicia and had led eventually to independent crown land status. Immigration had continued and urbanization had taken root, especially in Czernowitz and to a lesser extent in Suczawa and Radautz. National consciousness among the elites of the ethnic groups, mainly the Romanians and the Ukrainians, was on the rise and was to be enhanced by the founding of Francis Joseph University in 1875. Wallachia and Moldavia had merged and were about to be recognized as an independent nation, thus encouraging Romanian nationalists in both the Principalities and in Bukovina to contest the Austrian occupation of Northern Moldavia with renewed energy. The centenary celebrations, including the inauguration of the university, raised controversies in the different intellectual circles. In addition to Bidermann, the renowned statistician Adolf Ficker published his *Hundertjahrfeier der Vereinigung der Bukowina mit Österreich* [Centenary of the Unification of Bukovina with Austria]. These complacent works, containing nothing but praise for the Habsburg achievements, provoked an anonymously published reaction from the Romanian side by Mihail Kogălniceanu, entitled *Răpirea Bucovinei* [The Theft of Bukovina]. Moreover, the correspondence between Chancellor Kaunitz, Internuntius Thugut and the High Porte on the process the Austrian annexation of Bukovina was published in both Romanian and French. The booklet was immediately forbidden in Bukovina, which tarnished the festivities.⁵ According to Nistor, the preparation of the festivities had taken place without the participation of even one Romanian boyar, while the inauguration of the university was accompanied by provocative speeches, like the one by the dean of the law faculty, Frederic Schuller Libloy, who emphasized that “Romanians have not contributed one bit to the progress of science and should be glad to be enabled to receive now what they could not produce themselves”.⁶

Not only were the publications by Bidermann and Ficker the first works for a larger audience dealing with Austrian Bukovina, they also specifically

aimed at glorifying the Austrian achievements on the occasion of an anniversary which was no reason to celebrate to begin with in the eyes of Romanian nationalists. Adding insult to injury, Bidermann challenged several pillars of the Romanian nationalist discourse: He quoted one of Bukovina's first military commanders, Karl Freiherr von Enzenberg, who estimated the number of "true Moldavian" families to be only 6,000 out of 23,000 at the time of the occupation and emphasized that most boyar families were not of Romanian/Moldavian descent.⁷ Furthermore, he rejected the notion that the Romanians/Moldavians had settled in "empty territory".⁸ As for the claimed influx of Ukrainians, Bidermann pointed out how Enzenberg had not accommodated new immigrants from Galicia and had demanded a written declaration from the Galician landowner that the individual in question had indeed been free to go and he stipulated that in 1804, the area between Dniester, Seret and Czeremosh was already inhabited by Ukrainians.⁹ Contrary to Romanian nationalist assertions that "Ruthenians" and "Hutzuls" are separate tribes, Bidermann saw them as one.¹⁰ Reactions like the one by Kogălniceanu were hence to be expected. Criticism was also passed within Austrian circles, though. Julius Platter, whose study on usury in Bukovina was to provide antisemites with useful ammunition and which will be discussed below, asserted that books like Bidermann's and Ficker's painted a far too rosy picture of the state of affairs in the crown land.¹¹



1. Parade in Czernowitz in memory of the oath sworn to Emperor and Empire in 1777, postcard, year unknown

Cultural colonialism according to Franzos

The novelist and journalist Karl Emil Franzos (1848-1904) is one of the most frequently quoted sources on Austrian Bukovina. Born of Jewish parentage in Podolia, he spent his early years in Galicia, attended the Czernowitz gymnasium and studied law in Vienna and Graz before becoming a journalist and travel writer.¹² He was forced to abandon a career in administration because of his controversial membership of a German-nationalist student association advocating the unification of Austria and Germany.¹³ In spite of his Jewish background and his Galician birthplace, Franzos was raised a German.¹⁴ His firm belief in the beneficial influences of German culture in Eastern Europe was not so much based on a settled conviction of German superiority per se, but on that of the role model of western culture in general. At the same time, though, his colonial approach¹⁵ to those whose morals he tried to elevate encountered understandable resistance, not in the least with Romanian nationalists, when he published his *Halb-Asien. Kulturbilder aus Galizien, der Bukowina, Südrussland und Rumänien* [Semi-Asia: Cultural Images from Galicia, Bukovina, Southern Russia and Romania] in 1876:

Das Kulturstreben unter jenen Völkern zu wecken und zu fördern, ihrer nationalen Kultur der Stab zu sein, an dem sie sich aufranken kann – das ist die Aufgabe des Deutschtums im Osten. Wenn es dieselbe bisher nur wenig erfüllt hat, so ist dies die Schuld jener Nationen selbst. Sie haben der westlichen Bildung, der deutschen und französischen nur geringen Eingang gegönnt und dies wenige nicht gehörig verarbeitet; es ist ihnen nicht in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen und ist darum auch wenig mehr als der Firnis mit dem sie die autochtone Barbarei bedecken. Zu einer nutzbringenden Aneignung hätte eben Arbeit gehört, und Arbeit erscheint dem Polen und Rumänen leider als die achte Totsünde. [To awaken the cultural ambition of those nations, to be the stick for their national culture to twine up to – that is the task of Germanity in the east. If this has only been realized to a limited extent so far, those nations are to blame themselves. They have allowed only limited access to western education, to French and German, and have not properly processed that limited amount; it has not become second nature to them and therefore is not much more than the varnish to cover the indigenous barbarity. Hard work should have been part of a productive adoption [of western culture] and unfortunately hard work is apparently the eighth cardinal sin to the Pole and the Romanian.]¹⁶

Within the scope of this paper, a number of points should be made on Franzos' travel accounts, which were first published in the Austrian *Neue Freie Presse* between 1874 and 1876, then appeared in two volumes to be reprinted numerous times and translated into 15 languages,¹⁷ thus making it the first internationally accessible publication dealing with Bukovina. As referred to above, Franzos was by no means the unbiased traveler, eager to gain new insights into a world yet unknown: his liberal, Josephinist way of thinking had made him a staunch defender of the assimilation of Jews into German culture, of freedom for Ukrainian farmers (in Galicia) as well as a harsh critic of Romanian boyars and orthodox Jews. His travel accounts merely served to illustrate how in his view much remained to be done and continue to provoke (even post-communist) Romanian historians like Mircea Grigoriu, who reproached Franzos for failing completely to understand the national aspirations of the nationalities within the Dual Monarchy.¹⁸

The fact that *Aus Halb-Asien* was often reprinted reveals the sustained interest for Franzos' travels and his views. Franzos himself updated his book regularly and this way provided the reader with fascinating observations of the changes in Bukovina between 1876 and 1901. At times it requires careful simultaneous reading of different editions to disclose the author's altered perspective: In 1901, Franzos remarked how "(...) ist der geniale Gedanke des Monarchen, aus Österreich einen deutschen Culturstaat zu machen, nur in der Bukowina zur einigermaßen zur That geworden." [(...) the brilliant idea of the Monarch to turn Austria into a German civic society has only materialized to some degree in Bukovina].¹⁹ The *einigermaßen* [to some degree] was still tellingly absent in the earlier editions. More often however, Franzos ventilated more explicitly the negative developments he observes, for example in relation to the results of Austrian ethnic policies:

Die seit 1879 fast ununterbrochen herrschende „Versöhnungs“-Ära hat überall einen selbst in diesem unglücklichen Staate unerhörten Hader der Nationalitäten herbeigeführt, mit den schlimmsten auch in Galizien und der Bukowina. (...) Noch ist in der Bukowina die Sachlage etwas besser, aber auch dort hat die „Versöhnung“ bereits recht bedenkliche Erfolge aufzuweisen. Schon stehen Rumänen und Ruthenen einander feindlich gegenüber; das Deutschtum, bisher das vermittelnde Element, wird nun von beiden Seiten beföhdet, das Polentum gewinnt an Einfluß und schon liegen sich in demselben Ländchen, das noch 1876 ein Eldorado der unbedingten Toleranz gewesen, die Konfessionen in den Haaren. Und

was hätte die deutsche Universität Czernowitz für den gesamten Osten bedeuten können, während sie jetzt von der Regierung als Stiefkind betrachtet und auf das kärglichste ausgestattet, ein armseliges Dasein fristet! [The “Era of Reconciliation”, almost continuously dominating from 1879 onwards, has caused a discord between the nations everywhere, unheard of even in this unfortunate state, the worst being in Galicia and Bukovina.²⁰ (...) Still the situation in Bukovina is somewhat better, but there as well the “Reconciliation” already boasts rather alarming successes. Already, Romanians and Ruthenians clash; Germanity, hitherto the mediatory element, is now feuded by both sides, the Poles are gaining ground and already the religious denominations are at loggerheads in the same little land that only in 1876 was an Eldorado of unconditional tolerance. And what might the German university at Czernowitz have meant for the entire East, yet currently treated like an orphan by the government and, scantily equipped, it carves out a miserable existence.].²¹

Franzos’ views on Bukovinan multi-ethnic culture and its development seem to be contradictory at times, probably caused by inconsistent editorial work on the different editions of *Aus Halb-Asien*: Notwithstanding the expectation he expressed that “all brooks of different national cultures and backwardness [*Unkultur*] will eventually flow into one stream without anyone’s guessing its former variety of colours”,²² he recognized that the reason for the harmonious coexistence of different religions and peoples was the mere fact that none of them was dominant enough to oppress the others.²³ Towards the end of his life, Franzos became bitterly disappointed with the unifying and harmonizing forces of German culture in “Semi-Asia” as well as with the progress of Jewish assimilation into that same culture. Not only did the assimilation failure result from the rigid customs in the ghetto and the adverse attitude of the non-Jewish environment,²⁴ but also, according to Franzos, from the mitigation of German cultural influences in Galicia and Bukovina which had pushed the cultural orientation of Jews towards Zionism: whereas the choice between “remaining a Je” or “becoming a German” was easy since their own “corrupted slang” was close to German and obtaining “a language of culture” was attractive, a choice between “remaining a Jew” or “becoming a Romanian or a Pole”, would probably result in “remaining a Jew”.²⁵ Nevertheless, Viennese authorities were eager to invoke Franzos’ dismissal of a Jewish national identity when the government refused to officially recognize such identity in 1911, reasoning along the lines that “the government cannot be requested to acknowledge a Jewish identity when even Jews themselves

oppose it".²⁶ Franzos' later disillusiones with Jewish integration and the question why he should suddenly figure as a representative of nationalist Jews were conveniently ignored in this case.

Iorga's paradise, spoilt by "strangers"

A true mirror image of Franzos' work is Nicolae Iorga's *Neamul romănesc din Bucovina* [The Romanian People in Bukovina],²⁷ first published in 1905 and reprinted together with its twin *Neamul romănesc în Basarabia* in 2006. Strikingly, the reprinted edition lacks the necessary preface or introduction to the author's xenophobic and antisemitic ramblings and therewith aptly illustrates the return to prewar nationalist historiography which can regularly be observed in post-communist Central Eastern Europe. Although Iorga specialists disagree on the intensity of his anti-Semitism,²⁸ his views on the Romanian nation left no room for multi-ethnicity.²⁹

The Romanian historian Iorga is a fitting example of the impossible balancing act between scholarly activity and political activism. The author of more than 1,200 books and 20,000 articles, Iorga was one of the most prolific scholars of all time and a member of the Romanian, French, Yugoslav, and Polish academies. In addition, he was deeply involved in the political life of Romania throughout the first four decades of the twentieth century and served as a member of Parliament, as President of the interwar National Assembly, as minister, and briefly (1931-32) as Prime Minister. He was co-founder (in 1910) of the Democratic Nationalist Party. As a Romanian citizen he had no official status in Austrian Bukovina, but his activities within the Bucharest-based Cultural League (*Liga Culturală*, established in January 1891 by Bucharest students to draw attention to the actions taken by the Habsburg Monarchy against the Romanians living within its boundaries) intensified when the inter-ethnic *Freisinniger Verband* won the Bukovinian Diet elections in 1904 and thus formed a direct threat for local Romanian nationalist activism.³⁰

Neamul romănesc din Bucovina is presented like a travel account, a pilgrimage even, undertaken by Iorga without a clear purpose. The wandering observer found a land of natural beauty and eternal Romanian heritage, unfortunately spoiled by foreign elements and corrupting governance:

În Solca va să zică stăpîn e Evreul, cei vre-o sută de Evreî aũ în mîna lor cele cîteva mii de creștini. (...) Creșterea austriacă, din care iese spirit de clasă, fetișism față de Stat, iubirea bunurilor materiale ale vieții, aceasta și-a pus pecetea pe suflet. Încrederea în popor, în Romînimea toată, în alt viitor, nu se vede. [In Solca they say the Jew is the master, a some hundred Jews rule over several thousands of Christians. (...) The Austrian breeding which brought about class consciousness, state fetichism and the love for the material goods of life has marked the soul. One does not see any confidence in the people, in Romanian community as a whole, in another future.].³¹

As Corbea-Hoișie emphasized, the traveler only came across “beautiful”, “tall”, “broad-shouldered” Romanians and “big”, “fat”, “long-nosed” Jews with a “calculatory” and “pompous” pace.³² His alleged coalition with the Jews made the Habsburg Emperor the anti-Christ in person.³³

Direct personal attacks were reserved for Aurel Onciul, the Romanian front runner of the *Freisinniger Verband*, and his “infamous, unheard-of mockeries”,³⁴ as well as for the latter’s Ukrainian counterpart Stepan Smal’-Stockiy, “the Galician agitator and baptized Jew, more agitator than professor”.³⁵

Iorga’s “travel accounts” cannot possibly serve to provide reliable information on the ethnonational relations and the general status quo in multi-ethnic Bukovina: they are too obviously a political pamphlet. In spite of the questionable assertion by Iorga biographer Nagy-Talavera that “Iorga was first and foremost a historian (...) and had good instincts and great talent to recreate the event, but always on the basis of documents and facts”,³⁶ therewith obviously ignoring how amply documents and facts can be manipulated, it is safe to conclude with Hobsbawm³⁷ that political agendas produce ramshackle historiography. Still, Iorga represented a prominent voice in the increasingly bitter intra-national disputes in and on Bukovina together with the above-mentioned *Răpirea Bucovinei* by Kogălniceanu, and a headache for the Austrian authorities. His international reputation as a scholar certainly enhanced the persuasiveness of antisemitism and indigeneity theories such as the one about the allegedly Slavified Bukovinian Romanians who only needed to be “reminded” of their Romanian ancestry.³⁸ His work was to become very influential in Romanian nationalist propaganda of the 1920s and 1930s.

Platter and Mischler, German expatriates *avant la lettre*

Two other publications with a prominent role for the Jewish population of Bukovina are the social-economic analyses by Julius Platter, *Der Wucher in der Bukowina* [Usury in Bukovina] from 1878³⁹ and Marie Mischler, *Soziale und wirtschaftliche Skizzen aus der Bukowina* [Social and economic sketches from Bukovina] from 1893.⁴⁰

The economist Platter (1844-1923) was no stranger to Bukovina, where he had taught at the Francis Joseph University. Platter had clear persuasions with regard to social justice and staunchly defended social reform from above, the responsibilities of the property-owning class and the right to fair wages. His work, including a review of Karl Marx' *Das Kapital*, called the attention of Friedrich Engels to Platter's work.⁴¹ Mischler had similar academic affiliations through her husband, Ernst Mischler, a renowned statistician who taught at Francis Joseph University from 1888 to 1891 and established the Regional Statistic Authority of the Bukovina Duchy in 1890.⁴²

Both works are refreshing in the sense that they distanced themselves from the Austrian "cultural mission" and elaborated on the actual situation *in situ*, more often than not passing implicit and sobering criticism on the efforts made by the central authorities. Platter pointed out how the situation of the farmers had not improved over the last 100 years. Czernowitz was a dirty city with half-naked children playing in its streets, servants were seldom seen, there was no industry to speak of and for reasons unknown to the author the new railroad did not reach the larger market towns Sereth, Radautz and Suczawa, thus depriving them of trade opportunities.⁴³ Mischler noted that all towns were in a backward condition, without gaslight or a sewerage system. Snow was not being removed in the winter. She blamed the absence of a healthy middle class on the lack of an organic urbanisation of the rural population and called upon the authorities to create favourable conditions to advance this development.⁴⁴

Not only were Platter and Mischler the first authors to address social issues in Bukovina, they also proved to be the first exponents of "German nationalism" in the Bukovinan context. Whereas "Austrians" like Bidermann and Franzos had exclusively invoked German language and culture as vehicles to civilize the "barbarians", Platter's and especially Mischler's references to things "German" specifically implied an ethnic component. Platter emphasized how Germans could be recognized by their "decent presentation", how many alleged Germans were in fact Galicians who had

only a German name to show for their Germanness and were inclined to speak at home French or Polish rather than German. Jews “could not wash away their nationality with baptismal water, even when their parents had already been christened and had raised their children to be Christians” and not many “real Germans” would remain.⁴⁵ Mischler observed that immigrated Germans “regrettably dwindle away due to interaction, mixed marriages and the lack of national cohesion, that they turn into ‘nationless’ people, speaking two, three or even four languages if they are not simply Polonized at an earlier stage, especially in former times”. She added that there was hardly a more German province among the mixed-language provinces in Austria than Bukovina and acknowledged the contribution by the forceful Jewish population in this respect “to some extent”.⁴⁶ Strikingly, both Platter and Mischler emphasized the large and visible Polish presence in Bukovina at a time when the Polish influence in the now independent crown land had already significantly decreased. Mischler even observed a growing Polish influence by means of land purchases by the Polish.⁴⁷

These impressions may have resulted from the fact that both authors were members of urban communities and probably were well-connected to German Roman-Catholics, circles with a traditionally strong Polish presence. Additionally, in Platter’s case the frustration of the academic surfaced in his struggle with national/ethnic qualifications: while he claimed that Romanians and Ukrainians could easily be identified as such by their last names, which was certainly not correct, Jews could not always be distinguished from (ethnic) Germans since they almost invariably bore German family names.⁴⁸

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

Erst wirklich hohe Geistesbildung entnationalisirt den Juden vollständig, sie macht ihn zum wahren Staatsbürger, zum wirklichen Mitglied der europäischen Gesellschaft, wie wir das in den westeuropäischen Ländern

(d.h. im eigentlichen Europa), insbesondere in Frankreich deutlich an zahllosen Beispielen beobachten können. [Only truly higher education will denationalize the Jew completely, it will turn him into a true citizen, into a true member of European society in the way we can most clearly observe through countless examples in Western-European countries (that is, in Europe proper), especially in France].⁴⁹

Corbea-Hoisie has characterized both Platter and Mischler as writing “antisemitically slanted narratives” [*antisemitisch geprägte Schilderungen*],⁵⁰ but this portrayal fits in fact only Platter and then only to a certain degree. Unlike nationalists like the Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga,⁵¹ Platter did not attack Jews as such, but addressed the problem of usury in Bukovina and stressed the prominent role of Jews in this field. Admittedly, he did not shy away from racial slur and derogatory statements when he claimed for instance that Jews would never, or at least not any time soon, become farmers, since they loathed physical labour.⁵² This aside, his views on assimilation were remarkably similar to those held by Franzos. Platter’s reference to Western-Europe as “Europe proper” clearly recalled Franzos’ “Semi-Asia” and in his final remarks Platter even quoted him:

Der Sinn des Bauern ist auf Nichtsthun und Schnaps gerichtet. Der Sinn der Städter geht auf Ausbeutung des Nebenmenschen (- unbegrenzte Erwerbsgier ohne Arbeitslust! -) und auf Verschwendung und der Jude steckt alle in Seine Tasche. „Jedes Land hat die Juden, die es verdient“, sagt C.E. Franzos. Wenn dies wahr ist, und Vieles spricht dafür – so mag Jener für unseren Fall die Konsequenzen selbst ziehen [The peasant is inclined towards idleness and brandy. The townsfolk are inclined to prey upon their fellow man (- unlimited greed without industriousness! -) and on squandering and the Jew stuffs everything into his pocket. “Each country gets the Jews it deserves”, C.E. Franzos says. If this is true, and there is a lot to say for it – then everyone should draw his own conclusions with regard to our case].⁵³

Platter remained ambiguous in several ways: he did not always clearly distinguish between ‘Jews’ and ‘usurers’ and although his language on Jews was often racist and offensive, he did regard them as the most intelligent part of the Bukovinian population.⁵⁴

The antisemitic activists who would quote Platter’s observations later on usually painted the picture of an innocent, submissive peasantry trapped by the unscrupulous usurer. However, Platter himself placed the

responsibility for the bad state of affairs firmly with the community, which did not seem inclined to assist its own members in time of need. The author could not identify a community to begin with, only a sum of individuals, no villages but mere collections of clay huts. He showed no understanding for the local tradition of lavishly celebrated births, weddings, etc. when it was clear that one would not be able to meet the expenses and was even more abhorred by the party guests who “feasted and gormandized when they most certainly knew that, through their stomachs, hearth and home of the host went into the usurer’s pocket”.⁵⁵ Not only peasants borrowed irresponsibly, landowners did it, too, some even to idly gamble fortunes away: secret gambling sessions organized by large landowners were always attended by several Jews (*ein oder zwei schmutzige Kaftanjuden*), ready to provide the necessary sums.⁵⁶ Jews themselves, Platter asserted, simply did not indebt themselves for weddings and funerals.⁵⁷ Platter’s disenchanting sketches of Bukovinan society may or may not have been accurate, yet the fact remains that there was an obviously dark side to the rosy images provided before by the likes of Bidermann and later, after the Dual Monarchy had disappeared, by nostalgically inclined German historians and Jewish memoirists.



2. *Once a stronghold of Chassidism: the synagogue of Sadagora near Czernowitz in its current dilapidated state, March 2008*
(photo by the author)

In the introduction to her survey, Mischler pointed at an important feature of Bukovinan life for the educated newcomer:

The social stratum that might pay homage to the westerner is small; on the other hand the latter mostly comes entirely alien to the region and will not stay long. He mostly lives a "colonial life" which withholds him from searching and finding gratification in the ado of society (...).⁵⁸

Although Mischler was less explicit than the *Bukowiner Rundschau*, which characterized Bukovina as a penal colony for Austrians five years later,⁵⁹ she clearly indicated that for Viennese intellectuals Bukovina was merely a stopover on their way to new career opportunities. Her own life during the years in Czernowitz can therefore best be seen at that of today's "expatriate spouse". As she herself explained, her work was compiled of her own impressions enhanced by her husband's economic and statistic overviews. This way of compiling data and personal experiences may have led to the rather awkward and unbalanced way Mischler had structured her book: the first three chapters follow a traditional setup (Towns, Crafts, Trade), followed by a fourth on usury and parasitism and a fifth on the life of Chassidic Jews. The usury chapter might have been inspired by the social urgency of the topic and the political prominence attached to it by Platter's publication 15 years earlier. The chapter on Chassidic Jews can only be explained by the author's personal fascination with this exotic phenomenon, hence highlighting the sometimes curious mixture of economic analysis, journalistic approach and travel account. Although there is one case in which Mischler's observations have a slightly antisemitic ring to them,⁶⁰ she generally adopted a neutral tone in relation to the ethnicities in Bukovina and addressed one of the most notable features of Austrian Bukovina: the gap between rural and urban communities, not only in terms of development, but also in terms of ethnic composure. The majority of the rural population, Romanians and Ukrainians, were underrepresented in towns and cities, where Germans, Poles and Jews constituted the majority. In spite of the fact that the countryside grappled with overpopulation (causing fragmentation of arable farm land), migration to the urban centres failed to materialize and urban growth in Bukovina was caused exclusively by immigration from beyond its borders. Countryside and cities showed an unbalanced growth: in the first century after Austrian occupation, cities grew tenfold, villages only threefold.⁶¹

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

A radical shift – from Austrian Crownland to Romanian district

When the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy collapsed and Bukovina was united with Romania, it became imminently clear that the traditional paradigm would undergo drastic changes. Not only were the former Austrians to become Romanians, they also lost their direct connections to Vienna and German culture. The once carefully sought balance between the different nationalities was from now on to be dominated by the Romanian one, as was clearly seen in administration and education. Historiography on Bukovina adhered strictly to one version of history in Greater Romania, the Romanian nationalist one.

Şafran goes with the flow

An interesting example of this historiography is presented by Menachem Beir Şafran from Bacău, who defended his dissertation on the internal cultural relations in Bukovina between 1825 and 1861 in Basel in 1939.⁶² Having chosen this specific period in Bukovinan history in order to analyze the radical change in ethnic composition of the region during this time, Şafran has delivered a textbook example of the Romanian nationalist discourse, including the anachronisms, for instance when dealing with the situation in the 1830s:

Aus den vorhandenen Akten kann man ersehen, wie sehr sich die Sorgen der Sozial Höhergestellten um die Erlangung irgend einer persönlichen Begünstigung am Wiener Hofe drehten und wie wenig sie sich um die nationalen Interessen des rumänischen Volksteiles kümmerten. (...)

Nationalrumäne und Feind waren damals den regierenden Kreisen gleichbedeutende Begriffe. [The available documents reveal to what extent the socially privileged made every effort at the Court in Vienna to obtain some personal benefits and how little they cared about the national interests of the Romanian part of the population. (...) at that time, "National Romania" and "enemy" were synonyms in government circles].⁶³

Immigrants were blamed for squeezing out the Romanians from trade and handicraft, although the author did not specify how these immigrants had managed to succeed so smoothly. Aristocracy was said to have assimilated into the German circles,⁶⁴ while the mixed populations of Bukovina had "lacked a unified cultural direction". Colonists had "flooded the country and deprived it of its purely Romanian character".⁶⁵ "The Romanians alone were the indigenous population and bearers of the historical and cultural traditions of this once Moldavian swathe of land",⁶⁶ while "based on its historical past and as the representative of a specific, Romanian nationality", Bukovina had managed to achieve separation from Galicia and its political autonomy.⁶⁷

To Şafran, the authentic Bukovinan was the Romanian peasant. As expressed in the quotations above, the Bukovinan aristocracy was accused of squandering its Romanian heritage. Şafran emphasized that although in most parts of Austria farmers had still lived in medieval conditions, the situation in the eastern parts of the Empire had been downright deplorable.⁶⁸ The abolition of serfdom had been a great improvement on the moral level, but in reality the farmers' position had only deteriorated since he was not given any arable land and credit facilities to bridge the difficult transition period had not been available. The deep distrust towards the boyars had resulted in a flat refusal to work for them, which in turn had provoked the boyars to recruit workforces from Galicia.⁶⁹ Şafran blamed the boyars for both the cultural deprivation of the peasant class and for the influx of 'foreign' immigrants taking over its jobs.

The author's background make his views all the more fascinating: Şafran was the son of the Chief Rabbi of Bacău, Bezalel Şafran. His elder brother Alexandru was to become the youngest Chief Rabbi of Romania in 1940 and later, after being expelled by the communist regime, Chief Rabbi of Switzerland. His other brother Joseph was Chief Rabbi of Iaşi. Being of such prominent Jewish descent during a particularly violent antisemitic phase in Romanian history probably did not leave the author another option than to work within the discourse of contemporary Romanian

nationalism. After graduating at the Jewish Theological Academy in Vienna, Şafran had continued his studies of history, philosophy and religious history at the Vienna University, until in 1938 “continuation of his studies in Vienna proved to be impossible”, whereupon he had finished his dissertation in Basel.⁷⁰ Although hardly any other data on the author’s further endeavours are available apart from the fact that Romanian Chief Rabbi Alexandru Şafran is said to have saved his persecuted brothers during the war,⁷¹ it is remarkable how widely spread the publication of his doctoral thesis was: copies can still be found in libraries throughout Europe and the United States.⁷²

Nistor sets a lasting tone

Before Ion Nistor finished his *History of Bukovina*⁷³ in the 1950s, he had been released from the communist Sighet prison after serving a five year sentence. His work on Bukovina was only published in 1991, but is so much in line with the thinking of the Romanian nationalism before and during Greater Romania that a classification within bibliographies on Bukovina from the 1950s (or even the 1990s) would feel contrived. Nistor was, like Iorga and others, much more a political activist than an unbiased historian. A Bukovina born history professor and a member of the Romanian Academy from 1915, Nistor played a prominent political role after Bukovina had been united with Romania. He was elected rector of Cernăuţi University from 1920 and was a minister in several governments between 1922 and 1940, serving his first term as Minister of State for Bukovina. Communist purges ended his career and eventually caused him to be locked up in the notorious Sighet prison.⁷⁴ As pointed out by Hausleitner, Nistor’s *Istoria Bucovinei* did not fulfil the title’s promise since Nistor solely focused on Romanian activities and only marginally discussed the other nationalities – while regarding them as disruptive intruders.⁷⁵ Just like Iorga’s *Neamul românesc din Bucovina*, Nistor’s work was published in 1991 without any critical observations by the editors, in spite of its militant, xenophobic and antisemite character.

Not surprisingly, Nistor advocated the traditional Romanian nationalist point of view which was by and large no different from that of his contemporary Iorga. *Istoria Bucovinei* provides a fine example of the intensified tensions between Romanian and Ukrainian nationalists. Centre stage of dissent was the Orthodox Church. Romanian nationalists claimed

the Orthodox Church to be “theirs”, part of the Romanian national identity⁷⁶ and dreamt, until the 1867 Compromise (*Ausgleich*) between Austria and Hungary rendered this impossible, of a secession from Dalmatia in order to establish a religious community of Transylvania and Bukovina, thus uniting all Romanian Orthodox within the Habsburg Empire. There were also financial matters to be considered: the Austrian government had secularized the possessions of the Orthodox monasteries in the Church Fund and Romanian nationalists now feared that the Ukrainian Orthodox faction would lay claim to its wealth.

Eugen Hacman, a theologian and from 1835 Bishop of Bukovina, had successfully insisted on a 1820 guarantee that would allocate Church Fund means strictly to the Orthodox. This had prevented the Catholics from claiming Church Fund resources during the years of Galician rule, but could not be invoked against the Ukrainian Orthodox of Bucovina. Hacman saw himself as the bishop of *all* Orthodox believers and was not impressed by nationalist claims. He tried to create a situation acceptable to both sides. A fusion of the Transylvanian and Bukovinian bishoprics was not a viable option to Hacman, since it would severely weaken the position of the Bukovinian Ukrainians. He proposed the establishment of an independent Bukovinian Metropolis or archdiocese instead.⁷⁷ Romanian nationalists, many of whom were clerics⁷⁸ now staunchly opposed Bishop Hacman, who would live just long enough to see the formation of the Metropolis of Bukovina and Dalmatia in 1873. Hacman and his obvious disregard of Romanian nationalist interests made him a prime target for Nistor’s bitter attacks. Nistor maintained that Hacman’s position was not attributable to conviction, but to fear of losing his position of archbishop. That is why he fought national interests in clerical matters. He was an “opportunist”, a “malleable and docile instrument of Vienna who took advantage of his character weakness and his ambition to become Metropolitan at any price”.⁷⁹ Nistor found the sole motivation for the Imperial decree to establish a Metropolis for Dalmatia and Bukovina with the Bishop of Bukovina promoted to the rank of Metropolitan in the ambitions of the Dual Monarchy to establish the division of territories once and for all, and to keep nationalities divided along these lines, and not in Hacman’s ‘senile ambitions’.⁸⁰

Even worse, he saw Hacman as a promotor of *Bukovinism*, this notion of a regional identity of multi-ethnicity cemented by Austro-German *Hochkultur* and loyalty to the Emperor and thus very close to the ideal envisaged by Franzos. Romanian nationalists in Bukovina had accused

the Austrian government of a deliberate policy of creating a *homo bucovinensis* in order to thwart Romanian national ambitions.⁸¹ This is why, according to Nistor, Hacman even forbade his clergyfolk to attend Romanian theatrical performances and his students to read Romanian newspapers while constantly preaching tolerance towards *foreigners*.⁸² By accusing Hacman of Bukovinism and anti-Romanianism, Nistor provided his readers with a fine example of how his nationalist parameters troubled his analytic observations: the fact that Hacman was not supportive of the Romanian nationalist cause within the Orthodox Church did not make him automatically anti-Romanian. The Bishop was first and foremost an Orthodox believer with a responsibility for his entire religious community, no matter how (some of) its members might have identified themselves individually along national lines. Moreover, he showed a practical nature and feared an exodus of believers if the nationalist infighting continued.⁸³



3. A bilingual German-Romanian sign in a Czernowitz (now Chernivtsi, Ukraine) staircase, March 2008
(photo by the author)

Nistor showed a similar one-track mind when he discussed the role of German culture in Bukovina, consistently mixing up the concept of *Leitkultur* as advocated by Franzos and his own narrow ethno-national notions. He therefore qualified "Germanization" of education as a hindrance for the schooling of the "indigenous population"⁸⁴ and the founding of the university in 1875 "a pivotal instrument to promote German culture". He found further proof of the Bukovinism concept deliberately turned into a doctrine in the influence of large numbers of "German" functionaries in Bukovina, propaganda in the German press and in the fact that the "German administration" was in charge of the Church Fund.⁸⁵ More than against Hacman, Nistor agitated against Aurel Onciul, one of the leading figures of the earlier mentioned *Freisinniger Verband* and one of the initiators of the Bukovinian Compromise of 1909.⁸⁶ To Nistor's outrage, Onciul had claimed that defending Romanian national rights hindered the cultural progress of the Ukrainians.⁸⁷ According to Nistor, the *Freisinniger Verband* had meant only stronger support for the Ukrainians, who – Nistor claimed – had been backed in Bukovina by the Austrian government to make up for the fact that there was little Vienna could do for them in Galicia where the Poles had so clearly maintained their position of power. The internally divided Romanians, Nistor observed, had been incapable of offering resistance.⁸⁸

The theory of Daco-Roman continuity, "historical rights" and indigeneity was imported from Transylvania. Its character proved to be profoundly different in Bukovina. For Transylvanian Romanians it served within the context of the emancipation struggle against Magyar landowners, while in Bukovina those very landowners were *Romanian* and the indigeneity argument was shifted towards the Ukrainian population. Thus, in contrast to Transylvanian Romanians who tried to bring about change, Bukovinian Romanians argued along nationalist lines to maintain the *status quo*.⁸⁹ Within the framework of Romanian nationalism in general, anti-Ukrainianism was unique for Bukovina.: Nistor carefully avoided the generic "Ukrainians" and stuck to "Ruthenians" and "Hutzuls" so as to deny the Ukrainians their own nationality (and thus a majority on Bukovinian soil)⁹⁰ and claimed they were consciously abused by the Austrians as a tool against the Poles in Galicia, the Magyars in Subcarpathia and the Romanians in Bukovina.⁹¹ Romanian political parties were said to have refused cooperation with Ukrainian parties "because of their hostile attitude towards the Romanian population, their support of Hacman and their continuous penetration of the country in order to denationalize the

Romanians". Nistor saw no difference between Young-Ukrainians and Old-Ukrainians: both groups wanted to claim Bukovina, albeit for the realization of different state concepts.⁹²

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

Relations between native Moldavians and foreign settlers – Ruthenes, Germans, Lippovans, Armenians, etc. – were normal, imposed by the Romanian's spirit of hospitality. The difference in religion, however, impeded marriages between orthodox Romanians and catholic or protestant Germans. On the other hand, since the Galician Ruthenes went over from the Uniate to the Orthodox Church once they had settled in Bukovina, marriages between Romanians and Ruthenes occurred frequently to the detriment of the Romanians. The smarter Romanian woman easily learned her husband's foreign language whereas the Ruthenian woman did not really learn Romanian, thus imposing her language on the entire family.⁹³

The first Romanian ball organized in Czernowitz in 1864, Nistor emphasized, might have been about national pride, but most of all made clear to non-Romanians that they did not belong. He quoted one of the attendees stating in the *Concordia* newspaper:

In this way our national celebrations have started, so far unknown in Bukovina, so that foreigners, wondering how we, Romanians, organize a ball in their place, have felt for the first time during our carnival that they are on foreign territory and that it is them who are the minority where first they felt they were dominant.⁹⁴

Press reports in other newspapers of the time paint a different picture and only mention the balls of the different nationalities in a harmonious context.⁹⁵

Nistor's zealotry to present Bukovinian history within a framework of heroic struggle of aggrieved Romanian nationalists not only conflicted with other contemporary sources as shown above, it also produced some noteworthy contradictions within his own reasoning: Unlike Șafran,

Nistor portrayed Bukovinan aristocracy (*boierimea*) as a stronghold of Romanian self-awareness and anti-Habsburg resistance. This is how he interpreted their reluctance to take part in sessions of the Galician *Sejm* during the years of Galician dominance, while he left the contradicting fact that Bukovinians had not hesitated to respond to a call for help from their 'adoptive motherland' during the 1809 war against Napoleon unexplained.⁹⁶ A similar inconsistency concerned the role of Bishop Hacman allocated to him by Nistor, when a delegation of prominent Bucovinians presented a list of wishes to Emperor Ferdinand in 1848:

O delegație în frunte cu episcopul Eugenie porni la Olmütz pentru a prezenta împăratului Ferdinand petițiunea unei țări, care, deși mică, era totuși *reprezentanța unei națiuni, a națiunii moldovenești*, după cum declara episcopul în alocuțiunea sa către împărat. [A delegation led by Bishop Eugen set off to Olmütz to present to Emperor Ferdinand the petition of a land that, however small, still *represented a nation, a Moldavian nation*, as the Bishop declared in his address to the Emperor.].⁹⁷

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

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

Some final remarks

It is challenging to find source material dealing with identity in Habsburg Bukovina that is not tainted somehow by a political agenda of sorts. After approximately one century since the Habsburg occupation of the territory,

the accounts from Austrian Bukovina's "finest hour" are already infiltrated by nationalist, ethnocentric and, in some cases, racist influences. Rosy pictures of a multi-ethnic family stemming from German-Austrian authors should be taken with a grain of salt, while nationalist pamphlets such as Iorga's and the "cultural mission" of a Franzos have little to do with serious historiography. The excitement experienced by Viennese correspondents when confronted with Bukovina's multi-ethnic exoticism risks depicting the local community in an overly segregated way.

Apart from presenting an impressive number of (sometimes arguable) facts, Greater Romania's nationalist studies are anti-innovative by definition, since they serve invariably to back Romanian nationalist dogmata such as "indigeneity" and "squeezing out". The nationalist canon approaches history in terms of "intruders", "oppressors", and "victims" and limits itself from the outset by claiming "rights" and "wrongs" and by endlessly trying to prove the same point with yet another avalanche of dates, statistics and census analyses.

Paradoxically, the scholar interested in other than nationalist versions of Bukovinian history is largely confined to exactly these nationalist authors. However, these authors grudgingly admit that their portrayal of events is more ambiguous than intended: Franzos is frustrated by the lack of Austrian efforts to consolidate its cultural superiority and the unwillingness of the "uncultured" people to adopt these standards, Iorga resents how Austrian breeding has "corrupted" his revered Romanianness, Platter breaks with the myth of the "noble peasant" by noticing a lack of community spirit and a inclination to irresponsible borrowing and Nistor sees the "historical population with its indigenous rights" openly threatened by the alleged Viennese invention of a *homo bucovinensis*. Nationalist sources themselves might therefore be valuable sources in the effort to demonstrate that there was more to Bukovinian history than nationalist fervour alone.

Post-socialist developments and recovered scholarly freedom initially led to a worrying general come-back of old-school nationalism and is, in some cases, still prominently present in recent Romanian (and Ukrainian) publications on Habsburg Bukovina. However, the newly obtained access to relevant source material inspires both Western and Eastern European scholars to produce more critical, less biased analyses. Combined with the possibility of free exchanges and discussions with fellow academics abroad, the debate on Bukovinian history is likely to become much more diverse and dynamic.

NOTES

- 1 Prokopowitsch 1959, p. 37: "Die acht Nationen, die dieses kleine Land bewohnten, das ein wahres Miniaturbild des national so vielgegliederten österreichischen Kaiserstaates darstellte, lebten seit der Angliederung dieses Gebietes an Österreich im J. 1775 fast ein volles Jahrhundert in Frieden und Einvernehmen. Sie waren alle in erster Linie Bukowinaer und Österreicher und nationale Sonderbestrebungen waren bei ihnen selten anzutreffen".
- 2 Leerssen 2005.
- 3 Brubaker 2006, p. 15.
- 4 "Wir wollten bloß einen Theil der Erfolge und den äußerlichen Verlauf durch Thatsachen markiren, aus welche die Wärme der Dankesempfindung sich erklärt, womit in diesen Tagen die ihrer eingedenke Bevölkerung der Bukowina die Feier der hundertjährigen Verbindung des Landes mit Oesterreich begeht". Bidermann 1875, p. 115.
- 5 Hofbauer, H., *Bukowina 1774 bis 1919: Österreichs Osterweiterung*, Cordon/Kusdat 2002, pp.13-22 (pp. 18-19).
- 6 Nistor 1991, p. 216.
- 7 Bidermann 1875, p. 61.
- 8 Ibid., p. 60.
- 9 Ibid., p. 66.
- 10 Ibid. p. 67.
- 11 Platter, Julius, *Der Wucher in der Bukowina*, Fischer , Jena 1878, p. 37.
- 12 The details of Franzos' biography are taken from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1910-1911.
- 13 Bentz , Oliver, *Franzos, Emil: Chronist einer verlorenen Welt*, Wiener Zeitung, 30 January 2004.
- 14 Pollack 1984, p. 140.
- 15 Corbea-Hoişie 2004, p. 36.
- 16 Franzos 1901, p. XXI.
- 17 Erdheim 2004.
- 18 Grigoroviță 1996, pp. 57 -73.
- 19 Franzos 1901, p. 227.
- 20 Ibid., p. XXXII.
- 21 Ibid., p. XXXIII.
- 22 Ibid., p. 265.
- 23 Ibid., p. 268.
- 24 Bentz 2004.
- 25 Franzos 1901, pp. XXXVIII-XXXIX.
- 26 When defending Vienna's refusal to recognize Jews as a nationality, Governor Regner von Bleyleben quoted Franzos in the provincial Diet in 1911: "(...) der Ihnen doch gewiß nahe steht und der noch vor 30 Jahren

- folgendes geschrieben hat: ‚Die jüdische Nation im Osten ist - ich muß es zu meiner Schande gestehen - noch eine eigene Nation mit ihren eigenen Sitten, Sprache und Gebräuchen‘. Und da wünschen Sie, daß diese Regierung diesen von Juden selbst als schmachvoll bezeichneten Zustand petrifiziere?“ [(...) who is surely very close to you and who has written only 30 years ago: ‘The Jewish nation in the East is – I have to confess to my own disgrace – not a separate nation with its own traditions, language and practices‘. And now you require this government to petrify this situation, which is labeled ignominious by Jews themselves?"] Regner von Bleyleben, Oktavian (2002). *Meine Zeit als Landespräsident der Bukowina.* , in Cordon/Kusdat 2002, p. 25.
- 27 Iorga 1905/2006.
- 28 See Nagy-Talavera 1998, p. 270, and Oldson 1973, p. 85. The authors mainly focused on the question whether Iorga had been an “assimilationist” and hence would allow Jews the status of “true Romanians” with Oldson being the more critical in this respect.
- 29 Oldson 1973, p.56: “At one time, he maintains that all foreigners mean ill for Romania, that not one – and there he names the Russians, Germans, and Jews – wishes the Romanians well. On other occasions he says that nationalistic politics, and hence Romanian nationalism in general, should have a deep respect for other nations. (...) As with so much of what Iorga says, though, I believe that Iorga’s initial sentiment of fear and distrust of foreigners remains closer to his true beliefs”.
- 30 Corbea-Hoişie 1996, pp. 81-82.
- 31 *Ibid.*, p. 120.
- 32 Corbea-Hoişie 1996, pp. 86-87.
- 33 Corbea-Hoişie 2003, p. 112.
- 34 Iorga 1905/2006, pp. 57-58.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 211
- 36 Nagy-Taravela 1998, p. 517.
- 37 Hobsbawm 1990, p. 12: “(...) I cannot but add that no serious historian of nations and nationalism can be a committed political nationalist, except in the sense in which believers in the literal truth of the Scriptures, while unable to make contributions to evolutionary theory, are not precluded from making contributions to archaeology and Semitic philology. Nationalism requires too much belief in what is patently not so.”
- 38 Iorga 1905/2006, p. 228: “Niçi el nu ştie româneşte. Dar, ştînd aşa pe gînduri, cu ochii aceia buni, duioşi, cari ni pătrund, el îşi *aduce aminte*.” [“He does not know Romanian either. But, thus rapt in thought, with those good, gentle eyes penetrating us, he *remembers*”).
- 39 Platter 1878.
- 40 Mischler 1893.
- 41 Obermayer-Marnach 1983.

- 42 Obermayer-Marnach 1975.
- 43 Platter 1878, pp. 38-40.
- 44 Mischler 1893, pp. 10-11.
- 45 Platter 1878, p. 41: "(...) bedenken wir, dass unter den sogenannten Deutschen der eigentlichen Stadtbevölkerung sich eine Menge Galizier befinden, denen leider von ihrem Deutschthum oft nichts als der Name übriggeblieben ist, die in der eigenen Familie lieber polnisch oder französisch als deutsch sprechen, erwägen wir ferner, dass unter diesen Deutschen auch getaufte Juden mitlaufen, deren Nationalität durch das Taufwasser nicht gewaschen werden konnte und die, selbst wenn schon ihre Eltern sich taufen liessen und sie selbst als Christen geboren wurden, dennoch ihrer Nationalität nach nur als Juden bezeichnet werden können (...)"
- 46 Mischler 1893, p. 6: "(...) macht man aber bedauerlicher Weise die Wahrnehmung, daß eingewandete Deutsche durch den Verkehr, durch Eheschließung, durch den Mangel an Zusammenhalt der Nation verloren gehen und nationallose Menschen mit 2 – 3, oder auch 4 ‚Umgangssprachen‘ werden, falls sie nicht etwa, wie besonders früher, geradezu polonisiert werden. (...) Es gibt unter den gemischt-sprachigen Ländern in Oesterreich wohl kaum ein so deutsches Land wie die Bukovina, wozu allerdings auch einigermaßen die starke jüdische Bevölkerung beiträgt."
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 7: "In jüngster Zeit scheint wieder ein Aufschwung des polnischen Elementes dadurch zu erfolgen, daß polnische Adelige größere Güter in der Bukowina aufkaufen".
- 48 Platter 1878, p. 43.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 50 Corbea-Hoişie 1996, p. 88.
- 51 Iorga, Nicolae, *Neamul românesc din Bucovina*, Minerva/Semne, Bucharest 1905/2006).
- 52 Platter 1878, p. 46
- 53 *Ibid.*, p. 54: This specific Franzos quote had not escaped Iorga's attention either: "Fiecare țară are Evreii ce merită', a zis cineva al cărui interes era să creadă astfel. 'Fiecare țară se poartă cu Evreii săi cum merită ei', trebuie să fie răspunsul. Cît merită însă această păcătoasă calicime leneșă, care spurcă țara pe care o locuiește?" ["Each country has the Jews it deserves' someone has said whose interest it was to believe as much. 'Each country deals with the Jews the way they deserve to be dealt with', the answer should be. What does that miserable, lazy poor lot, which desecrates the land, deserve?" See Iorga 1905/2006, p. 195.
- 54 *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- 55 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- 56 *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 43.

- 58 'Die soziale Schichte, welche demselben huldigen könnte ist klein, andererseits kommt der Westländer meist völlig fremd in das Land und bleibt nicht lange in demselben. Es ist für ihn mehr ein ‚Colonial-Leben‘, welches er führt und welches ihn abhält, in den Zuständen der Gesellschaft an sich Befriedigung zu suchen und zu finden (...)'. Mischler 1893, p. 2.
- 59 'Die Strafkolonie', *Bukowiner Rundschau* 2749, 11 June 1898.
- 60 Mischler 1893, p. 121: In the last chapter she noted: "Bei der großen, thatsächlich als Katastrophe zu bezeichnenden Ueberschwemmung, welche im September 1889 durch das Austreten des Pruth hervorgerufen wurde, und durch welche namentlich die niedriger gelegenen Judenquartiere der Hauptstadt zerstört wurden, machte ich eine Rundfahrt durch die bedrohten Gassen und trat auch in ein Haus, in welchem die Flut bis zur Schwelle reichte. Dert Besitzer, ein Chasside, trat auf mich zu und, während ich hergriffen die Verwüstung betrachtete, trug er mir ein Geschäft an." ["During the big flood caused by the overflowing of the Prut banks in September 1889, which could rightfully be described as a catastrophe and which destroyed especially the lower situated Jewish quarters, I visited the threatened alleys and also entered a house in which the flood reached the threshold. The owner, a Chassidic Jew, approached me and, while I was still smitten with the devastation, tried to do business with me".]
- 61 *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.
- 62 Šafran 1939.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 138: "Das grosse Zuströmen der Kolonisten, welche die Rumänen vom Handel und Handwerk verdrängten, liessen keinen rumänischen Bürgerstand aufkommen. Der Adel, der gleichzeitig die intellektuelle Klasse bildete, assimilierte sich dem deutschen Milieu".
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 183: "Dem Völkergemisch das die Bukowina bewohnte fehlte es an seiner einheitlichen kulturellen Richtung. Die Siedler hatten das Land mit fremden Elementen überschwemmt und ihm den rein rumänischen Charakter geraubt".
- 66 *Ibid.*, p. 79: "In diesem wahren Sprachen- und Völkergemisch sind allein die Rumänen eine einheimische, bodenständige Bevölkerung und Träger der historischen und kulturellen Traditionen dieses ehemaligen moldauischen Landstriches".
- 67 *Ibid.*, p. 85: "Und nur auf Grund ihrer historischen Vergangenheit und als Vertreterin einer besonderen, der rumänischen Nationalität, konnte die Bukowina im Jahre 1848/49 die Loslösung von Galizien anstreben und ihre politische Autonomie erwirken".
- 68 *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- 69 *Ibid.*, pp. 134-35.
- 70 *Ibid.*, p 207, curriculum vitae.
- 71 "Nécrologie Alexandre Šafran", *Le Monde*, 31 July 2006.

- 72 Source: <http://www.worldcat.org>.
- 73 Nistor 1991.
- 74 Neagoe 1991, pp. V-XVII.
- 75 Hausleitner 2001, p. 449.
- 76 See for instance Iorga 1905/2006, p. 208: "Ce e biserica, ortodoxă sau națională? Națională, spun Romîniî cu iubire de neam (...)".
- 77 Hausleitner 2006.
- 78 Nistor 1991, p. 90.
- 79 *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.
- 80 *Ibid.*, pp. 194-195.
- 81 Similar views are held in Romanian academic circles to this day and even appear in recent publications of the Romanian Academy: "Se demonstrează că 'Homo Bucovinensis' este un personaj inventat, fără identitate națională, ca să servească politicii antiromânești". ["It is proved that the *homo bucovinensis* is a character without a national identity, invented to serve anti-Romanian policies"], Vatamaniuc 2006, p. 533.
- 82 Nistor 1991, p. 207.
- 83 "Nun lehrt sowohl mich, als auch meinen ganzen romanischen und slavischen Clerus eine vieljährige Erfahrung, das Unzufriedenheit und Erbitterung gegen die Kirche, respective gegen den Clerus in der Bukowina, mag sie auch unbegründet sein, fast jedesmal einen Abfall von der Kirche selbst in Massen nach sich ziehe", in: Smal-Stocki 1899, p. 128.
- 84 Nistor 1991, p. 189.
- 85 *Ibid.*, p. 208.
- 86 This compromise provided a complicated system in which elections were held according to national representation. See Stourzh 1985, pp. 233-38.
- 87 Nistor 1991, p. 325.
- 88 *Ibid.*, p. 324.
- 89 Hausleitner 2006, p. 4.
- 90 Soviet authorities later employed the same method by distinguishing between "Romanians" and "Moldavians" when referring to the Romanians in Soviet (North) Bukovina.
- 91 Nistor 1991, pp. 101-02.
- 92 *Ibid.*, p. 309.
- 93 *Ibid.*, p. 22: "Raporturile dintre moldovenii bastinași și coloniștii străini - ruteni, germani, lipoveni, armeni etc. - erau cele normale, impuse de spiritul de ospitalitate tolerantă a românului. Deosebirea de religie impiedica însă căsătoriile între românii ortodocși și germani, catolici sau protestanți. În schimb însă, prin faptul că rutenii galițieni, așezîndu-se în Bucovina treceau de la biserica unită la cea ortodoxă, căsătoriile între români și ruteni deveniră foarte frecvente și adesea în dauna românilor. Românca,

mai isteafă, deprindea ușor limba străină a soțului ei, câtă vreme ruteancă nu prea învăța românește, impunând limba ei familiei întregi ».

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 166: “Cu modul acesta au început la noi petrecerile naționale, pînă acum necunoscute în Bucovina, încît străinii, minunîndu-se cum de venim noi, românii, a face bal în postul lor, dar în carnavalul nostru, au simțit înțîia oara ca ei se afla în țara străină și că sunt ei în minoritate, pe cînd înainte se simțeau ei stăpîni”.

⁹⁵ See for instance Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung, *Czernowitzer Angelegenheiten: Junimeaball*, 1498 (1909), p. 5, on the Junimea ball organized by the Romanian Junimea society: “(...) und die gesamte Intelligenz, die rumänische sowohl als auch die übrige, zu feierlichem und doch gemütlichem Beisammensein vereinigt” [“(...) and the entire intelligentsia, the Romanian as well as the others, [were] joined in a solemn yet cosy gathering”].

⁹⁶ Nistor 1991, pp. 58-59.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 94.

Bibliography

- ***, "Czernowitzer Angelegenheiten: Junimeaball", *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1498 (1909), p. 5.
- ***, "Die Strafcolonie", *Bukowiner Rundschau*, 2749, 11 June 1898, p. 1.
- ***, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1910-1911.
- BENTZ, O., "Franzos, Emil: Chronist einer verlorenen Welt", *Wiener Zeitung*, 30 January 2004.
- BIDERMANN, H. I., *Die Bukowina unter österreichischer Verwaltung 1775-1875*, Selbstverlag des Verfassers, Vienna, 1875.
- BRUBAKER, R. et al., *Nationalist politics and everyday ethnicity in a Transylvanian town*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2006.
- CORBEA-HOISIE, A., "Urbane Kohabitation in Czernowitz als Modell einer gespannten Multikulturalität", in *Neohelicon*, XXIII (1), 1996.
- CORBEA-HOISIE, A., *La Bucovine - Éléments d'histoire politique et culturelle*, Institut d'Études Slaves, Paris, 2004.
- CORBEA-HOISIE, A., *Czernowitzer Geschichten - Über eine städtische Kultur in Mitteleuropa*, Böhlau, Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, 2003.
- CORDON, C. and KUSDAT, H. (Ed.), *An der Zeiten Ränder: Czernowitz und die Bukowina: Geschichte, Literatur, Verfolgung, Exil*, Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft, Vienna, 2002.
- ERDHEIM, C., "Karl Emil Franzos „Aus Halb-Asien“ - Zum 100. Todestag des polnisch-österreichischen Schriftstellers", in *Illustrierte Neue Welt*, 8/9, Vienna, 2004.
- FRANZOS, K. E., *Aus Halb-Asien. Kulturbilder aus Galizien, der Bukowina, Südrussland und Rumänien*, Vol. 1, Concordia, Berlin, 1901.
- GRIGOROVITȚĂ, M., *Din istoria colonizării Bucovinei*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, Bucharest, 1996.
- HAUSLEITNER, Mariana, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina - Die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918-1944*, Verlag R.Oldenbourg, Munich, 2001.
- HAUSLEITNER, Mariana, "Der Griechisch-Orientalische Religionsfonds und die rumänischen Vereine in der Bukowina", in *Kirche und Nation in Ostmitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert (1848-1914)*, conference paper, Lüneburg, 2006.
- HOBBSAWM, E. J., *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- Iancu, C., "Nécrologie Alexandre Safran", *Le Monde*, 31 July 2006, online edition.
- IORGA, N., *Neamul românesc din Bucovina*, Minerva/Semne, Bucharest, 1905/2006.
- LEERSEN, J., *The Cultivation of Culture - towards a Definition of Romantic Nationalism in Europe*, Working Paper European Studies, Amsterdam, 2005.

- MISCHLER, M., *Soziale und wirtschaftliche Skizzen aus der Bukowina*, Weiß, Vienna/Leipzig, 1893.
- NAGY-TALAVERA, N.M., *Nicolae Iorga : A Biography*, Center for Romanian Studies, Iași/Portland, 1998.
- NEAGOE, S., *Ion Nistor, un istoric pentru eternitatea românilor de pretutindeni*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 1991.
- NISTOR, I., *Istoria Bucovinei*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 1991.
- OBERMAYER-MARNACH, E. (ed.), *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexicon 1815-1950*, VI. Band, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1975.
- OBERMAYER-MARNACH, E. (ed.), *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexicon 1815-1950*, VIII. Band, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1983.
- OLDSON, W.O. *The Historical and Nationalistic Thought of Nicolae Iorga*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1973.
- PLATTER, J., *Der Wucher in der Bukowina*, Fischer, Jena, 1878.
- POLLACK, M., *Nach Galizien: von Chassiden, Huzulen, Polen und Ruthenen : eine imaginäre Reise durch die verschwundene Welt Ostgaliziens und der Bukowina*, Christian Brandstätter, Vienna/Munich, 1984.
- PROKOPOWITSCH, E. *Das Ende der österreichischen Herrschaft in der Bukowina*, R. Oldenbourg, Munich, 1959.
- SMAL-STOCKI, S. (ed.), *Nationale und Kirchliche Bestrebungen der Rumänen in der Bukowina 1848 – 1865 [‘Von Bischof Hakmann in einem Sendschreiben dargestellt’]*, Ruska Rada, Czernowitz, 1899.
- STOURZH, G., *Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs, 1848-1918*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1985.
- SAFRAN, M. B., *Die inneren kulturellen Verhältnisse in der Bukowina (1825-1861)*, Druckerei “Argus”, Botoșani, 1939.
- VATAMANIUC, D., *Bucovina între Occident și Orient – studii și documente*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2006.