

The  
**Carl Beck  
Papers**

in Russian &  
East European Studies

Number 2108  
Volume 1

**Svetlana Frunchak**

**Studying the Land,  
Contesting the Land:**  
A Select Historiographic Guide  
to Modern Bukovina

Volume 1: Essay



The  
**Carl Beck**  
**Papers**

in Russian &  
East European Studies

Number 2108  
Volume 1

**Svetlana Frunchak**

**Studying the Land,  
Contesting the Land:**  
A Select Historiographic Guide  
to Modern Bukovina

Volume 1: Essay

Published in two parts:

Volume 1, Essay

Volume 2, Notes

**Svetlana Frunchak** has a BA (honors) in History and Education from Chernivtsi National University (Ukraine) and a MA in Political Science from Central European University (Hungary). She is a PhD candidate at University of Toronto, specializing in Soviet and East European history. Her academic interests include cultural, social, and urban history, nationality theory, and Jewish studies. Her doctoral research and publications examine the incorporation by Soviet Union of the newly acquired western borderland territories, focusing on the city of Chernivtsi, a former Habsburg provincial capital which had undergone a profound cultural and demographic transformation during and after World War Two. Svetlana's research has been supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Ontario Graduate Scholarship, Chancellor Jackman Graduate Fellowship in the Humanities, Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies, and University of Toronto.

No. 2108, November 2011

© 2011 by The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh

ISSN 0889-275X

*Image from cover:* Original painting by Olexandr Garmyder. Printed with permission from the artist.

*The Carl Beck Papers*

Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden, Andrew Konitzer

Managing Editor: Eileen O'Malley

Editorial Assistant: Julie N. Tvaruzek

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and between 40 and 90 pages in length, including notes. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4400 Wesley W. Posvar Hall, 230 South Bouquet Street, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

## **Abstract**

This guide surveys the historiography of Bukovina, a region adjacent to the slopes of the outer, eastern Carpathians in East Central Europe. This work is intended as an introductory guide to the historical literature on Bukovina, which is voluminous but not easily accessible to readers who are not familiar with Eastern European languages. Another purpose of this guide is to demonstrate how historiography became a tool for political and cultural controversy in a borderland region. The discourse about Bukovina's past, or rather the multiple controversial interpretations that tend to ignore each other, suggest that ideas of nationalism and territoriality, which have provided the major framework for conceptualizing of Europe's past and present since the late eighteenth century, continue to dominate historical writings about the region. A (linguistically equipped) student of Bukovina would be looking at a large variety of general studies and an even more striking number of period- and theme-specific studies, published at different times and in various places. The naïve researcher might be surprised to find quite divergent stories about the same region: many historical studies of Bukovina illustrate what might be called the borderland syndrome of contesting shared land—different ethnic communities produce quite separate historical narratives.

## Introduction

Over the course of the twentieth century, every time the East European region of Bukovina changed hands, the occasion was marked by replacing the statue in the central square of the capital. The politically neutral statue of Saint Maria, erected under Habsburg rule, gave way to a National Union memorial built by the interwar Greater Romanian authorities. That memorial was changed under the Soviet regime to a sculpture of Lenin, and later to the “national bard” Taras Shevchenko in independent Ukraine. Along with many others, these stone symbols were used by the authorities to construct a usable past for the disputed land and to tell the population of this once multicultural borderland how to identify themselves collectively in relation to their current state.

A less visual but by no means less important milieu for the construction of a past is represented by the historiography of Bukovina. By surveying this historiography, the present study serves two purposes. First, it is intended as an introductory guide to the historical literature on Bukovina, which is voluminous but not easily accessible to readers who are not familiar with Eastern European languages. My second purpose is to demonstrate how historiography became a tool for political and cultural controversy in a borderland region. Although it is designed primarily as a research aid, on a more general level I argue that a traditional historical model centered on the territorial state is not sufficient, and at times completely inappropriate, for understanding the complicated historical development of borderland regions and the Eastern European region in general.

The area later known as Bukovina is adjacent to the slopes of the outer, eastern Carpathians and is roughly delineated by the Dniester in the north, Bistrița in the south, and Siret on the southeast, with the Prut and Seceava rivers flowing through it eastward. The name Bukovina comes from *buk* meaning “beech tree” in eastern Slavic languages. Different variations of this toponym were rather common in Eastern and Central Europe. “Bukovina” was used locally but did not denote any political or administrative unit until the late eighteenth century. The road to modernity started for Bukovina in 1774, when, as a result of the Russian-Turkish war of 1768–1774 and Austria’s role as mediator in the peacemaking negotiations between the Russian and Ottoman empires, the territory was included *de facto* in the Habsburg Empire. The area had made up the margins of the medieval Slavic states and the early-modern Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until the mid-fourteenth century; it then gradually became a part of the Moldavian Principality, which, in its turn, had been a vassal state of the Ottoman Empire during the sixteenth century. Having obtained the

neighboring territory of Galicia (as a part of Poland) in 1772, the Austrian Empire considered Bukovina, which was rich in forests and rivers and had a predominantly cattle-breeding local population, to be a highly desirable territorial acquisition. According to Austrian military and political advisors, obtaining this corner of Eastern Europe was important because it provided better protection, restricted emigration from Galicia and other eastern provinces of the empire, prevented the spread of epidemics from the Ottoman territories, and made transportation to Galicia easier.

A typical Eastern European borderland, Bukovina was largely populated by Orthodox Slavic- and Romanian-speaking peasants and a small number of Jews. By the end of the Habsburg period in 1918, it was home to numerous German (Protestant and Catholic), Jewish (including Hasidic), Romanian, and Polish Roman-Catholic residents, and fewer numbers of Russians (Old Believers), Slovaks, Czechs, Hungarians (Szekler), and other migrants. The capital of the province, Czernowitz, was a modern Eastern European provincial capital, multiethnic if predominantly German-speaking. The diverse cultural character of the region began to change during World War I, when Bukovina became a battlefield on the eastern front, and more so between 1918 and 1940, when the region was part of Greater Romania. The process of cultural homogenization, a typical fate for a borderland region long claimed and finally acquired by a nationalistic European state, somewhat simplified the cultural demographics of Bukovina. World War II began in the region in 1940, when the Red army entered the northern segment and annexed it to the Soviet Union together with neighboring Bessarabia. A brief period of Soviet rule (June 1940–June 1941) was followed by a Romanian takeover (1941–1944) and then a second period of Soviet rule that lasted until 1991 when Chernivtsi province automatically became a part of the newly independent Ukrainian state. The war and the Holocaust made the demographic and cultural change in the region even more massive, brutal, and irreversible; the subsequent fifty years of Soviet rule reinforced this change through demographic and cultural policies as well as extensive manipulations of popular memory.

For a long time historians shied away from studying border areas like Bukovina and preferred to locate their research within the traditional frameworks of nation-state or empire. Borderlands, which often differ substantially from central regions in terms of population demographics and culture, do not fit into these traditional categories. Frontier areas present certain challenges not only for state-builders who try to incorporate them into the body politic, but also for historians—their multilingual populations, for example. Therefore borderlands used to be largely consigned to the realm of “nationalizing” narratives, ones written to support particular states

or claims. Recently the distinct concepts of border zones and boundaries received significant attention in the fields of anthropology and cultural studies,<sup>1</sup> which was followed by a new trend in western historical scholarship, namely, challenges to state as the dominant framework for historical research and the conceptualization of contested border areas as historical borderlands.<sup>2</sup> However, the history of Bukovina has not yet been seriously revised from this new perspective. The historiography of this region is still dominated by competing “nationalizing” accounts. Although an enormous number of studies of the region have been published primarily in Eastern European languages,<sup>3</sup> little is known in the West about Bukovina outside the scattered communities of the diaspora.

### **Structure and Limitations**

This paper surveys published primary sources and historical works devoted to the history of Bukovina between 1774 and 1991.<sup>4</sup> The material has been arranged topically and chronologically, based on events that traditionally signify major periods in the history of East-Central Europe and Bukovina in particular. Two topical sections surveying bibliographic aids and general historical studies are followed by five chronological sections dealing with the Austrian period, 1774–1914; the First World War, 1914–1918; the interwar Romanian period, 1919–1940, the Second World War, 1941–1945, and the Soviet period, 1945–1991. Each chronological section is preceded by a brief historical overview and includes two subsections: published primary sources and historical studies. Works are discussed in the sections dedicated to the periods dealt with in the text regardless of the date of publication. The chronological structure was chosen as the most convenient form of organizing an introductory guide; as a result, existing serious scholarly studies of Bukovina had to be included alongside the numerous highly selective and politicized accounts—the “nationalizing” narratives of Bukovina that reveal conflicting opinions about the region’s political affiliation and its population’s identity. Such accounts, although very useful, would be treated by most historians today as subjects of study rather than historical studies in and of themselves.

The guide covers historical literature devoted exclusively or primarily to the region. Broader historical studies containing separate chapters or sections on Bukovina are considered only if they make significant contributions to the historiography of the region. Except for the historical provincial capital of Bukovina, today’s Chernivtsi, studies of separate towns, other localities, and personalities are also omitted in most cases due to space limitations. Similarly, studies in historical ethnography,

anthropology, geography, and other related literature, as well as historical encyclopedias that do not have separate volumes on Bukovina and studies of Bukovinian diasporas, were not included in most instances as this material would be enough for a separate study. Published primary sources covered in the guide include collections of historical documents, memoirs, and major governmental, legal, and statistical publications. The guide also provides introductory surveys of the press in Bukovina and discusses available press guides, catalogues, and bibliographical studies.

## Nomenclature

As is common for borderlands, geographical locations and residents of Bukovina have been known by different names. As ideas of modern nationalism were gaining ground in East-Central Europe throughout the nineteenth century, self and mutual identifications of the various population groups and localities acquired highly politicized meanings that are reflected in the historical works surveyed.

The common English-language name is used here; other historical and present-day versions include Bucovina, Bukovyna, Bukowyna, and Buchenland. Since the region was officially divided between the USSR and the Romanian Kingdom, the name Bukovina has been most often used in combination with Northern (for the Soviet, or Ukrainian, part) and Southern (for the Romanian part). The largest part of the surveyed historical literature deals with the region as a whole or with its larger northern part which includes the historical provincial capital.<sup>5</sup>

Similar to the province itself, its capital city has been known under different names, all likely deriving from Chern, the name of a nearby medieval Slavic settlement.<sup>6</sup> The following are the most commonly used forms of the city's name: Czernowitz (German), Cernăuți (Romanian), Chernovtsy (Russian), and Chernivtsi (Ukrainian). In the early years of Soviet rule, different variations were also used (e.g., Chernovitsy) before the new official name was established in 1944. To reflect the historical political meanings of the city's name, the three most common names are used in this study: Czernowitz in discussions of the Austrian period (including World War I), Cernăuți for the Romanian period (including World War II), and Chernivtsi for the post-1944 era. Chernivtsi is also the administrative center of the Chernivtsi province (*oblast'*) of present-day Ukraine. Although the names Northern Bukovina, Chernivtsi province, and even Bukovina are often used interchangeably today, it is important to bear in mind that they are not synonymous. The name Bukovina obviously indicates the largest territory of all three; Chernivtsi *oblast'* technically includes two territories that, historically, were not considered parts of



Bukovina at all. The first is historically known as Northern Bessarabia and includes the districts of Novoselytsia, Khotyn, Kel'mentsi, and Sokyriany. The second, the Hertsa (Herța) district, was a territory in the Dorohoi region in the “Romanian Old Kingdom” (known as *Regat*) until 1940.

The politicization of nomenclature in studies of Bukovina is especially strong when it comes to ethnonym usage. The constructed nature of national identity, or any other popular identity, for that matter, is hardly doubted by western historians today. Since the ground-breaking works of Ernest Gellner<sup>7</sup> and Benedict Anderson,<sup>8</sup> which challenged the once common perception of nations as primordial units and national consciousness as a natural and inborn feeling of belonging to national communities, an impressive amount of research has provided important evidence in support of understanding national identity as a social and cultural construct. The complexity of the so-called nation-building process is especially evident in studies of borderland areas, where more than one national idea, promoted by political rulers or cultural elites, competed for the hearts and minds of borderland residents. Imposing official national identities on borderland populations did not necessarily mean these identities were internalized as intended by their proponents. In reality, popular identities were multilayered, fluid, and often opportunistic.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, any national group name should be taken with a grain of salt in a historical discussion of a borderland, as should any population statistics concerning such areas. The present study, however, deals primarily with historical studies whose authors not only take national identities for granted but also often have strongly politicized opinions about the numbers and roles of certain national groups in the area under consideration.

In the case of Bukovina, two cultural groups—Ukrainians and Romanians—are claimed by their elites to be indigenous and predominant in the area, resulting in fierce culture wars over population statistics during the twentieth century among local historians, and mutual accusations of forced nationalization policies. However, local populations in Bukovina, as in other borderland areas in East-Central Europe, had predominantly religious, regional, and peasant identities such as “a local” or “an Orthodox” throughout the nineteenth and rather late into the twentieth century. When ethnic identities became more common, older endonyms such as “Rusyn” and “Rus’ky” were used rather than the modern “Ukrainian.” “Ukrainian” and “Romanian,” therefore, are highly politicized and their use is problematic in the study of Bukovina. Yet avoiding these ethnonyms is even more problematic in a historiographic survey, a format that does not leave much space for theoretical discussions and critical analysis. Thus, having called upon the reader to approach

these terms critically, “Ukrainian” and “Romanian” are used here in keeping with historical usage.

Ethnonyms of other Bukovinian population groups are comparatively less problematic. The communities that settled in the territory of Bukovina in modern times as immigrants, in-migrants, or colonizers, were relatively easy to identify by language, religion, or strong community affiliation. The numerous cultural groups of Bukovina continued to use their traditional autonyms—Pole, German, Hungarian; Schwab, Szekler; Jew or Hasid. In most cases, these autonyms were also used by other groups to identify their bearers. Their traditional autonyms did not prevent different population groups from sharing other identities such as regional, urban, or religious; nor did the nonindigenous groups avoid politicization of their multiple ethnonyms and self-identifications.

## **Bibliographic Aids and Historiographic Studies**

### **Bibliographies from the Late Nineteenth Century to 1940**

The first bibliographic studies of Bukovina appeared in the region toward the end of the nineteenth century, revealing an outburst of scholarly interest in this comparatively new Austrian province. The early scholarly works were written by Austrian intellectuals whose interest was partly political. As a remote eastern borderland, Bukovina was perceived by the Austrian colonizers as a backward yet romantic land in need of development and worthy of admiration and meticulous study. Systematizing available information about the region was one of the primary tasks of Austrian authorities and intellectuals, resulting in the publication of a number of bibliographic aids covering Bukovina separately or along with other eastern provinces of the empire. The earliest one, a pamphlet about the history and holdings of the Czernowitz University library that appeared as early as 1885, contains a selective overview of literature on Bukovina.<sup>10</sup> In 1892, the historian Johann Polek published a directory of local lore studies,<sup>11</sup> followed by a brief survey of regional and folklore studies, covering literature since 1773.<sup>12</sup> Raimund Friedrich Kaindl, the most well-known historian and ethnographer of Bukovina in the Austrian era, whose life and work are briefly discussed below, also published two bibliographic surveys in the early 1890s.<sup>13</sup> Bibliographic works that appeared between the late 1890s and the outbreak of World War I were published almost exclusively in German and according to Austro-German scholarly traditions, although some came from a

younger generation of scholars of East European background trained in German-language universities.<sup>14</sup>

The next bibliographic study of the region was published only in 1940 in Germany under Nazi rule. It was compiled by Erich Prokopowitsch, one of the prominent historians of Bukovina in the post–World War II era, who started his academic career at Czernowitz University (Franz-Josephs Universität founded in 1875) and worked there until 1940, when he was “repatriated” to the Third Reich together with the majority of Bukovina Germans. His unannotated bibliographic directory is structured thematically, including sections on periodicals, statistical publications, literature on national movements and organizations, local studies and history, folklore studies, arts, education, church life, economics, and ethnography. The work was prepared during the interwar period in Bukovina and represents the old Habsburg bibliographic scholarship marked by meticulous classification and inclusiveness. However, it is also definitely marked by the spirit of the time of its publication, as it does not include any contributions made by Jewish authors. That omission, apparently dictated by the editor, is explained in a footnote under the transparent pretext that, due to the large number of such contributions, they could not be included in a single paper.<sup>15</sup>

### **Bibliographies Published After 1940**

After another long break, bibliographic studies of Bukovina were resumed only in the second half of the 1960s. Soviet bibliographic aids were the most numerous and regular in the postwar period. If Prokopowitsch’s study was likely meant as a bibliography of a lost land, the first Soviet bibliographic studies were produced to provide a scholarly introduction to a newly acquired land. Given the authoritarian nature of the then Soviet state and the exceptionally tense international situation of the moment, inclusiveness was not a priority for their authors and editors (and hardly even a possibility, given the isolation of Soviet scholars from the non-Soviet scholarship and sources). Instead, their primary task was to provide a highly selective reference aid to be used by future Soviet historians whose task was to rewrite the history of Bukovina according to Soviet Ukrainian standards<sup>16</sup> and to justify the incorporation of the region into the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Two bibliographic directories on the newly incorporated western regions of Ukraine were quickly prepared in 1940, but they hardly even mentioned Bukovina.<sup>17</sup> No separate directory on the Chernivtsi region was published in the 1940s and 1950s. This was partially due to timing: the German invasion began in less than a year after

the incorporation of Northern Bukovina into Ukraine in June 1940. In addition, the circumstances of Bukovina's annexation by the USSR and the official reasoning behind it were rather confusing.<sup>18</sup> Unlike other western Ukrainian regions such as Galicia, whose connection to the rest of Ukrainian territory was well established in Ukrainian historiography, both Soviet and emigrant, it was more difficult to fit Bukovina's existing historiography into the new grand narrative of Ukrainian history. Lest early Soviet bibliographies make Bukovina's "reunification" look like the colonization of a foreign land, it was better to maintain bibliographic silence until the "ideologically correct" Soviet historical studies of the region appeared after the war.

Soviet bibliographic studies of Bukovina included annual directories of newly published works and sources as well as ad hoc surveys, published as separate volumes or in scholarly periodicals.<sup>19</sup> Such publications were in most cases the responsibility of regionally based bibliographers and historians affiliated with the State University of Chernivtsi. Needless to say, Soviet bibliographic aids remained very selective and covered, with rare exceptions, only the works of Soviet scholars and writers.

Due to its historical background, Bukovina remained a subject of interest for German-language scholars in the second part of the twentieth century.<sup>20</sup> The first extended bibliographical study was compiled in the 1960s by Erich Beck, the major bibliographer of the region. His first volume, which covered the literature published up to 1965, was followed by two subsequent works covering the literature from 1965 to 1975 and from 1975 to 1990.<sup>21</sup> All three are unannotated and arranged chronologically, geographically, and according to the fields of study or nationality of the population. Although very extensive bibliographies, the first and second volumes have errors and omissions, and German sources predominate, which is in large part due to Beck's difficulty in accessing sources published behind the Iron Curtain. The content of the most recent volume is revised and extended to include many sources from Eastern Europe; however, omissions and errors still occur, particularly in the references to the older Eastern European studies. Nonetheless, Beck's works remain the most complete bibliographic studies of Bukovina to date and serve as important research aids.

The only English-language bibliographical study devoted to Galicia and Bukovina is a research handbook prepared by John-Paul Himka covering the period from the late nineteenth through the early twentieth century.<sup>22</sup> A limited edition intended for libraries and research institutions, it was initially developed for researchers at an open-air Ukrainian museum in Alberta, Canada (Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village) and thus represents primarily the Ukrainian population of Habsburg Galicia and Bukovina. The handbook includes published sources such

as local and communal administration reports and legislative documents; statistical publications; governmental, ecclesiastical, and educational tables of ranks; and selected periodicals of the Austrian period. Additionally, Himka reviewed many archival and library holdings located in and outside Bukovina, including those in North America. Most important, the work includes an un-annotated bibliography of Bukovina, which, although limited primarily to Ukrainian themes, can serve as a useful complement to Beck's bibliographies.

No separate bibliographies of Bukovina appeared in Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Communist bloc. The only exception is represented by a series of studies of the Ukrainian periodical press in Bukovina by Myroslav Romaniuk.<sup>23</sup> The studies examine Ukrainian periodicals of the region from the end of nineteenth through the beginning of the twentieth century as historical sources. The works contain conveniently organized periodical listings and descriptions which are complemented by extensive analysis of the subject. Detailed and valuable though they are, Romaniuk's works demonstrate clearly how the nation-centered approach to historical research creates, even if unintentionally, a distorted image of this borderland region's past. Not only is it hardly justified to single out the Ukrainian (or any other "national") press from the complex and multifaceted public sphere of Habsburg Bukovina, but the use of "Ukrainian" in the titles of the works imposes a contemporary national identity on a community that was far from homogeneous in its cultural and national self-perceptions.

### **Historiographic Studies**

Historiographic reviews that concern Bukovina are scarce. Similar to other historical studies of Bukovina published in the Soviet period, historiographic works of that time served the purpose of creating a Soviet Ukrainian historical narrative about the region. As demonstrated in more detail below, the Soviet narrative was based on two pillars. The first was the idea of the cultural and spiritual unity of the Bukovinian population with the population of the rest of Ukraine. This was based on the belief that ethnic Ukrainians were the primordial inhabitants of the region, subjugated or oppressed in various ways by foreign newcomers at different times. This idea was inseparable from the second pillar of the narrative: the Marxist idea of the social struggle to liberate the region from feudal and capitalist oppression (defined, most often, also in ethnic terms). Historiographic studies, by their nature, were designed as the most direct tools to crystallize this straightforward historical narrative from the mosaic of works on Bukovina's complicated past. Accordingly,

uncovering and condemning “the Western bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalistic falsifications of the history of Soviet Bukovina” was the major theme of the highly selective and doctrinal Soviet historiographic reviews.<sup>24</sup>

The authors of the historiographic surveys that appeared in Bukovina soon after the collapse of the USSR and the creation of the independent Ukrainian state only partially modified the traditional Soviet approach. First, they remain highly selective, rarely going beyond Ukrainian contributions to the field, with the exception of selected works by émigré Ukrainian historians. Second, the authors of these surveys tend to evaluate historical works almost exclusively according to their compatibility with the idea that Bukovina historically, culturally, and politically belongs in the Ukrainian domain.<sup>25</sup> The central paradigm of post-Soviet Ukrainian historiography, based on collective suffering and sanctified national unity, when applied to the history of a region that was contested and culturally diverse in the past, is revealed most clearly in the strong language of appropriation that is used to claim Bukovina for Ukraine time and again. An example of this approach is an article by Anatolii Kotsur and B. Bilets’kyi that, although claiming to cover all the literature from 1940 to 1996, cites only select Soviet studies, briefly mentions some post-Soviet works and works published in the Ukrainian diaspora in the West, and ignores other foreign studies, including Eastern European and Russian ones. The continuity between Soviet and post-Soviet Ukrainian historiography is especially clear in the case of Bukovina and the western Ukrainian regions. Repressions and Russification—aspects traditionally viewed as the evils of the Soviet regime—are downplayed to give priority to the “reunification” of Northern Bukovina with Ukraine, depicted as a natural and positive development. One should note that the most cataclysmic historical event, usually placed in the center of the Ukrainian paradigm of national suffering—the famine of 1932–1933—did not occur in Bukovina and other regions annexed during World War II.

Reviews that analyze the dominant nationalist concepts rather than reproducing them are still exceptions, not the rule. More analytical reviews are often authored by social scientists rather than historians,<sup>26</sup> as is the case with an article by Kurt Scharr on contemporary interpretations of Bukovina and Bukovinian identity by German, Austrian, Ukrainian, and Romanian authors.<sup>27</sup> The essay concerns studies written after 1991 and concentrates on the discourses around contemporary Bukovina. Along with selected historical works, which are not the author’s central focus, Scharr discusses press and Internet sites, conferences, popular editions, guides, exhibitions, textbooks, and other literature.

Of use, too, are reviews of Moldavian studies of the Holocaust by Diana Dimi-  
tru and Vladimir Solonari, although they are only partially relevant to Bukovina's  
history.<sup>28</sup>

## **General Historical Studies**

Since the end of the nineteenth century, when the first general historical works  
on Bukovina appeared, their number has grown impressively. Bukovina is the sub-  
ject of several encyclopedic volumes that provide brief histories of nearly all its  
numerically significant population groups. Some of them focus on particular cultural  
communities or ethnic groups; others allege to be general histories of the region and  
yet, most often, they implicitly voice the political beliefs of their authors and claim  
“historic rights” to Bukovina for their respective ethnic communities.

### **Austrian Studies from the Late Nineteenth Century**

The least ethnocentric were the general historical studies by the Austrian histo-  
rians of the Habsburg era. Written from the point of view of a “civilized” colonizer  
of an underdeveloped, recently acquired borderland, the first imperial historians  
of Bukovina could not and were not interested in claiming their ethnic roots in the  
region. If anything, they represented a political interest of a different nature: to  
study a land that was not theirs in the past, to develop it, and to make it theirs in the  
future. They reveal the role of their own ethnic group, and of their empire-state, for  
that matter, as undoubtedly progressive and exceptional and there was no need to  
assert it in any specific manner. According to the comparatively liberal nationality  
policies of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, the peaceful development of all ethnic  
groups of the region was desirable and beneficial, as long as the colonial status of  
the land was not jeopardized.

Scholarly research began right after the annexation of Bukovina in 1774.  
Encouraged by the Austrian administration, historical and ethnographical studies  
of Bukovina were rather numerous. Austrian historians were equally meticulous  
in studying archaeological and written sources to research the early periods of Bu-  
kovina's history. Their general interpretation of this history can be summarized as  
follows: the eastern Slavs, officially identified as Ruthenians,<sup>29</sup> inhabited the region  
from as early as the fifth century CE; in later periods, Bukovina's comparatively  
more developed economy continuously attracted migrants from neighboring regions,  
primarily populations who spoke Romance languages or dialects and were known  
as Walachians (Vlachs) or Moldavians, but also Poles, Jews, and Hungarians among

others; in the course of its history Bukovina became a home for many nationalities; its inclusion in the Austrian Empire promoted the region's rapid cultural, urban, and economic development which, in turn, provided an opportunity for peaceful coexistence and for numerous ethnic groups to thrive. Although the majority of the studies representing this interpretation were written in German, the official language of the province, some were published in other languages common in the then established scholarly world, including Polish.<sup>30</sup>

The first monographic general history of Bukovina was written by Raimund Friedrich Kaindl, the most well-known and prolific historian of the region in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who embodied Austro-German intellectual interest in Bukovina. Born in Czernowitz to a German mother and an Austrian father, Kaindl was raised by his educated parents to admire Austro-German civilization. From childhood he was truly fascinated by Bukovina's diverse inhabitants. Upon completion of his study of German linguistics, Austrian history, and geography at Czernowitz University, he defended his second doctoral dissertation (*Habilitationssarbeit*) in Vienna on the Austrian annexation of Bukovina. He then returned to Bukovina where he lived and worked until he had to leave the region during World War I.<sup>31</sup> In addition to two detailed general historical accounts of Bukovina from the earliest times to the end of nineteenth century, Kaindl published an extensive history of Ruthenians in Bukovina, the first comprehensive history of Bukovina's capital Czernowitz, and a number of more specific works.<sup>32</sup>

Probably the most impressive Austrian encyclopedic edition dedicated to Bukovina is the illustrated thirteenth volume of *Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy in Words and Pictures*.<sup>33</sup> The purpose of the volume was to popularize this Austrian province among western readers. Along with a detailed historical overview, the volume includes sections on ethnography, art, literature, and religious institutions. The historical section, by Josef Szombathi, Johann Polek, Ferdinand Zieglauer von Blumental, and Dimitrie (also Demetrius, Demetr) Onciul, represents very well the official nineteenth-century historiographical concept of Bukovina's past, outlined above.

### **Slavic Interpretations in the Late Austrian Period**

A different variety of general works on Bukovina's history began to appear at the turn of the century as the ideas of "national revival" gained ground among the eastern Slavic intelligentsia. Bukovina became a subject of interest for the representatives of two major intellectual movements that spread among the eastern Slavs



of Austria-Hungary and their supporters in the Russian Empire. The Russophiles or, sometimes, Moscophiles, advocated the unity of all eastern Slavs in a single Russian nation; they considered the Slavs of Eastern Europe as the once lost branches of the Great Russian people. Russophiles used the autonym of the Bukovinian eastern Slavs—Rusyns—in support of this argument and eagerly conceptualized Bukovina as a “forgotten Russian corner in Austria.”<sup>34</sup> The rival intellectual current was represented by the early Ukrainian national movement, often referred to as Ukrainophile. Works representing this view were less numerous and more defensive, describing Bukovina’s native Slavs as oppressed Ukrainians who had not yet discovered their true nationality.<sup>35</sup>

Most of the works on Bukovina with a Russophile and Ukrainophile orientation were not published in Bukovina, where any kind of Slavic national idea remained weak until the interwar period, but in Galicia, Dnieper (e.g., Russian) Ukraine, or Russia proper. The majority of these works were written in Russian or one of the eastern Slavic idioms, mostly in the form of brochures, articles, or pamphlets. Although they did make strong historical arguments, these Russophile works and their early Ukrainophile counterparts often were descriptive in style and ethnographic in nature—a typical phenomenon in the later nineteenth century, the time of romantic nationalism and strong ethnographic interest in the intellectual life of Eastern Europe. Naturally, these works put an emphasis on the local eastern Slavic (Rusyn/Rus’ki) inhabitants of the region and viewed them as undoubted natives of this territory, which, in general, did not contradict the official Austrian view. In fact, works that were historical in nature, such as Myron Korduba’s textbook prepared in the early 1900s for Ukrainian schools in Bukovina, were compilations from earlier Austrian historical studies.<sup>36</sup>

### **Romanian Interpretations of the Late Austrian and Interwar Periods**

The eastern Slavic national movements were not the only ones to claim the borderland region of Bukovina. The rival of both Great Russian and Ukrainian national ideas in and about Bukovina was the Romanian national idea which developed at about the same time. As Romanian nationalism, inspired and supported by the young, irredentist Romanian state created in 1878, spread among groups of the younger generation of historians and other intellectuals in Bukovina, a variety of works appeared that offered a different, Romanian, conceptualization of the region’s history.<sup>37</sup> Most of these works were formal scholarly studies with a stress on political

development and statistics as opposed to Slavic popular literature or ethnographic studies. They reflected the later stage of the Romanian national movement which leaned on the pillar of an existing independent nation-state and was much more political and concrete than the amorphous eastern Slavic ideas, developing in oppressive conditions.

This Romanian vision of Bukovina's past was at the same time very similar to and very different from the eastern Slavic narratives. Their similarity is strikingly evident in the singling out and preoccupation with the autochthonous population of Bukovina, which made both eastern Slavic and Romanian conceptualizations distinct from the official Austrian one that stressed the diversity of the population and the economic development of the region as a whole. The Romanian version claimed that the Romanian population was the indigenous one, resulting in a historical narrative of Bukovina that looked quite different from the Austrian and the Slavic variants. It was based on the "theory of Ruthenianization of Bukovina" and had the following basic outline: the Romanian population that descended from proto-Romanians of Roman Dacia had populated the territory of Bukovina since prehistoric times and had always constituted a majority of the region's inhabitants; eastern Slavs, referred to as Ruthenians, migrated to the province primarily from neighboring Galicia much later, mostly after the annexation of Bukovina by the Austrian Empire. According to the Romanian interpretation, this migration was strongly encouraged by Habsburg authorities and led to the assimilation of many local Romanians by the Slavic newcomers. The Romanian version also stressed that the territory of Bukovina never constituted a part of any eastern Slavic medieval entity but had been part of the Moldavian Principality from early times.

As demonstrated in the following sections, the arguments between eastern Slavic and Romanian authors on the issue of the early native population and, therefore, the question of who should rightfully "inherit" Bukovina, became the leitmotif of the historiography of this borderland throughout and beyond the twentieth century. At the turn of the nineteenth century, however, the proponents of the Romanian interpretation were much more aggressive in claiming their historic rights to this land than were their eastern Slavic counterparts. Partially due to the different, more political and irredentist stage of the Romanian national movement in general, this assertiveness can also be explained by the fact that the Romanian conceptualization of Bukovina's history went openly against standard Austrian interpretations. Generally, following the founder of modern Romanian historical scholarship, Xenopol, Romanian historians of the early twentieth century preoccupied by relations with their Slavic neighbors were increasingly turning to fierce nationalist polemics and

advocating openly chauvinistic, exclusivist views of the Romanian state. Relations with Russia were largely conceived in terms of the Russian assault on Romanian independence in order to erase Romanian “nationality.” And Romanian “rights” to the disputed borderland “principalities” were most often established on the basis of the “continuity” of Romanian statehood in these territories.<sup>38</sup>

The nineteenth-century Romanian interpretation of the history of Bukovina and Bessarabia culminated during the last two decades of Austrian rule in the works of Ion Nistor and Nicolae Iorga. These authors continued their studies during the interwar Romanian period, when the Romanian interpretation became the official one.<sup>39</sup> In fact, the interwar geopolitical concept of the Romanian state, based on significant territorial expansion and justified by supposed ethnic kinship, was strongly influenced by Nistor. He himself became an important politician and statist ideologue.<sup>40</sup> Besides Nistor and Iorga, who were major figures in Romanian historical scholarship, a number of other, Bukovina-based authors published a variety of works whose politicized and assertive characters are no less obvious than that of the larger general works mentioned above.<sup>41</sup>

### **Ukrainian Studies between 1918 and 1991**

In 1928, a fascinating study was published in the then capital of Ukraine, Kharkiv.<sup>42</sup> This work, *Bukovina: Its Past and Present, a Social-Political Sketch with Illustrations and a Map of Bukovina*, was the only general Ukrainian study of the interwar period. Its author was Hryhorii Piddubnyi, an immigrant from Romanian Bukovina who was equally attracted to communism and Ukrainian nationalism. After several years of lively publishing activity in an atmosphere of remarkable development in Ukrainian culture—the “executed renaissance”—during the Soviet Ukrainianization campaign, Piddubnyi was arrested in one of several waves of repressive purges in the 1930s. He wrote *Bukovina*, he said, to provide citizens of Soviet Ukraine as well as Bukovinian emigrants in America with credible information about the region. As he acknowledged, his sketch had a limited source base due to difficulties accessing material; the book relied on pre–World War I works, including many by R. F. Kaindl, as well as press material and even oral testimonies, particularly for the post–World War I period. *Bukovina* consisted of three sections dedicated to geographical and historical background; the characteristics of the Romanian period, including the transfer process, the police system, the Romanianization of culture, and education; and descriptions of “socially active forces”—“peasants, workers, and political parties. Although generally following a Marxist interpretation of Bukov-

inian history, Piddubnyi stressed the ethnic argument that Bukovina “belonged” to Ukraine while also emphasizing its uniqueness, taking a defensive line against the tendency of Ukrainian historians to either include the region within “western Ukraine” or ignore it entirely. After Piddubnyi’s arrest, interest in Bukovina among Soviet Ukrainian historians ceased, only to revive after the region became a part of the Ukrainian republic in 1940.

When, after a long break, a new generation of general studies of Bukovina began to appear in the mid-1950s, the competing interpretations were ethnicized and politicized to the extreme. Romanians’ fierce assertiveness was mirrored and challenged in two Ukrainian versions. One was the official narrative based on Marxist ideology and on the Soviet variety of Ukrainian nationalism; the second came from communities of Ukrainian emigrants from Bukovina, many of whom were right-wing nationalists. During the Cold War, when access to sources located behind the Iron Curtain was limited and serious ideological censorship or self-censorship became a requirement of historical scholarship on both sides, several interpretations of Bukovina’s history emerged. It was as if there were two Bukovinas, each existing in a separate (imagined) reality within a corresponding national history.

Émigré works are well represented by a voluminous general history of the region which appeared in 1956. The book, *Bukovina—its Past and Present*, was prepared by Arkadii Zhukovs’kyi, Denys Kvitkovs’kyi, and Teofil Bryndzan, all of whom were affiliated with the Ukrainian diaspora in the west.<sup>43</sup> One part was dedicated to current conditions and included sections on geography, ethnography, folklore, national and social composition, economy, politics, culture and education, church and religion, public organizations, Bukovina in international treaties, local histories and the diaspora. Most important for the present study, however, was the book’s extended general history. Unlike its descriptive or populist precursors from the turn of the century, this interpretative work conveyed the still dominant, standard nationalist conception of modern Ukrainian history. Founded by the historian Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi, the national historical myth was based on continuity between the medieval protostate Kievan Rus’, the later medieval and early modern eastern Slavic principalities, and the modern Ukrainian state, on the one hand, and on equating the history of the state with the history of the people, on the other. Accordingly, Zhukovs’kyi’s work turned Bukovina into a Ukrainian land torn away from its mother-state and put its political, cultural, and economic past in the context of Ukrainian history. The authors were heavily focused on eastern Slavs (now retrospectively referred to only as Ukrainians) and only marginally discussed other nationalities. In more contextualized terms, the primary purpose of the authors of

*Bukovina—Its Past and Present* was to refute Romanian claims to the region and prove that Bukovina was a “truly Ukrainian land.”

In addition to the traditional argument that eastern Slavs represented the autochthons of the region, the work emphasized that Bukovina was a part of Kievan Rus’ and the later Galician-Volhynian principality. These were crucial milestones in the perceived continuum of Ukrainian national statehood. Consequently, all other rulers in Bukovina were seen as foreign invaders and suppressors of the native (proto-) Ukrainian population. The Austrian era was considered the lesser evil for Bukovinian Ukrainians, and Soviet rule was represented as “the most tragic” period.<sup>44</sup> The latter was interpreted largely in terms of a “Judeo-Communist” conspiracy myth, while the actions of members of the radical Ukrainian nationalist movement, represented by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), were glorified, even though their activity in Bukovina never reached significant proportions and was substantially an import from the neighboring regions of Galicia and Volhynia.<sup>45</sup> Several other contributions to the historiography of the region were made by scholars affiliated with the Ukrainian diasporas, including a fairly voluminous study of the history of law in Bukovina and Bessarabia from earliest times to 1944.<sup>46</sup>

The Soviet Ukrainian interpretation of Bukovina’s history shared the western diaspora’s understanding of earlier periods. They both highlighted the continual struggle of the people of Bukovina for reunification with brethren in the rest of Ukraine. The Soviet works cited the same Austrian sources and used the same arguments about the native eastern Slavic population, the political affiliation with Kievan Rus’ and with later Slavic principalities, and the nationally oppressive essence of interwar Romanian rule in Bukovina. It differed from the nationalist Ukrainian interpretation in two ways: first, it put greater emphasis on social oppression and class struggle, and, second, it asserted the strong and continuous ties of the Ukrainian population of Bukovina with Russians in terms of culture, economy, and revolutionary tradition.

The good and evil historical forces in the two Ukrainian variants differed sharply, though, when it came to the Soviet period. A disaster for Ukrainians (not only in Bukovina) in the eyes of Ukrainian nationalist emigrant historians, Soviet rule was conceptualized in Soviet Ukrainian historiography as the successful conclusion to a century-long struggle for Bukovina’s national and social liberation, and a glorious time of long-needed reform and improvement for this poverty-ridden, socially and culturally backward, and oppressed region. The earlier periods were represented by dry accounts of political events, schematic narratives of economic

developments and social exploitation, and tremendously exaggerated stories of each social upheaval.

Discussions of the region's non-Ukrainian population in Soviet historiography were mainly limited to the discourse of social and national oppression. Although the historical presence of a number of Romanian peasants and workers was acknowledged, re-christened as Moldavians in official Soviet historiography and general official discourse, their minority status was firmly established. The presence and significance of the Jewish population in Bukovina at any time in the past became a non-topic, reflecting not only the need to stress Ukrainian dominance, but also the official and popular anti-Semitism of the late-Stalinist and post-Stalinist Soviet Union in general and Soviet Ukraine in particular. Although brief studies dedicated to specific periods and subjects, discussed below, were numerous, only a few general studies came out during the Soviet period. Several general studies were published between 1956 and 1980.<sup>47</sup> The best representation of the Soviet Ukrainian narrative of Bukovina's past can be found in a volume on Chernivtsi province in the encyclopedic series *A History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR*.<sup>48</sup> Its largest part, though, was devoted to separate villages and towns of the province. Its chapters on the history of the region as a whole and on the city of Chernivtsi well represent the Soviet vision of Bukovina's past, as do propagandist historical sketches and guidebooks with brief historical surveys that are the most schematic illustrations of the glorifying Soviet transformation of Bukovina after the "dark ages" of foreign exploitation.<sup>49</sup>

### **Post–World War II Romanian Studies**

Similar to developments in the Ukrainian historiography of Bukovina, Romanian interpretations were modified in the postwar period, when Romania became part of the so-called Communist bloc. Since territorial revisionism was a taboo in Socialist Romania, its historians largely avoided Bukovina and other borderlands lost by Romania until the collapse of the Soviet empire. Some general historical works published in the 1950s even had to put forward claims that reflected an official, internationalist position and "friendly" relations with the USSR. Therefore, the interwar annexation of Bukovina to Romania was conceptualized as an occupation made possible by the difficult international situation of the young Soviet Ukrainian Republic.<sup>50</sup> This position was not long-lived, however, and changed when the Romanian Communist leader Ceaușescu proclaimed his "independent course" in the mid-1960s. His ideas were based on promoting the unitary nation-state, claims

of historical continuity with the pre-Communist era, and ethnic nationalism. This change was reflected in a national historiography that, among other tendencies, began resurrecting interwar claims for borderland areas.<sup>51</sup>

Meanwhile, émigré Romanian scholars continued to focus on Bukovina (if only as a geographic extension of Bessarabia) throughout the postwar era, taking a strongly nationalist and irredentist stand. Similar to interwar and wartime Romanian works, the major analytical premise of émigré publications dating from the Cold War era was the Romanian search for national unity and the meaning of borderlands for national unification. For example, several contributions to a collection of articles entitled *The Tragic Plight of a Border Area* emphasised the old argument about mass Ukrainian colonization of Bukovina allegedly enforced by the Habsburg government and generally characterized the Austrian period as the time of “frustration and despair” for local Romanians.<sup>52</sup> However, in the postwar period, the main focus shifted from the autochthonous population to the pre-World War II Soviet-Romanian conflict and the alleged historical unfairness of the annexation of Bessarabia and Bukovina by the Soviet Union, as well as the Soviet project of forging a separate Moldavian national identity in Bessarabia. *The Tragic Plight*, and a book by Nicolas Dima, *Bessarabia and Bukovina: The Soviet-Romanian Territorial Dispute*, are the most important representations of the émigré Romanian treatment of this subject.<sup>53</sup> Both books are focused heavily on Bessarabia, extending their general arguments to Bukovina in passing mentions. Dima’s book is a more coherent narrative which begins with a detailed account of the “search for Romanian national unity” before the creation of the modern Romanian state. It then outlines the troubled Soviet-Romanian relations of the interwar years, resulting in the “historically unfair” annexation of Bessarabia and Bukovina by the Soviet Union. Finally, it discusses the creation and promotion of an artificial Moldavian identity mixed with the policies of Russification in the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic created within the USSR in 1940. Like several contributors to Manoliu-Manea’s collection, Dima offers a detailed analysis of socioeconomic developments based on statistical data, explaining, for example, the connection between the influxes of Russians and Ukrainians and the preferences given to Slavs over Romanians. Dima also pays much attention to linguistic assimilation in Russification policies. Generally, he blames the ethnic “tragedy” of the regions under consideration on the central Soviet government, formally asserting a friendly attitude toward Ukraine, “the true neighbor of Romania.”<sup>54</sup> At the same time, he operates with essentialist, primordialist categories pertaining to national identities and “feelings.” When stating, for instance, that all Moldavians are “Romanians in their hearts,”<sup>55</sup> Dima joins the authors of several contributions to Manea’s collection

who eagerly employed emotional language such as “national tragedy” and “cultural genocide” when discussing the Soviet annexation. At the same time they openly asserted “the rights of Romania to Bessarabia and Bukovina” when analyzing the current political situation.<sup>56</sup>

### **Other Interpretations in the Post–World War II Period**

The postwar Ukrainian and Romanian narratives about Bukovina, constructed around the central themes of “historic rights” and the antagonism between “natives” and “invaders,” represent only one part of the historiographic profile of the region. Another part was contributed by members of communities who used to see Bukovina as their home and who, thanks to their large numbers, their political and economic positions, or cultural influence (or any combination of these factors) played important roles in its historical development. These communities—primarily Jews, Austro-Germans, and, to a lesser extent, Poles—could never “claim” Bukovina for themselves in the way Ukrainians and Romanians did, speculating about their historical rights to the land. However, they did reclaim their roles in Bukovina’s past, roles that were almost completely ignored or seriously misrepresented by the dominant Romanian and Ukrainian interpretations. In doing so, they produced their own versions of Bukovina’s history.

One such version was the two-volume, illustrated collection, *The History of the Jews in Bucovina*, edited by Hugo Gold (1962).<sup>57</sup> Organized chronologically, it included two general historical accounts dealing with the pre-1919 period and the time between 1919 and 1944. The rest of the work consisted of articles on specific subjects: religious life, organizations and political parties, sport, local histories, and personal accounts, the latter mostly concerning the Holocaust. The general historical chapters were extensive and represented a nostalgic account of Bukovina’s past through the prism of its Jewish community’s history. Bukovina was conceptualized in this collection, essentially, as a lost homeland for the Jews who found in Bukovina conditions and opportunities unique for Eastern Europe. In the Jewish interpretation, the Austrian period was the golden age; Romanian rule was “the beginning of the end,” with its nationalistic trends and anti-Semitic policies; and both World War II and the Soviet period were disastrous.

Another narrative of Bukovina’s past with a similar outline and nostalgia for the lost land can be found in an encyclopedic collection on the history of Germans in Bukovina edited by Franz Lang (1961) and in several other Austrian and German studies published between the 1960s and 1980s.<sup>58</sup> The former volume includes



works by the older generation of historians, such as Erich Prokopowitsch, as well as younger scholars, including Erich Beck and Emanuel Turczynski. Although a direct heir to the general histories of Bukovina published in the Austrian period, the collection is a history written by the expellee, not the colonizer, mourning the loss of the “Motherland of yesterday” that had to be abandoned.<sup>59</sup> Like Gold’s collection, Lang’s focuses on the history of a single cultural group—the Germans of Bukovina—but actually offers an Austro-German reading of the history of Bukovina. Both are written clearly from ethnocentric perspectives. And yet, paradoxically, by acknowledging the minority status of their ethnic groups and by illuminating their interactions with other populations and their respective roles in the life of the region, these regional histories construct more complete and complex narratives of Bukovina’s past than do the allegedly comprehensive studies by Romanian and Ukrainian historians of the postwar period.<sup>60</sup>

### **Post–1991 Studies**

The big picture of Bukovina’s historiography remained largely unchanged despite some modifications provoked by the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the interpretation of post–Cold War Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The history of Bukovina has not been reconceptualized beyond paying tribute to the new demands of minimal political correctness. One of the new developments was improved access to sources for research all over the world resulting, among other things, in a renewed interest in Bukovina. In addition, some modifications, although often superficial, were made to the major rival interpretations of Bukovina’s history: Marxist elements were eliminated, while nationalist Ukrainian and Romanian versions had to include some appreciation for Bukovina’s past diversity and for the complexity of its historical development. Finally, a nostalgia-driven interest in the history of Bukovina among the diasporic communities has weakened somewhat, as fewer first- and second-generation emigrants from the region remain alive or aware of their background. The authors of the numerous general publications that have appeared since the early 1990s not only cite each other’s works, but also meet at conferences dedicated to Bukovinian studies and publish their research in collections of articles. The historical diversity of the region has been almost universally acknowledged; moreover, the concept of multiculturalism now dominates the shared rhetoric of Bukovinian studies. Underneath this rhetoric, however, the essence of the different interpretations of Bukovina’s history in Europe, as well as the nature of the differences between them, remains unchanged.

While most German-language books and collections continue to promote the image of the lost land of unique tolerance and peaceful multiculturalism, idealizing Austrian politics and the civilizing role of German-language culture, Ukrainian and Romanian works are largely engaged in two competing projects of historical construction. One of the first German publications of the post-Soviet era—a collection of essays that resulted from a trip to Bukovina by intellectuals with Bukovinian backgrounds—departed from the traditional depiction of Austrian Bukovina as the “Switzerland of the East” and a perfect example of tolerance and multiculturalism.<sup>61</sup> If this early, impressionist collection revolved around the naïve question of whether it was possible for Bukovina to go “back to Europe,” later German studies revealed more differentiated, sophisticated, and research-based approaches, although without making a complete break with the “lost paradise” model.<sup>62</sup>

Post-Soviet Ukrainian revisionism, based on a Soviet narrative that has been cleansed of Marxist jargon, the rhetoric of the friendship of peoples, and other visible markers of Soviet ideology, and amended with elements of the alternative, émigré interpretation of Ukrainian history, is well represented by a collective history of Bukovina published in 1998 by a group of historians at Chernivtsi University. The book, formally edited by the university’s president, Stepan Kostyshyn (a professor of biology), but in fact written by a group of local Ukrainian historians, is a history of the Ukrainians of Bukovina and their struggle against foreign occupations.<sup>63</sup>

Post-1991 Romanian revisionism is well represented by a voluminous collection of studies and documents, *Bukovina between West and East*, written and edited by Dimitrie Vatamaniuc.<sup>64</sup> This book depicts Austrian rule as the initial and primary violation of historical “objectivity” by tearing the region away from Romania and attacking the Romanian Orthodox Church as a landholding, cultural, and national institution. Vatamaniuc also presents Ukrainians as the beneficiaries of this historical unfairness and calls upon them to acknowledge themselves as colonizers in Northern Bukovina. His vision of the reconciliation of Romanian, Ukrainian, and German historians in their “fight” over Bukovina is emblematic of the limits of revisionism in contemporary historical studies of the region. In his introductory article, he suggests that historians sit down at a round table, present their documents and decide, once and forever, what ethnos formed the native community and is thus the rightful heir to Bukovinian land.

Vatamaniuc’s and Kostyshyn’s books, as well as other recent general and survey studies of Bukovina by Romanian and Ukrainian authors, contain an array of fascinating details about various aspects of their people’s past in the area. They elaborate themes marginalized in Cold War studies because of ideological limita-

tions (for Soviet Ukrainian and Socialist Romanian studies) or the lack of access to sources (for émigré studies), such as the lives and work of local intellectuals and artists, and the development of various cultural, social, and professional movements. These post-1991 studies accommodate some minorities in their histories of Bukovina, but they still construct these histories on the foundations of nationalist ideologies that are restrictive, exclusivist, and ethnocentric.<sup>65</sup> An important aspect of these construction processes is to republish earlier studies.<sup>66</sup>

One feature of recent studies of Bukovina published in Eastern Europe is the astounding reduction, almost to the point of total absence, of Jewish presence in the historical narrative. A recent monograph, coauthored by the literary theorist Marianne Hirsch and the historian Leo Spitzer, began to fill this lacuna. Their book, dedicated primarily to the Jewish memory of Czernowitz, also provides an excellent brief survey of the city's and, to a lesser extent, the region's history through the prism of its Jewish participants.<sup>67</sup>

A number of scholarly periodicals wholly or partially devoted to historical studies of Bukovina have appeared at different times. *Kaindl-Archiv* quarterly, named for R. F. Kaindl, has been published since 1978 by the Bukovina Institute, a research organization in Stuttgart sponsored by former Bukovina Germans.<sup>68</sup> Similar centers for Bukovinian studies in Romania have been publishing two periodicals, *Analele Bucovinei* (Bukovinian Annals) and *Glasul Bucovinei* (Voice of Bukovina), since 1994.<sup>69</sup> Still in the 1970s, two volumes of the series *Mynule i suchasne Pivnichnoi Bukovyny* (Past and Present of Northern Bukovina) came out in Kiev.<sup>70</sup> Three periodicals have been published in Chernivtsi: a single issue of an intended annual entitled *Visnyk tsentru Bukovynoznavstva* (Bulletin of the Center for Bukovina Studies) came out in 1993;<sup>71</sup> also from the Center for Bukovina Studies, *Zelena Bukovyna* (Green Bukovina), dedicated primarily to environmental issues but containing some articles on the history of Bukovina;<sup>72</sup> and the multidisciplinary almanac *Bukovyns'kyi zhurnal* (Bukovinian Journal), a local periodical largely devoted to Bukovinian studies.<sup>73</sup> Several scholarly series published by Chernivtsi National University are dedicated primarily to the history, politics, and culture of Bukovina.<sup>74</sup> Articles from these periodicals are discussed below according to their research subjects and periods.

## Studies of the Austrian Period, 1774–1914

The diplomatic settlement between Austria and the Ottoman Empire that led to Bukovina's annexation began in 1774. Delineating the borders took two years and involved many actors, both central and local, from the Austrian, Russian, Ottoman, and Moldavian sides. The inclusion was completed in October 1776, when all the local nobles and high-ranking clergy of Bukovina swore fealty to the Austrian Empire. The first Austrian period, which lasted until 1848, resulted not only in a new political order and faster economic development but also in significant demographic changes. Previously populated largely by Orthodox Slavic and Romanian cattlemen and peasants and an insignificant number of Jews, the province now attracted mass immigration of, most of all, Jewish communities of different backgrounds, numerous German-speaking Protestant and Catholic colonizers, and new Romanian settlers. Bukovina also became a desirable destination for smaller communities of Russian Old Believers fleeing persecution; Hungarian-speakers from Romania known as Szekler, Slovak, Czech, and others. The movements were encouraged by the Austrian administration in order to enhance the region's economic development. After Bukovina lost its initial semiautonomous, military-ruled status in 1786 and became part of the neighboring Galician administrative district (*Kreis*), its demographic and religious profile was further changed by Polish migrants and the consequent stronger presence of the Roman Catholic Church.

The period between the revolutions of 1848–1849 and the Austrian-Hungarian Compromise, or *Ausgleich*, of 1867 brought several changes in the administrative status of Bukovina as well as a wave of social revolts and the first signs of various national movements in the region. After the *Ausgleich* and the establishment of the Dual monarchy, Bukovina became a separate Austrian province (a crownland within the Austrian part of the empire known as Cisleithania) with its capital at Czernowitz, a rapidly developing city designed by imperial city planners to become a modern provincial center. During this period, between the late 1860s and the outbreak of the First World War, Bukovina enjoyed political stability enhanced by Vienna's liberal policies as well as steady economic and urban development. A former rural Ottoman frontier valued by Austrians primarily for its convenient geographic location and abundant forests, this peripheral and comparatively unexplored region of the Austrian polity was now seen as a safe haven by some settlers and as the land of opportunity by others, which resulted in the outstanding cultural diversity of Bukovina.

## Published Primary Sources

Published primary sources on the Austrian period are numerous and include administrative reports, tables of ranks, and statistical tables, as well as materials that were published at later times as historical documents or documentary collections, often with commentaries and editorial notes. One of the earliest documents that contained extended information about Bukovina at the time of its incorporation into the Austrian Empire was a report by General Gabriel Splény, the chief of the military administration of the province until 1778.<sup>75</sup> Splény described in detail the geography and natural resources, existing towns and infrastructure, and the population of the territory, finding it extremely backward in terms of economic development. Interestingly, Splény characterized the majority of residents as Orthodox and Moldavian. He was likely simply referring to the region's political affiliation with the Moldavian Principality, but in doing so he caused later polemicists frustration when they sought out information on the ethnicity of native Bukovinians in this early and important document.<sup>76</sup>

The period after the abolition of the military administration and the establishment of civil authority and diets in Bukovina is well covered in a multitude of Austrian government publications. A number of documents from the time of the administrative subordination of Bukovina to Galicia are found in Galician publications.<sup>77</sup> After the separate crown land of Bukovina was created in 1861, regional and local governmental reports and the proceedings of the provincial diet were issued regularly.<sup>78</sup> The provincial legislation of Bukovina<sup>79</sup> and the documents of the municipal and communal governments, published as special handbooks,<sup>80</sup> represent another group of sources. Statistical data on Austrian Bukovina can be found in many central Austrian governmental publications; most of the data from 1787 to 1849 and 1859 to 1861, when Bukovina was administratively part of Galicia, and occasional statistical reports from the post-1861 period, can be found in Galician provincial statistical publications. The first statistical publications dedicated to Bukovina exclusively, such as the chamber of commerce and industry publications<sup>81</sup> and census results,<sup>82</sup> began to appear after 1861. The most important source of numerical data about Austrian Bukovina is a series of regular publications by the Crown Land Statistical Office, established in 1891.<sup>83</sup> The data found in these publications cover a broad range of subjects from population statistics,<sup>84</sup> finance,<sup>85</sup> healthcare,<sup>86</sup> and agriculture,<sup>87</sup> to real estate,<sup>88</sup> taxes,<sup>89</sup> and communal assets.

The tables of ranks, known as *Schematismus*, were annual handbooks listing the major offices and officeholders; these also became valuable historical sources.

As in the case of statistical publications, although some material on Bukovina can be found in the all-Austrian and Galician tables, the most complete information was published in provincial tables of ranks of various kinds such as governmental, ecclesiastic, educational, and corporate.<sup>90</sup>

In 1899, the regional gendarmerie of Bukovina published what became one of the most interesting sources on the late Austrian period, a study of local history dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of Franz-Joseph's reign. Unlike the more formal documents mentioned above, issued either outside Bukovina or, if in the region, according to formal government requirements, this fascinating ethnographic account prepared by the local police and later turned into a school textbook reveals how the region was viewed and experienced by authorities at the lowest level who were in constant and direct contact with various population groups.<sup>91</sup> Another set of perspectives on Austrian Bukovina can be found in the accounts and descriptions left by individuals who traveled to or through the region or lived there temporarily in various capacities.<sup>92</sup>

The more specific materials published by or for various educational, cultural, political, and religious institutions in Bukovina can also be of great historical interest. This guide cites only a brief selection of such sources, including publications about Chernivtsi University and the central libraries of the region.<sup>93</sup> A full list of these sources would also include pamphlets, published speeches, proclamations, and so forth. Such a list, however, would be extremely long and hard to complete, as these materials were published in small numbers and are scattered in numerous (primarily local and regional) libraries and archives.

Several collections of historical documents concerning the Austrian period were published at different times. The first group came out during the Habsburg years in Austria and in Romania. Prepared by Austrian and Romanian historians, although from very different perspectives, they were dedicated to the same theme: the incorporation of Bukovina into the Austrian Empire and the early periods of Austrian rule.<sup>94</sup> Several short selections of documents were compiled in the first decade of the twentieth century by activists of the Russophile and Ukrainian movements who were primarily interested in the eastern Slavs of Bukovina and their ties with Russian and Ukrainian activists from other regions.<sup>95</sup> Soviet historians of Bukovina also published several collections, all of them dedicated to the second half of Austrian rule and representing exclusively the themes of social and national oppression and the late "revolutionary liberation movement."<sup>96</sup> Finally, two specialized collections dedicated, respectively, to events during the revolution of 1848–1849 in Bukovina

and to education in the region, were published in Germany and Austria in the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>97</sup>

The periodical press offers important sources on Austrian Bukovina. Newspapers in Bukovina were numerous and diverse, representing a variety of communities as well as political, social, religious, and cultural groups. Although the east-Slavic press of Bukovina is well researched and indexed,<sup>98</sup> there is only one study that deals with all Bukovinian periodicals from the period.<sup>99</sup> The first regional newspaper appeared in Bukovina in 1848; in 1885 there were already ten, and by 1914 their number grew to sixty-three. By the 1890s, many of them had a clear political orientation. The major regional newspapers included: the German-language *Bukovinaer Zeitung*, *Bukovinaer Rundschau*, *Czernowitzer Tagblatt*, *Czernowitzer Zeitung*, *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Volksprese*, *Vorwärts*; the Romanian-language *Gazeta Bucovinei*, *Deșteptarea*, *Privitorul*; and the Polish-language *Gazeta Polska*. Russophile newspapers were usually published in Russian or Iazychie, a mixture of Russian, Church Slavonic, and local dialects and included *Pravoslavnaia Bukovyna*, *Bukovyns'ki vidomosti*, *Narodnaia rada*, *Pravoslavnaia rus'*. Ukrainophile papers of different political or religious orientation included *Bukovyna*, *Nova Bukovyna*, *Narodnyi holos*, *Rus'ka rada*, *Ukraina*, *Pratsia*, *Narodna volia*, *Borot'ba*, and *Zaliznychnyk*. Along with newspapers, a large number of so-called calendars (annual almanacs) of political parties,<sup>100</sup> “thick” journals,<sup>101</sup> and popular periodicals targeted primarily to the peasant population<sup>102</sup> are valuable sources for researching the social and cultural history of the region.

### **Historical Studies, 1870s–1918**

The first scholarly studies of the Austrian period in Bukovina began to appear in the 1870s, when the modern historical method was emerging in Germany. Along with three works considered fundamental in Bukovinian historiography, *Bukovina Under the Austrian Administration* by H. Biderman<sup>103</sup> and the two works on the incorporation of Bukovina into Austria by Johann Polek,<sup>104</sup> a number of smaller or more specific studies were published between the 1870s and the end of World War I by these and other authors.<sup>105</sup> Raimund F. Kaindl remained the most prolific historian and ethnographer of Bukovina, dividing his interests between political history and what today would be called cultural studies.<sup>106</sup> Generally, Austrian historians of Habsburg Bukovina focused primarily on three major themes: the political history of Bukovina’s annexation and administration, the economic progress of the province under Habsburg rule, and Bukovina’s various population groups, with an emphasis on

German colonization. Notions of progress and civilization were central to Austrian narratives after the annexation; they were reflected in the special attention historians paid to the development of modern administrative institutions, infrastructure, and education in the region. At the same, the genuine interest in this eastern borderland, whose diversity was growing together with its population, resulted in a great number of ethnographic and local lore studies as well as in the development of a second strong paradigm of regional history, that of Bukovina's tolerant multiculturalism.

With the coming of national movements to Bukovina at the turn of the century, a number of historical works, most of them popular rather than scholarly, were published by authors who positioned themselves as Ukrainian or Romanian rather than Austrian. The Ukrainian works on the Austrian period (there were almost no works of candidly Russophile orientation dedicated specifically to the Austrian period) differed from the general historical works by Ukrainian authors. Rather than simply popularizing the history of Bukovina among eastern Slavs by preparing Ukrainian-language compilations of scholarly research, these historians concentrated on the development of Rusyn/Ukrainian national social life, educational venues, and religious affairs—and, ultimately, national consciousness—in Bukovina.<sup>107</sup> Ivan Franko, the well-known writer and activist from Galicia's Ukrainian national movement, also studied Bukovina. His extensive work about a peasant parliamentary deputy from Bukovina who became the leader of a popular social revolt in 1842–1843, Luk'ian Kobylitsia, proposed an idealistic interpretation of this event.<sup>108</sup>

Most Romanian historical studies of the Austrian period were published during the last decade of Habsburg rule in Bukovina, a time of political turmoil and war. Because many of these works were published in Romania rather than in Bukovina or Austria and were thus free from Austrian censorship or rules of political correctness, they put forward sharper and more critical theses than their Ukrainian counterparts. Concerned with the political position of Bukovina rather than simply the national awareness and social life of its Romanian residents, contemporary Romanian historians conceptualized the Austrian period, generally, as a century of unhappiness and suffering.<sup>109</sup> As the political crisis in the Austrian-Hungarian Empire was deepening, the number of Romanian works critical of Austrian rule grew. Their major theme was the Austrian annexation, interpreted as an act of political robbery that resulted in a tragic historical injustice. The populist concept of “the abduction of Bukovina” became the title of works by many authors, including the famous Romanian poet and national ideologist Mihai Eminescu (Mihail Eminovici), who spent part of his life in Czernowitz and dedicated several works to the history and politics of Habsburg Bukovina.<sup>110</sup> Romanian authors strongly advocated “Ruthenianization” of Bukovina,



often turning to statistics to prove their points.<sup>111</sup> The strengthening of the Ukrainian national movement was blamed on Austrian policies that allegedly supported such developments. The Austrian concepts of progress and tolerant multiculturalism, never seriously attacked by Ukrainian authors during the Habsburg era, were definitely torn apart at the turn of the century by Romanian historians who instead proposed paradigms of abduction and national suffering.

### **Historical Studies, 1918–1991**

These paradigms were maintained and developed in the works published throughout the interwar period, although, as the political goal of the incorporation of Bukovina into Romania was achieved, interest in the Austrian period per se subsided among Romanian historians.<sup>112</sup> Several studies of the Austrian period were written by Ukrainian historians both in and outside Soviet Ukraine. Soviet works, largely based on factual material found in earlier studies, focused on social antagonisms, according to Marxist historical conventions.<sup>113</sup> The non-Soviet Ukrainian perspective was more akin to Romanian studies in its preoccupation with what could be called the “ethnostatistics” of Bukovina.<sup>114</sup> In general, though, the Austrian period was conceptualized by both Marxist and nationalist Ukrainian historians as primarily a time of crystallization and the active development of a Ukrainian national movement. The Austrian administration was blamed for anti-Ukrainian policies and for ruling according to the “divide and conquer” principle, namely, for supporting the Romanian movement in order to weaken the Ukrainian one. “Conscious” Ukrainians were idealized and juxtaposed with “Austrian” (or “bourgeois,” in the Marxist interpretation) Ukrainians, indifferent to national (and class) liberation and too loyal to Vienna. However, most Ukrainian historians still gave credit to Austrian authorities for fostering cultural and educational developments in the region. A work on the German colonization of Bukovina was also published during the interwar period in Germany.<sup>115</sup>

Since the end of World War II, the historiography of Habsburg Bukovina can be fit into two major interpretations. One view was the nostalgic perception of Austrian Bukovina as a lost and idealized land characterized primarily by tolerance and the eastward march of western civilization. The second interpretation viewed the Austrian period as a historical abnormality—an imprisonment—on a predetermined path toward (re)unification with either the Ukrainian or the Romanian nation. The nostalgic interpretation was developed primarily by authors who are, or are related to, German and Jewish emigrants from the region. Obviously heir to the official

approach adopted earlier by historians of the Habsburg era, if summarized in generalized terms, the Austro-German postwar narrative emphasized the tolerant liberalism of Austrian rule and the importance of the German population as a balancing factor in a multiethnic environment. Especially strong attention is paid to educational and cultural developments.<sup>116</sup> The most prolific historians in this group included Erich Prokopowitsch,<sup>117</sup> Rudolf Wagner,<sup>118</sup> and Emanuel Turczynski (probably the most zealous propagandist of the concept of “tolerant multiculturalism”).<sup>119</sup> Many German historians of postwar Bukovina paid special attention to Chernivtsi University which, in their opinion, represented one of the most important pillars of tolerance, “Europeanness,” and liberal Austrian ideology in Bukovina.<sup>120</sup> Nostalgia for a lost fatherland is also a dominant motif of a series of short studies by Sophie Welish, whose work describes various aspects of the cultural, social, and everyday life of Bukovinian Germans in Habsburg times.<sup>121</sup>

Jewish historians of the Cold War era also conceptualized the Austrian period, particularly its second half, as the “Golden Age” for Bukovinian Jews.<sup>122</sup> This aspect of the history of Austrian Bukovina was almost completely omitted from both Ukrainian and Romanian narratives that appeared between 1945 and 1991. If the Austro-German influence had to be acknowledged, although in the form of criticism or condemnation of Austrian colonization and oppression, ignoring the Jews in the region did not present any problems either for the simplified Marxist or for the radicalized post-Holocaust nationalist approaches to Ukrainian and Romanian history. After the majority of the former “colonizers” left the region and the insignificant number of Bukovinian Jews who remained in the region fell into disfavor with Soviet authorities, Ukrainian and Romanian interpretations of the Austrian period were radically simplified and modified to fit the mutually exclusive primordial and territory-based frameworks of the two national histories that happened to overlap geographically in Bukovina.

Representing the proverbial narrative of the victor, which was especially blatant when produced in an authoritarian state, Soviet works on the Austrian period in Bukovina were exceptionally abundant. Reflecting the early, careful steps of Soviet power in newly incorporated Bukovina in 1940, the first Soviet study, published in Moscow the same year, still paid tribute to the Ukrainian national movement as a whole, flirting with local Ukrainian activists and promoting an image of the national liberator in the controversial international situation of the time.<sup>123</sup> Later works, traditional for Soviet historiography as a whole, conceptualized the period primarily in terms of the peasants’ and workers’ struggle for social liberation. The Ukrainian national movement in Bukovina became a controversial issue for Soviet historians

who were obliged to differentiate clearly between pro-socialist and “nationalist-bourgeois” activists and organizations in the region, honoring the former and criticizing the latter. Because such a strict division in the political spectrum of Bukovinian Ukrainians was not true of the Austrian period, such demarcation by Soviet historians involved a large degree of deliberate myth-making and image construction.

The best examples of the creation of local heroes in Bukovina by Soviet cultural historians were depictions of the legendary peasant leader Luk’ian Kobylitsia and two Ukrainian writers and activists, Ol’ha Kobylians’ka and Yuri Fed’kovych. However, reflecting the conventions of Soviet historiography as well as the specific need to fit Bukovina into the general Marxist narrative of Ukrainian history, the two most heavily explored topics remained social antagonisms and upheavals—conceptualized as the revolutionary movement—and the economic and cultural ties of Austrian Bukovina with Russia and Dnieper Ukraine.<sup>124</sup> The other, non-Marxist version of the Ukrainian interpretation of the Austrian period was developed, throughout the Cold War era, by émigré Ukrainian historians in the West.<sup>125</sup> Among the few studies of Bukovina that appeared in Communist Romania, the majority examined the Habsburg period. Following the lead of Soviet studies, these works dealt primarily with revolutionary movements and social struggle, avoiding, with several exceptions, the controversial issue of national identities.<sup>126</sup>

### **Historical Studies after 1991**

The non-Marxist Ukrainian conceptualization of Austrian Bukovina developed in the western diaspora was largely adopted, with some modifications, by post-Soviet Ukrainian historiography. At the same time, a significant number of the historical studies of Habsburg Bukovina published in post-Soviet, independent Ukraine, although they claim a deep rupture with the Soviet interpretation, have inherited, to a large degree, the nation-state centered, territorial framework and judgmental, truth-revealing style of the latter. Although the Ukrainian population of Bukovina and its national movement in the second part of Habsburg rule remains the most popular theme, pioneered by Vasyl’ Botushans’kyi from the older generation historian and the younger scholar Olexandr Dobrzhanskyi,<sup>127</sup> the sphere of scholarly interest among Ukrainian historians of Bukovina has widened. Several recent monographs examine the administrative and legal order in Austrian Bukovina, the censuses of the region, infrastructure and transportation development, and the Polish national movement.<sup>128</sup> A number of smaller studies are dedicated to a variety of subjects, including those previously neglected by Ukrainian historians: Jews and, in particular,

Hasidic communities; Russian Old Believers; and Poles.<sup>129</sup> In general, one can speak of an increasing interest in non-Ukrainian population groups and, especially, in the German communities of the Austrian years among writers in Bukovina, resulting in several larger historical studies<sup>130</sup> as well as in the translation and publication of a number of primary sources and historical works of the Habsburg period.<sup>131</sup> However, this work has been done by German linguists and journalists rather than historians of the region. Most of the recent historical interpretations of Austrian Bukovina published in Ukraine remain focused on reaffirming “Ukrainian historical rights” no matter the specific subject matter.

In Romania, after the fall of the USSR and the collapse of the Communist bloc, interest among historians in Habsburg Bukovina grew significantly. Many post-Communist studies by Romanian historians build on the pre-World War II conceptualization of Austrian rule: abducted Bukovina rightfully belonged to the (proto-)Romanian polity. The continuous struggle of Bukovinian Romanians for national liberation and unification with the Romanian state combined with an intensive critique of both Ukrainian nationalism and Austrian administration, constitutes the essence of this interpretation. It is perhaps best represented by a comprehensive, voluminous study of the Austrian period by Mihai Iacobescu.<sup>132</sup> The historians Ștefan Purici, Radu Grigorovici, Constantin Ungureanu, Mihai-Ștefan Ceașu, Mircea Grigoroviță, and several others published extensively on this period, concerning themselves primarily with migration, statistical data interpretation, and the development of Romanian culture in the region.<sup>133</sup> Strong interest in these subjects simultaneously stemmed from and supported the general view of the Austrian era as the root of Ukrainian colonization and forceful, deliberate, cultural de-Romanianization of Bukovina. With rare exceptions, Romanian post-Communist studies ignore the multicultural, and particularly Jewish, aspect of Bukovinian history.<sup>134</sup> However, as in recent Ukrainian historiography of the post-Soviet period, the range of themes explored by some Romanian historians of Bukovina somewhat broadened, as did their source base. Recent research themes include parliamentary politics, the evolution of a regional political administration, and the Germans of Bukovina. Together with limited revisions of traditionally popular subjects from a more open-minded perspective, this has resulted in a more multifaceted image of the Habsburg era in Romanian historiography.<sup>135</sup>

After 1991, the nostalgic interpretation of Austrian Bukovina as an almost modern paradise of tolerance—a view that remained dominant through the Cold War era—has been criticized. The German historian Trude Mauer, for example, has started questioning the roots and nature of multiculturalism in Austrian Bukovina.<sup>136</sup>

Along the same lines, Kazimierz Feleszko argued that the residents of Austrian Bukovina developed a cultural community that transcended ethnicity or language due to both voluntary or compulsory study and the use of several languages in public and private.<sup>137</sup>

A similar turn to more nuanced examination of the Habsburg period occurred in post-1991 Jewish studies. Fred Stambrook argued quite convincingly that Austrian Bukovina represents a special case in the history of Eastern European Jews as the home of “the most accepted and least persecuted Jewish community in Eastern Europe.”<sup>138</sup> David Sha’ari, Albert Lichtblau, and Michael John showed that an extraordinary proportion of Jews in Bukovina—that is, relative to other Eastern European countries—were able to become members of the modern industrial, commercial, and even landowning elite of the province. The late economic modernization and the virtual absence of aristocratic elites within the two dominant ethnolinguistic groups, Romanians and Ukrainians, not only allowed for the economic and educational advancement of many Jews, but also resulted in the widespread acculturation of numerous Jewish elites into German language and culture. This created a unique situation toward the end of Austrian rule: Jews serving as major bearers of official elite culture.<sup>139</sup> Among other themes, Jewish scholars started paying more attention to the Czernowitz conference of 1908 dedicated to the national languages of Eastern European Jews.<sup>140</sup> David Rechter recently analyzed complex Jewish identities in the Habsburg era that were influenced by national, regional, and imperial loyalties but also highly dependent on more localized and personalized contexts.<sup>141</sup> Fred Stambrook reached similar conclusions in his recent article on identities in late Austrian Bukovina, the only study in the field published outside Europe (besides works on Bukovinian German emigrants in America and works by Welish cited above).<sup>142</sup> Stambrook’s and Rechter’s analysis of the evolution of Bukovinian multiculturalism goes against the tendency to idealize Bukovinian history during the Habsburg era and argue instead that a multiplicity of identities and competing loyalties existed at that time.

It is worth noting that the previous generation of recognized western specialists on the history of the Habsburg Empire followed one of the “nationalist” perspectives when considering Austrian Bukovina in their broader studies. Robert Kann, who devoted a chapter to Bukovina in his important study of nationalism in the Habsburg Empire, discussed only the Ukrainian national movement, hardly even mentioning the Romanian population or nationalism in Bukovina.<sup>143</sup> On the contrary, a dedicated British student of Eastern European nationalities, R. W. Seton-Watson, adopted the Romanian ‘Ruthenianization’ thesis and viewed Bukovina as Romanian land under

foreign rule, subject to forced Slavicization encouraged by the Austrian administration, emphasizing also that the region's population before 1774 was predominantly Romanian.<sup>144</sup>

## **Studies of the First World War, 1914–1918**

Historians continue to debate whether the Great War of 1914–1918 should be considered to be profound rupture in the course of European history;<sup>145</sup> for Bukovina, it certainly was. After the comparative political and social stability of the late Austrian period, the borderland became a battleground. The location of the famous Russian Brusilov offensive in August 1914, Bukovina survived three occupations by the Russian imperial army—the last one in 1916 jointly with Romanian military units—and three consequent Austrian takeovers, before it was finally held by Romanian troops. The war resurrected old Russian and Romanian disputes and claims for the province and intensified a new political force: the Ukrainian national movement. For the civic population of the province these years were marked by mass death and disease, violence, and destruction.

According to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk signed on March 3, 1918, between Russia and the Central Powers, Bukovina remained a part of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. However, since the empire was in political turmoil, Ukrainian and Romanian nationalist organizations formed provincial national councils in Czernowitz. The Ukrainian Council, headed by Omelian Popovych, was joined by Romanian activists who favored Bukovina remaining within the federated Habsburg Empire. The joint council proclaimed a provisional Ukrainian-Romanian government on November 6, 1918, with the prospect of a possible division of the province into Romanian and Ukrainian parts, depending upon the results of a popular vote. At the same time, the Romanian National Council, headed by Iancu Flondor, advocated incorporation of Bukovina into the Romanian state. On November 11, 1918, Romanian military forces entered the capital of Bukovina and the region effectively became part of Greater Romania. The Romanian National Council of Bukovina also organized “a general congress of Bukovina,” where representatives of select political groups and organizations in the region approved a resolution about the unconditional unification of the province with the Romanian Kingdom. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian People's Assembly, an alternative political venture also dating from November 1918, was called in Czernowitz by the Ukrainian National Council, and allegedly proclaimed the will of the people to join the Western Ukrainian People's Republic. The third local political force in the region in 1918 was the Jewish National Council. Although

the events of the Great War were examined in many works that were cited in the previous section, as well as in some of the works on the interwar period dealt with in the following section, the importance and complexity of World War I in Bukovina warrants dedicating a separate section to the studies that deal with this period.

### **Published Primary Sources**

A special publication was issued by the British Foreign Office based on material about Bukovina prepared for the British delegation at the Paris Peace Conference. Although relying primarily on secondary sources, this directory is an interesting source that illuminates the process of diplomatic negotiations for the region and particularly the support for Romanian claims by the British delegation.<sup>146</sup> Ukrainian politicians also published a French-language collection of documents to be presented at the conference to support their diplomatic struggle for international recognition of the short-lived Western Ukrainian Republic. This was proclaimed in Galicia in 1918 and claimed parts of Bukovina and the Transcarpathian (Subcarpathian) region. The second half of the collection was entirely dedicated to Bukovina.<sup>147</sup> Several memoirs of World War I events in Bukovina were published over the course of the twentieth century, including the recollections of the former regional police commander, Eduard Fischer, and the last president of the province, Joseph von Etdorf.<sup>148</sup> A section on Bukovina is also included in an anniversary collection of documents dedicated to the unification of Greater Romania in 1918.<sup>149</sup>

### **Historical Studies, 1918–1991**

The earliest studies concerning the events of World War I were written by Ukrainian activists and historians who were mostly concerned with the political circumstances of the Romanian annexation of Bukovina in November 1918. Studies published in the interwar and early postwar years by Serhii Kaniuk, I. Popovych, and Myron Korduba interpreted the Romanian annexation of Bukovina as a historical injustice—a coup followed by enslavement.<sup>150</sup> The diplomatic aspects of the transfer of Bukovina to Romania were examined in 1959 by Leonid Sonevtsky, who argued that Bukovina was used as an important token in the diplomatic negotiations and fell victim to the political struggle between the Central Powers and the Entente for Romania's loyalty.<sup>151</sup> In the 1960s, former nationalist Bukovinian Ukrainians in the United States chose to concentrate on successes rather than failures. They proposed the most interesting conceptualization of the final stage of the war in Bukovina

in accord with the general perception of twentieth-century Ukrainian history as a unanimous, unequal struggle for political independence and state power; the autumn events of 1918 were pompously described as a brief period of Ukrainian state power in Bukovina.<sup>152</sup> Soviet Ukrainian historiography of the postwar period, on the contrary, almost completely ignored the political efforts of Ukrainian nationalist organizations in 1918 and conceptualized the World War I period as marked by the intensification of social struggle and the revolutionary movement in Bukovina connected to Russia's October revolution.<sup>153</sup>

Romanian authors of the interwar period such as Ion Nistor and Theodore Bălan, as well as their followers among Romanian emigrants in the West, deemed the World War I period crucial for the consolidation of the Romanian national movement in Bukovina and Romanian national unification in general. They saw the events of November 1918 as a fair and historically justified Romanian triumph.<sup>154</sup> In his works specifically dedicated to the “unification,” as well as in the general survey studies noted in the previous section, Nistor, for example, called the entry of the Romanian army into Czernowitz (renamed Cernăuți) as “a day of rejoicing for the capital of Bukovina.” He asserted with emotion and pomp that the liberating army met no resistance, “bringing to the population the peace for which they longed.”<sup>155</sup> He quoted extensively from the declaration of the “General Congress of Bukovina” which allegedly “enthusiastically voted for the motion of union”<sup>156</sup> and “begged [King Ferdinand I] to receive liberated Bukovina under his sceptre.”<sup>157</sup> Thus, according to Nistor, by the Act of Union of Cernăuți of November 1918, “a wrong that had persisted 144 years had been righted. Moldavia had recovered her unity.”<sup>158</sup>

For the German historian Erich Prokopowitsch, however, a “wrong” had been done in November 1918. His 1959 book—one of the two most detailed, thorough, and analytical works on the First World War in Bukovina—was based heavily on the reports of the last president of Bukovina, Count Joseph von Etdorf.<sup>159</sup> The work examined the final years and days of the war in Bukovina and the political competition over the region, citing documents recounting the civic and political activities of various national organizations during the time of military rule. He also studied Austrian policies concerning Bukovina, particularly the October 1918 manifesto that promised Bukovina a special autonomous status in a federated empire. The study ended with a brief negative appraisal of Romanian rule in Bukovina that was considerably less scholarly and more judgmental than the rest of the book.



## Historical Studies after 1991

After 1991, as openly Marxist interpretations lost respectability in Ukrainian historiography, the events of 1918 were revisited by several scholars.<sup>160</sup> While international relations and diplomacy concerning the transfer of Bukovina to Romania were given due attention and reinterpreted, the history of World War I and 1918 was primarily reconstructed around the Ukrainian People's Assembly, which was interpreted as a new foundation for legitimizing the ultimate reunification of Bukovina with Ukraine. According to the memoirs of its participants and witnesses, the assembly, although widely attended and quite emotional, had had a vague political character; it was a semichaotic mass meeting typical of the revolutionary era.<sup>161</sup> The assembly was reconstructed by post-Soviet Ukrainian historians, however, as the new foundation upon which to justify the "reunification" of Bukovina with Ukraine. As a historical claim based on modern democratic principles suitable for the new era Ukraine was then entering, the reference to the assembly's proclamation replaced the outdated discussions of links between the revolutionary movements in Bukovina, Dnieper Ukraine, and Russia that were emphasized by Soviet historiography. It supplemented the still respected but vague and romanticized references to the primordial connections between Bukovina, Kievan Rus', and other medieval principalities of eastern Slavs.

The 2003 book by the Chernivtsi-based historian Volodymyr Zapolovs'kyi, *Bukovina in the Last War of Austria-Hungary, 1914–1918*, stands out as the most thorough study of World War I in Bukovina.<sup>162</sup> Zapolovs'kyi was remarkably critical in his evaluations of the Ukrainian national movements, placing them in the context of the complex political and social developments in Bukovina during the war. As a military historian, he paid considerable attention to military operations and international negotiations about Bukovina.<sup>163</sup> Romanian diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference in general, and negotiations about Bukovina in particular, were also researched in a broader study by Sherman Spector.<sup>164</sup>

In the 1990s, several Romanian historians also revisited the events of World War I in Bukovina, focusing, as had their predecessors in the interwar years, on the unification of 1918 within the framework of an ethnicity-based, state-building process. Just as their Ukrainian counterparts were preoccupied with the Ukrainian Assembly of 1918, Romanian studies paid particular attention to the Popular Assembly called by the Romanian National Council in Bukovina. They interpreted it as an important and successful event that fostered the creation of the Greater Romanian state and its international recognition.<sup>165</sup>

The Jewish National Council was the subject of a 1992 article by David Sha'ari. Sha'ari praised the council's ability to overcome its numerous inner controversies and to unite in this important time when it had to choose whether to support the Ukrainian or the Romanian national movement. While the former was perceived as more favorable to Jews but incapable of maintaining power and unrealistic in its plans to join the illusory Ukrainian State, the latter was deemed more politically credible but more anti-Semitic in character.<sup>166</sup>

## **Studies of the Interwar Romanian Period, 1919–1940**

After the transfer of Bukovina to the Romanian Kingdom according to the treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (September 1919), the region experienced significant changes. As part of a highly centralized Romanian state, Bukovina was deprived of its autonomy and turned into a regular province; as a result, its non-Romanian populations were considered national minorities. Their rights and interests enjoyed little legal protection; the cultural politics of the government in Bukovina were marked by aggressive Romanianization of education and public life. The state also sponsored a movement of Romanian peasants into the region in order to change its demographic profile. In the economic sphere, most of the Austrian financial investments were replaced by Romanian funds, while investments by Entente members were also encouraged.

Generally, the Romanian central government fostered Bukovina's economic development, and particularly its construction business; however, two economic crises, of 1929–1933 and 1937–1939 had a serious negative impact on the region's economy. The Romanian political system, although initially dominated by the National-Liberal Party, still allowed for limited and controlled activity by other regional and national parties and organizations. Right-wing radicalism in Romania grew continuously throughout the interwar period, culminating in the rule of the National-Christian Party and the establishment of a royal dictatorship in 1938–1940. These immediate prewar years in Bukovina were marked by a noticeable polarization of society along ethnic lines. While many Romanians embraced the radical nationalist and anti-Semitic ideology propagated by the state, a number of Germans sympathized with National-Socialism, and more and more Ukrainians and Jews leaned toward socialist ideologies. The interwar Romanian period in the province was brought to an abrupt end on June 28, 1940, when the Red Army occupied the northern part of Bukovina.

## Published Primary Sources

Because the period of Romanian rule was comparatively short, and the transitional process of administrative reform and adjustment took a long time, there were few governmental or similar publications specifically on Bukovina.<sup>167</sup> Soviet and Romanian historians put together several collections of historical documents exclusively or primarily dedicated to the interwar period. Their editors were biased in their selection of documents and abstracts, aiming to provide the best possible support for official interpretations of the history of Bukovina.<sup>168</sup>

An important category of published sources on the interwar period is represented by personal memoirs, mostly those of Bukovinian Jews who left the region during World War II. For Holocaust survivors from Bukovina, the interwar period and the region itself signified the pretrauma experience of peace and happiness and thus became the subject of detailed recollections and nostalgic reflections.<sup>169</sup> Extensive biographical memoirs by Adolf Katzenbeisser, Prive Friedjung, Pearl Fichmann, and others illustrate Jewish life in Bukovina.<sup>170</sup> In 1998, a fascinating collection of interviews with Bukovinian Jews entitled *Chernivtsi Was Once a Jewish City* was published as a joint initiative of the Heinrich Böll foundation of Berlin and the Society of Jewish Culture in Chernivtsi. It contains sixteen detailed interviews with German-speaking Jews from Bukovina recorded, transcribed, and analyzed by a group of students from the Free University of Berlin in 1996.<sup>171</sup> Periodwise, most of the memoirs and recollections concern earlier or later times together with the interwar period. A book on the development and destruction of the Hasidic Center in the town of Sadagora near Chernivtsi also contained diaries and memoirs concerning the interwar years.<sup>172</sup> Apart from the memoirs of Holocaust survivors, recollections of the members of Ukrainian nationalist organizations in Bukovina were published in the Western Ukrainian diaspora and later in post-Soviet Ukraine.<sup>173</sup>

The regional press of the politically turbulent interwar period constitutes a valuable group of primary sources. The major newspapers of the period included the Romanian-language *Monitorul Bucovinei*, *Universul*, *Glasul Bucovinei*, the German-language *Czernowitzer Morgenblatt*, *Vorwärts*; and the Ukrainian-language *Ridnyi kraj*, *Chas, Borets'*, *Samostiina dumka*, *Volia Naroda*, *Hromada*, and *Nove Zhyttia*. The Jewish press of Romanian (as well as the Austrian) era in Bukovina has been studied primarily by the linguist Markus Winkler. Although mostly interested in political and cultural identities and their expressions in the Jewish press, Winkler also published a survey article about the general systematization of the interwar

era Bukovinian press.<sup>174</sup> Already cited guides to the Bukovinian press by Myroslav Romaniuk and Erich Prokopowitsch also cover the interwar years.

### **Historical Studies, 1920s–1940s**

As one of the newly acquired regions of the Romanian state, Bukovina received particular attention from Romanian historians in the interwar period. The central ideas shared by the majority of historical works were glorification of the national unification and justification of the historical rights of the Romanian state to Bukovina. In his numerous published works and speeches the most established historian of Bukovina at the time, Ion Nistor, professed and advocated the disappearance of “Bukovinianism” as a regional identity and its replacement by a strong Romanian national identity among the population of the region.<sup>175</sup> Ukrainian historians also published several popular historical works in the interwar years. Most of these publications appeared either in immigrant communities in the West or in Bukovina proper, while several works came out in the USSR. Soviet Ukrainian historians presented Soviet Ukraine as Galicia’s Piedmont since the creation of Ukrainian Soviet Republic within the USSR. Bukovina was traditionally either marginally mentioned in interwar Soviet studies about western Ukrainian lands or omitted entirely. In the late 1920s, however, a small group of Marxist or leftist Ukrainian emigrants from Romanian Bukovina, including the above-mentioned Piddubnyi and Kaniuk (the latter became one of the few venerated local Communists in Bukovina under the Soviet regime) published a number of short studies about their region in Soviet Ukraine. These publications represented Bukovina as a lost and forgotten ethnic Ukrainian territory and aimed to attract the attention of Ukrainian ideologues and the interest of the public in this region. At the same time, non-Marxist Bukovinian authors Kuzelia, Symovych, Haras, and others published a number of small studies in Cernăuți and other Central and Western European cities. Regardless of their political inclinations, Ukrainian authors who published in the 1920s were concerned with the disadvantageous position of Ukrainians in Romanian Bukovina as a result of intensive Romanianization cultural policies. Many of them concentrated on developments in education, which was the primary target of these policies.<sup>176</sup>

### **Historical Studies, 1940s–1991**

Between the end of World War II and the collapse of the USSR, the interwar period in Bukovina’s history was studied primarily by Soviet historians.<sup>177</sup> As dictated by Soviet ideology and the official Soviet Ukrainian version of the history of

Bukovina, the major thesis of these works was constructed around the “historical validity” of Bukovina’s reunification with Soviet Ukraine. Accordingly, the most frequently discussed topics included the formation and activities of the regional branch of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of Ukraine in Bukovina, the impact of the Russian revolution of 1917 on the Bukovinian working class, and the general theme of the very broadly defined “toilers’ struggle for liberation from foreign rule and reunification with Ukraine and Russia.” One publication was dedicated to an ideological critique of Zionism but based on the history of Zionist and other non-Communist Jewish organizations in interwar Bukovina as well as the “struggle of the Communists of Bukovina with Zionist reactionary militarism.”<sup>178</sup> The book illustrates the perception of Bukovina by Ukrainian party officials in the region as a most “dangerous” place for the spread and influence of Jewish nationalism, mass interest in emigration, and, generally, the numbers and the cultural influence of its Jewish population. The few historical studies of the interwar period that were published in Romania during the Communist era similarly followed official Soviet guidelines for writing the history of this borderland region.<sup>179</sup>

Most of the few Western studies of interwar Bukovina that also happen to be the least prejudiced and the most analytical were published in Germany. The works of the Cold War period, including those by the most prolific German historians of Bukovina, Emanuel Turczynski and Erich Prokopowitsch, focused on Bukovinian Germans and their new status as a national minority in the region. Strongly critical of the aggressive cultural and minority rights policies of the Romanian government, most of the German works conceptualized the interwar era as the beginning of the end of “Carpathian Austria” and its multiculturalism, idealizing it even more strongly against the background of the interwar period’s militant Romanianization.<sup>180</sup> Another dedicated researcher of Bukovinian Germans and their emigration, Sophie Welisch, argued that Germans, as a minority favored by the Romanian government, succeeded in maintaining a strong national identity and even in protecting their political rights in spite of the continuous Romanianization of official public culture and education.<sup>181</sup> One contribution to research on the non-German population in Bukovina was published in 1975 in Israel by Haim Shamir, who discussed a previously unpublished document from the Nazi German consulate in Chernivtsi regarding the size, political beliefs, and economic situation of Jewish communities in the area.<sup>182</sup>

## Historical Studies after 1991

Studies of interwar Bukovina that appeared after the end of the Cold War explore a wider range of subjects. Post-Soviet Ukrainian works include, among others, several brief studies by Ihor Piddubnyi on the political life, administration, and industry in the region; works by Olexandr Masan on the reaction of the Bukovinian Ukrainian community to the famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine; and above-mentioned studies by Myroslav Romaniuk on the Ukrainian press.<sup>183</sup> The overarching tendency of all recent Ukrainian studies is to treat the interwar decades as a period of collective suffering for Ukrainians in Bukovina, or, rather, of Ukrainian Bukovina occupied by a nationalist and oppressive Romanian state. Perhaps the only study that somewhat diverges from this victimizing conceptualization is a glorifying history of Bukovyns'kyi kurin', a militant nationalist organization affiliated with the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists that was staffed primarily by Ukrainians from Bukovina but fought in various locations and for various causes. Based on a fair number of primary documents, the study traces the fate of the unit from 1918, when it left Bukovina for good, until 1944.<sup>184</sup> Most authors of recent Romanian works continue to operate within the framework of national Romanian history in their research. They avoid openly irredentist claims, employing descriptive approaches and focusing on the investigation of local details and specific documents.<sup>185</sup> Ștefan Purici is one historian who started to break the paradigm of ethnic history-writing by giving special attention to the national minority problem in interwar Bukovina.<sup>186</sup> Several recent contributions by German and Israeli historians share the general assumption that the imposition of a single national culture on multiethnic Bukovinian society was a strong negative factor, but it did not eliminate multiculturalism altogether before World War II.<sup>187</sup> David Sha'ari, for example, showed that Romanianization of the region's culture was met with protest by Jewish intellectuals who appreciated the liberalism of past times.<sup>188</sup>

Very important contributions to the study of Bukovina between the two world wars, and the memory thereof, were made by social scientists and literary theorists. In order to explain the native contextuality of Paul Celan, who was born and formed as a poet in inter-war Cernăuți, and whose poetry is one of the most important emblems of western memory of the Holocaust, Amy Colin surveyed the cultural history of Bukovina and its capital during the interwar years, with an emphasis on Jewish culture, poetry, and literature.<sup>189</sup> Two more recent studies of Cernăuți-Czernowitz Jewish identities and their ties to the space and its unique ethos have radically transformed the picture of interwar Bukovina as constructed by “nationalizing”

historical memories, bringing back into the historical narrative a very numerous and important group, namely, urban the Jews. For many of them, as Florence Heymann, Marianne Hirsch, and Leo Spitzer have argued convincingly, Bukovina and its capital belonged (and often still belongs) neither to Romania nor to Ukraine but to an East European, German-speaking Austria that no longer existed when these people were growing up and building their lives in “Czernowitz.”<sup>190</sup> A cohort of German linguists and social scientists, including the already mentioned Markus Winkler as well as Susanne Marten-Finnis, are studying the remarkable cultural dynamism of interwar Cernăuți. These scholars look beyond the widespread image of harmonious coexistence among diverse linguistic, religious, and ethnic groups, investigating heated ideological and religious conflicts that divided the urban community through the prism of Jewish press.<sup>191</sup>

Mariana Hausleitner’s study, *The Romanianization of Bukovina: Realizing the Nation-State Ambitions of Greater Romania* (2001), is the only historical monograph to date entirely and exclusively dedicated to interwar Bukovina. The work examines the region in the context of the aggressive nationality policies of interwar Romania, conceptualizing the period of Romanian rule (including the years of World War II) as a time of the gradual destruction of the *Bukovinian Ausgleich*, the tolerant multiculturalism that, according to Hausleitner, survived the First World War intact.<sup>192</sup> Particularly, she argues that the ruling National Liberal Party of Romania, and specifically its broad program to integrate the newly acquired provinces into the centralized nation-state, was responsible for the harsh measures of Romanianization taken in education. She shows that the agrarian reform was designed primarily to promote the colonization of Bukovina and other borderland provinces by peasants from inner Romania. However, Hausleitner also deems the local Romanians of Bukovina, specifically those in positions of authority, responsible for interpreting central directives and laws too radically and implementing them too vigorously. While the initial central policies of Romanianization were to some extent counterbalanced by attempts by the National Peasant Party of Romania in 1928–1933 to accommodate the needs of national minorities, these adjustments were met with no enthusiasm by the local government of Bukovina. Ultimately, claims Hausleitner, the final years of flourishing multiculturalism in Bukovina occurred in the mid-1930s. The rapid and dramatic cultural homogenization that occurred between the late 1930s and 1944 was irreversible. Another important contribution to the subject was made by the historian Irina Livezeanu who dedicated a chapter to Bukovina in her broader study of the cultural politics of Greater Romania.<sup>193</sup>

## Studies of the Second World War, 1940–1944

In June 1940, Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina, with some adjoining territories were annexed by the Soviet Union. While annexation of Bessarabia had been agreed upon beforehand in a secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement between the USSR and Germany (August 23, 1939) and was officially justified by the alleged “historical rights” of Russia for this territory, Northern Bukovina was seized *impromptu* in the context of Romania’s rather helpless international position. On June 28, 1940, two days after sending a note to the Romanian government requesting the return of Bessarabia along with Northern Bukovina—the latter on the grounds of assumed ethnic, linguistic, and cultural connections of the local populations with the Ukrainian people—Red Army troops marched on the streets of Chernivtsi. The city was soon the administrative center of the newly created Chernivtsi *oblast’* of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The first period of Soviet rule in Northern Bukovina lasted until the German invasion in June 1941. During that year the scenario of rapid Sovietization already tested on Galicia and Volhynia (annexed a year earlier) was repeated: “repatriation” of the German population, the first attempts at the collectivization of agriculture, the repression of social and political “enemies,” along with the nationalization of large industrial and commercial enterprises and real estate and the centralization of education, health care, and social welfare. The transfer of Germans agreed upon between the USSR and the Third Reich not only deprived Bukovina of the absolute majority of its German population but also became a way to emigrate for a number of non-German Bukovinians who did not welcome the Soviet regime and were able to manipulate the Nazi ethnodemographic policies to their (often short-term or illusory) advantage.

After the German-Soviet war began on June 22, 1941, Soviet authorities and the Red Army, fearing encirclement, left Chernivtsi *oblast’* almost without resistance, leaving only several frontier guards behind. The Romanian army soon took their place. Before the evacuation of the Soviet government, thousands of political prisoners were executed or deported to labor camps in the eastern part of the USSR. A power vacuum lasting several days was used by various anti-Semitic forces, mostly radical Ukrainian and Romanian nationalists, to organize pogroms and mass executions of Jews.<sup>194</sup> By July 7, 1941, when the Romanian military regime was firmly established, the Holocaust in the reunited region of Bukovina acquired a more organized form: with the exception of several mass executions performed by Nazi officials, the Jewish population (and several neighboring regions) was deported to



camps in Transnistria.<sup>195</sup> The non-Jewish civilian population had to cope with the brutal military regime and the presence of both Soviet and Ukrainian nationalist partisan groups who were opponents of the current regime and each other. In 1944, the Red army reoccupied Chernivtsi (on March 23) and the whole territory of Northern Bukovina (in September). Mass Soviet repressions and the semivoluntary repatriation of the remaining Jewish population to Romania in 1945–1946 became the final chapter in the radical demographic change that Bukovina underwent during the Second World War.

### **Published Primary Sources**

The biggest Soviet documentary collection dedicated to World War Two focuses primarily on the first year of Soviet rule (1940–1941) and on the early postwar period; like other Soviet collections, it is heavily dominated by Communist Party reports. Documents from the the Nazi-Romanian occupation of 1941–1944 are represented by select Soviet guerrilla and underground resistance materials and only a few files regarding the wartime Romanian administration and repressions. Because official historiography practically denied that the Holocaust occurred in the Soviet Union, the implementation of the “final solution” in Bukovina was not mentioned. The collection contains several extracts of the letters of Bukovinians from concentration camps without indicating camp locations or the Jewish nationality of the authors.<sup>196</sup> The research and publishing project *The Memory Book of Ukraine* (1994) includes lists of persons who died in the Second World War and suffered from wartime repressions in Chernivtsi province.<sup>197</sup>

In 2004, a collection of documents and memoirs on the repatriation of Germans from Bukovina in 1940 was put together by Ukrainian researchers in Chernivtsi.<sup>198</sup> Of several publications dealing with broader subjects important for the study of World War II Bukovina, most recent is a collection of German documents on the Holocaust in Romania edited by Ottmar Trasca and Dennis Deletant. This and several earlier volumes on the extermination of Jews in Romania indicate the increased interest in Transnistria, which until recently was an almost forgotten part of the Holocaust.<sup>199</sup> Other collections mostly contain documents concerning the Holocaust in the USSR, particularly Ukraine; the experience of war-time German repatriates from Romania; and materials about the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).<sup>200</sup> The already cited volume edited by Stelian Neagoe included materials on the Soviet annexation in 1940.<sup>201</sup> In most of these collections the materials related to Bukovina were marginal, reflecting the “abnormal” borderland position of this territory that hardly fits into any of the existing paradigms of studying the war and the Holocaust.

Numerous Holocaust survivors' memoirs concerning Bukovina were either written by survivors themselves or based on interviews with them.<sup>202</sup> Many were published in Israel by Yad Vashem; others appeared in Germany, North America, and Ukraine. A particularly important source on the history of the Holocaust in Northern Bukovina and, to a lesser extent, neighboring regions, is a series published between 1991 and 1996 as the *Herald of the Society of Jewish Culture in Chernivtsi*, with the support of the Association of the Prisoners of Nazi Ghettos and Concentration Camps and the Chernivtsi State Archive. The five issues of the *Herald* contained numerous recollections of Holocaust survivors who lived in Bukovina before, during, or after World War II; surveys of the Chernivtsi State Archive's holdings concerning the Holocaust; lists of victims, perpetrators, and rescuers in various locations in Northern Bukovina; locations of mass executions and graves; and other related materials. The last issue also included a summary of the activities of the Jewish Communist resistance in Chernivtsi based entirely on archival documents.<sup>203</sup> Although the central theme of the majority of memoirs was World War II and the Holocaust, some of them also concerned earlier or (more often) later periods, including exile to Siberia or emigration. Hirsch and Spitzer synthesized and analyzed a large number of the available memoirs about interwar and wartime Bukovina in their recent book quoted in the previous sections.<sup>204</sup> The relative scarcity of official documents about the Transnistrian camps and the uniqueness of this case make these memoirs very valuable historical sources.

Another numerous group of memoirs belongs to Ukrainians from Bukovina, most of them nationalists and active participants of the OUN-UPA units in Bukovina, published either in the West (during the Cold War) or in post-Soviet Ukraine. These recollections are akin to Soviet publications in terms of their highly ideological perspective.<sup>205</sup> Memoirs by members of the Soviet underground and guerilla groups that acted in Bukovina,<sup>206</sup> of former soldiers of the Romanian army who participated in the military campaign of 1941,<sup>207</sup> and of German emigrants from the region<sup>208</sup> have also been published. A large number of memoirs, biographical sketches, and similar materials concerning the events of World War II, as well as the prewar and postwar periods, were published in the late-Soviet and post-Soviet periods in local newspapers in Northern Bukovina, primarily in Chernivtsi. These publications are not covered in the present guide due to their nontraditional format and publication criteria and the related difficulties in accessing the majority of them. Many of these publications are, however, of great historical interest and were published in this unusual form due to financial difficulties and shortages of scholarly and other publication opportunities in contemporary Ukraine.

## Historical Studies, 1940s–1991

Studies of World War II in Bukovina that appeared between the immediate postwar years and the collapse of the USSR covered a broad range of themes and offered divergent perspectives on the subject. Written in a time of strong ideological polarization in the world and the flourishing of diasporas formed by wartime emigrants and refugees, the postwar historiography of this period can be well characterized by a Russian proverb: “One prefers to talk about his own pain.”<sup>209</sup> Most of the authors mentioned in this section were clearly affiliated with one or another community of former Bukovinians abroad and represented, or constructed, these communities’ collective sentiments, usually dominated by notions of collective loss and nostalgia for the abandoned motherland. Quite different in this respect were Soviet writers who clearly put the triumph of the war era above its tragedy. Immediately after the annexation, a series of articles appeared in the central (Kiev-based) party and Soviet journals of the Ukrainian republic, commenting on the settlement with Romania and instructing readers in the appropriate interpretation of this “triumph of Stalin’s wise foreign policies.”<sup>210</sup> An “historical-geographical sketch” of the regions of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina was also published as early as August 1940 in the major journal for public educators of the republic, providing Ukrainian secondary-school teachers with guidelines for including the newly acquired territories in the school curriculum.<sup>211</sup> Apart from the early popular propaganda books describing changes during the first year of Soviet control,<sup>212</sup> Soviet historical studies included a major monograph on the period and several smaller contributions published in the major historical journal of Soviet Ukraine.<sup>213</sup> Similar to other Soviet literature on the Second World War, these works idealized the heroism of the Red Army and underground resistance groups while condemning, in general terms and often in rather violent language, the atrocities of the occupation regime. At the same time, the themes of organized and popular violence against the Jews; repatriations of Germans, Romanians, and Jews; popular collaboration with the occupational authorities; the activities of the Ukrainian nationalist organizations; and, naturally, Soviet repressions were entirely omitted or seriously distorted. Many Soviet works focused on 1940–1941, interpreting this period as the long-awaited and well-deserved triumph of progressive forces in Bukovina led by the Communist Party.

The diplomatic and political aspects of the annexation of Northern Bukovina by the USSR were approached almost exclusively by Romanian authors who looked at the event from an irredentist perspective.<sup>214</sup> In addition to their strong ideological biases, these studies suffered from a lack of access to the Soviet sources necessary

for a more thorough analysis. The mass repatriation of Germans from Bukovina in 1940 was studied by former Bukovinian Germans or their descendants who, similarly, did not have access to a wide range of sources and took a descriptive, almost ethnographical, approach to their subject.<sup>215</sup> Only two journal articles were dedicated to Soviet transformations in Bukovina in 1940–1941—a subject very hard to research without direct access to Soviet archives and literature. In a 1953 article, Jurij Fedyns’kyj investigated Sovietization in 1940 through the medium of the courts. He supervised student interns in the civil courts of Chernivtsi as a professor of the law faculty of Lviv University prior to his emigration from Bukovina. He later used the legal documents he worked with and his personal experience for his study. He concluded that civil law was used, at least during the early, transitional stage, as an important instrument for establishing a positive image of Soviet power among the local population. It did so by protecting the rights of small property owners in a timely and respectful manner, promoting the Soviet legal system and culture, and also promoting Ukrainian language while remaining considerate of ethnic minorities who did not speak it fluently.<sup>216</sup>

An article by Dov Levin published in 1976 discussed the inception of Soviet rule in Bukovina from a different perspective, using the fate of its Jewish population as a prism to look at the first year of the Soviet regime, the thirty three-months of the wartime Romanian occupation, and (very briefly) the return and reestablishment of Soviet power. He described and analyzed the relationships between the new regime and various parts of the Jewish population and particular Jewish organizations, pointing out the immediate repression of Zionist groups and supporters and the gradual disappointment and frustration that developed among leftist, including Communist, groups within a Jewish community initially enthusiastic about the Soviet takeover. Levin closed his article with an important remark about Chernivtsi becoming “one of the most active [Jewish] centers in the Soviet Union,” a point that never received the attention and development that it rightfully deserved. Undoubtedly a very informative work about one of the most complicated periods in Bukovina’s history, Levin’s article, due to understandable access problems, was based almost exclusively on published Soviet documents and testimonies by former Jewish emigrants and refugees from Bukovina.<sup>217</sup>

Two more comprehensive studies of World War II in Bukovina should be mentioned: an article by the émigré Ukrainian historian Arkadii Zhukovs’kyi concerning Romanian-occupied Bukovina together with Bessarabia and Transnistria,<sup>218</sup> and a short look analyzing Bukovina’s status from the perspective of international law by the German historian and social scientist Hermann Weber.<sup>219</sup> Zhukovs’kyi’s article

was based on a very limited selection of sources that included two Soviet collections of documents and several western publications, mostly works by Ukrainian émigré historians. Although the author admitted the limitations of the work, he nonetheless produced a historical narrative that was truly fascinating in its simplification of the wartime history of three frontier territories going through the most dramatic political and demographic transformations. Zhukovs'kyi continued the tradition of Ukrainian émigré historiography, which conceptualized Bukovina as a Ukrainian land separated from Ukraine, and remained preoccupied exclusively with the rights (or lack thereof), concerns, numbers, and interests of Ukrainians in the region. The five page's devoted to wartime history of Transnistria mentioned Jewish expellees twice, giving their numbers, and pointing out the need for a separate study of the "Jewish question" in this territory.<sup>220</sup> Mentioning the Jews in the context of Transnistria and occasionally elsewhere in the article did not jeopardize Zhukovs'kyi's general representation of Bukovinian Ukrainians as the major victims of both Soviet and Romanian wartime occupations. The OUN and UPA were depicted as heroic and patriotic protectors of the Ukrainian population from the barbarian troops of the Red Army and the Romanian-German military. Not surprisingly, this conceptualization could not accommodate even the slightest hint as to the role of the OUN-UPA units and other nationalist groups in the anti-Jewish violence in late July 1941.

In contrast to Zhukovs'kyi's article, Weber's book was based largely on archival documents. It consisted of two parts dedicated, respectively, to the partition of Bukovina between the USSR and Romania and the Romanian military occupation of 1941–1944, as well as an appendix containing several primary documents and a list of court decisions concerning the persecution of Jews in Romania and Bukovina. Having considered the political situation and the norms and provisions of international relations of the war era, Weber concluded that the transfer of Northern Bukovina from Romania to the Soviet Union did not represent an obvious violation of contemporary international law and established practices. In his view, this territorial concession was based on a bilateral agreement and did not differ essentially from many other transfers and assignments of territories executed or supported by various states (including members of the anti-Hitler coalition) before, during, and after World War II. Weber also did not find any evidence of the violation of "the principle of self-determination of nations" which was the central methodological premise of his analysis. His analytical and logical report contained much information and answered a great number of questions but, despite its promising title, *Bukovina in the Second World War*, his work does not explain much about the significant and dramatic changes that this territory and its extraordinarily diverse population

went through during the war. Just like Zhukovs'kyi's openly nationalistic historical overview, Weber's account serves as a persuasive example of the fallacy of a nation-state-centered historical framework when applied to borderlands. Not one of the Cold War era studies comes close to an adequate treatment of the Holocaust in the region.

Toward the end of the Cold War era, the wartime fate of Bukovina's (and Bessarabia's) Jewish population was finally addressed in historical studies based on original documents. The historian Jean Ancel was among the first to put forward an argument that would become widely accepted among historians of the modern Romanian state only in the late 1990s: Antonescu's government was not merely a puppet-state in Hitler's hands in terms of the extermination of its Jewish population. It was, rather, an initiator and active perpetrator of the Holocaust.<sup>221</sup> Ancel argued that the cleansing of borderlands areas—the “lost provinces” of Bukovina and Bessarabia— of its Jewish population (and eventually of its “Ukrainian element” and any Romanians who had been “spoiled by Bolshevik propaganda”) was seen as particularly important in order to secure the unity and homogeneity of the nation state in the future. Ancel told an extremely important, detailed, and disturbing story of the early phase of the extermination of Jews in Bukovina and Bessarabia, including the “interregnum” of early July 1941, when numerous pogroms and mass killings were organized by the local non-Jewish population without the involvement of state authorities. Ancel, however, made some generalizing, categorizing claims about the participation of “Christians” (i.e., non-Jews) in the extermination. While he made an immensely important contribution to the historiography of the region by bringing to light the active role of many locals in the extermination and the passive role of many more silent witnesses, his statement that the centuries-long experience of peaceful coexistence and friendly relations between Jews and Christians was “quickly put out of mind by Romanians and Ukrainians alike”<sup>222</sup> has to be qualified. Some locals did play positive roles during the dark days of the Holocaust.<sup>223</sup>

### **Historical Studies after 1991**

A more nuanced account of the early stage of the Holocaust in Bukovina was published more recently by Vladimir Solonari. He showed on the basis of a wide variety of available sources that the mass murder of Jews in Bukovina was inspired in most cases by modern nationalism. Nationalist ideologies put the “cleansing of nations” in the center of their belief systems. Solonari demonstrated that one year of Soviet rule did not have a direct effect on the spread of ant-Semitism in Northern

Bukovina: local populations did not “buy” the argument about the Jewish-Soviet connection unless they had been anti-Semitic and/or radically nationalist before. If anything, Soviet demographic and social policies indirectly confirmed the existing anti-Semitic sentiments among some locals. Typically, the cases where nearly entire Jewish populations were exterminated were encouraged by local Ukrainian or Romanian nationalists who became popular leaders. In other cases, concluded Solonari, anti-Jewish violence, permitted and encouraged by Romanian authorities once they arrived, took the form of violent pogroms. The goals of the latter were usually plunder and other forms of material enrichment as well as humiliation of Jews rather than the extermination of them as a national group. “Ordinary,” non-indoctrinated, rural locals, usually impoverished and badly educated, killed Jews not because they were Jewish but rather out of personal opportunism justified by propaganda that “normalized” violence, encouragement by others, and the lack of responsibility made possible by the overall radical ethos of World War II.<sup>224</sup>

Generally, post-1991 studies of World War II in Bukovina cover an even wider array of themes and, as a whole, have a much more inclusive and diversified source base. Outside Bukovina, the diplomatic aspects of the Soviet annexation and its consequences were revisited by the historians Miroslav Tejchman<sup>225</sup> and Christopher Zigger,<sup>226</sup> while the history of repatriation of Germans in 1940 was reexamined by Valerii Pasat after the opening of the Moscow archives.<sup>227</sup> With the collapse of the socialist bloc, interest in the study of Bukovina during World War II revived in Ukraine and Romania. A number of previously taboo subjects were recently approached in both countries, including the Holocaust in Bukovina. This topic is still problematic because it requires at least partially overcoming the exclusionist, ethnicity-based approach that dominates the history of the region. It also involves highly sensitive themes of collective and personal responsibility that are not easily accommodated by Romanian or Ukrainian official historical memories which are based on the marriage of ethnic victimization and national heroism.

Several important historical studies of the Holocaust in Romania have marked the beginning of an end of the era to the chronic Holocaust denial characteristic of postwar Romanian society.<sup>228</sup> Nonetheless, as late as 2003, top Romanian officials made Holocaust-denying statements, provoking the strong disapproval of Western observers. As a result, an International Commission on the Holocaust in Romania was created and reported, based on authoritative investigation, an array of shocking data about the Holocaust in Transnistria and beyond. Several public acts of acknowledgement and commemoration of the Holocaust have taken place in the country since 2004, although they were a necessity dictated by the politics of European integration

rather than voluntary acts of reconciliation. The Romanian state and society still have to come to terms with the reality of their countrymen's direct participation in the Holocaust.<sup>229</sup> Revisiting the wartime history of Bukovina and Bessarabia should be at the center of a reconciliation process, reflecting the priority and proportions of anti-Jewish violence in these territories. So far, however, Romanian works on this subject are very scarce and largely confined to the so-called unification of Romania after the "liberation" of Bukovina in July 1941.<sup>230</sup> Dimitru Sandru, for example, fiercely criticized Ukrainian nationalist activities in Bukovina. His study examined Ukrainian nationalist propaganda and political organizations under the Romanian regime of 1941–1944, focusing on attempts to claim Bukovina as part of an independent Ukrainian state. In Sandru's opinion, Ukrainian irredentism combined with Communist underground propaganda contributed greatly to the "Ruthenianization" of this "Romanian territory."<sup>231</sup>

In fact, the only Romanian book that deals with the Antonescu regime in Bukovina directly was published in Moldova by the Romanian-trained Moldovan historian Pavel Moraru.<sup>232</sup> The work typified contemporary Moldovan historiography of World War II which strongly supported the Romanian nationalist approach to modern history. Moraru reduced the discrimination and violence against Jews in Bukovina under Antonescu to a "moderate" policy of national "purification," namely, "resettlement" to Transnistria where many Jews were supposedly placed in "socially useful" jobs.<sup>233</sup> The deportations to Transnistria were discussed in the context of the history of the Romanian administration in the region, in a section entitled "Population and the Demographic Evolution in Bukovina," in a subsection on "Jews." The Holocaust was absent from Moraru's table of contents, while his attitudes toward Romanian and western historians who published sobering studies on the Holocaust in Romania was openly critical.

Dealing with notions of collective responsibility and victim-perpetrator relations is inescapable now that the Romanian Holocaust is becoming one of the central themes of public debates in and about Eastern Europe. In Ukraine, public and historical discourse about the Holocaust received somewhat more consideration if only because this discourse is limited to judging others, such as the Nazi and Romanian governments, for policies of violence and extermination. In Bukovina, in particular, recent Ukrainian works have tended to limit the history of Jewish wartime suffering to the Romanian Holocaust and early postwar anti-Semitic policies of the Soviet government. They simplify a more complicated reality by ignoring or marginalizing numerous cases of mass and individual violence against Jews perpetrated by Ukrainians, often led or initiated by members and supporters of the OUN-UPA.<sup>234</sup> The



most prolific Ukrainian researcher of the Holocaust in Bukovina, Oleh Surovtsev, reconstructed a more complex wartime reality of life and death in Jewish communities of the region. However, like his many colleagues, Surovtsev did not move from factual recognition of the participation of locals or the role of the OUN in the Holocaust to rethinking these important themes of recent Ukrainian history. Instead, his focus was on the actions of the Nazis and the Romanian government, utilizing an impressive source base that included studies fiercely criticized by Romanian and Moldovan historians like Moraru.<sup>235</sup> The problem of the violent anti-Semitic ideology and anti-Jewish actions of these organizations in general remains one of the most problematic issues in contemporary Ukrainian historiography.<sup>236</sup>

Apart from the Holocaust, recent Ukrainian works include studies of demographic changes and the repatriation policies of Soviet authorities in 1940–1941, the war-time activities of the OUN and UPA in Bukovina conceptualized as a struggle for Ukrainian statehood, the structure of Romanian military rule in 1941–1944, and the diplomatic negotiations of 1940, among others.<sup>237</sup> Most of them are article-length studies; only one is a comprehensive history of Bukovina in World War II.<sup>238</sup> While some of these studies make brief but useful contributions to this understudied field of Soviet and Eastern European history, many are based on a very limited number of sources and are quite biased and openly politicized. As in Romanian historiography, the model of “national reunification” remains almost sacred and precludes historians from looking beyond the nation-state framework to approach Bukovina as a historical borderland.

## **The Soviet Period, 1945–1991**

The partition of Bukovina between Romania and the Soviet Union was ratified by the Soviet-Romanian armistice of September 12, 1944, and later by the Paris Peace Treaty signed between the Allies and Romania on February 10, 1947. The latter also confirmed and legitimized the Soviet-Romanian border of June 1940. Together with the northern part of Bessarabia, known as the Khotyn region, and an adjoining Romanian district (Herts), Northern Bukovina became Chernivtsi province (*oblast*) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. There were significant demographic changes in Bukovina after 1944. In addition to resumed Soviet repressions and deportations of “alien elements” and “enemies of the people,” Chernivtsi province witnessed an unprecedented “evacuation” of Jews to Romania in 1945–1946. Concerned with the high concentration of Jewish survivors of the Holocaust in Chernivtsi, the Soviet government issued a special decree that allowed

and in fact demanded the emigration to Romania of Jews who had been Romanian citizens prior to 1940. This resulted in a unique Soviet population transfer that was probably equally desired by the Jews of Bukovina, local authorities, and the central authorities of the USSR and the Ukrainian Republic. Nonetheless, Chernivtsi remained one of the most important centers of Jewish culture in the USSR at least through the first postwar decade. Simultaneously, there was a great influx of migrants from eastern Ukraine and, to a lesser extent, from other regions of the Soviet Union. This brought, first of all, experienced Soviet and party cadres who then occupied most positions of authority. The first postwar years were also marked by collectivization of agriculture accompanied by mass repressions of *kurkuls*,<sup>239</sup> famines and epidemics, and the frustrating liquidation of the remnants of UPA units that lasted until the mid-1950s.

The postwar economic and social development of Chernivtsi province generally followed prewar patterns established in other regions of Soviet Ukraine. After the situation was “normalized” in the 1950s, industrialization was a priority. The initial mass migration of primarily Ukrainian and other eastern Slavic populations was later followed by the slower but continuous process of social advancement of local rural Ukrainians. Although limited, the promotion of Romanians and their culture was supported in districts recognized by authorities as predominantly Romanian. The later Soviet cultural and educational policies in Northern Bukovina did not differ much from those in other Soviet regions, resulting in the partial Russification of Ukrainian, Romanian, and remaining Jewish populations in urban centers. Along with economic stagnation and social tensions, the last decades of Soviet rule were marked by serious environmental problems.

### **Published Primary Sources**

The initial Soviet law on the inclusion of Bukovina and neighboring territories into the Ukrainian SSR as well as the treaties that finalized Bukovina’s political status after the end of the war were published in the USSR both separately and in documentary collections.<sup>240</sup> Other governmental publications dedicated to the region were limited to statistical collections of Chernivtsi *oblast’* and geographical directories.<sup>241</sup> A Soviet documentary collection that covered the years 1946–1970 was published as a follow-up to one cited in the preceding section. It concentrated almost exclusively on the economic and social achievements of Soviet power in the region but also included some material on educational and cultural developments.<sup>242</sup> A very different, although not essentially contradictory, picture of Soviet Bukovina emerged

in a memoir of a former Bukovinian who visited Chernivtsi province in 1969. Its author, Filaret Lukiianovych, who was born and raised in a Ukrainian village and was a member of the Ukrainian nationalist underground before his emigration in 1945, described Soviet Bukovina from the point of view of a nationalist Ukrainian émigré, comparing the current situation to the interwar Romanian period which he remembered well. Generally highly critical of “the Soviets,” Lukiianovych’s travel account was a telling illustration of Soviet cultural and demographic policies that were undoubtedly strongly and consciously oriented toward the region’s Ukrainization.<sup>243</sup>

Only a few published documents concerning the Soviet period appeared after the collapse of the USSR. One collection was dedicated to social movements and public life in the province in the last months of Soviet rule in 1991 and mostly included materials originally published in the local press.<sup>244</sup> The chief editor of this work, Stepan Dalavurak, was the leader of another publication project. A number of former students at Chernivtsi educational institutions who were victims of Stalinist repression were asked to write short memoirs which were later collected and published.<sup>245</sup> Both publications were prepared in the spirit of ethnic nationalism that dominated in Ukraine in the 1990s. They thus reinforced the image of Northern Bukovina as a primordially Ukrainian territory suppressed, together with the rest of Ukraine, by the authoritarian and Russian-speaking Soviet regime. On the other hand, some documents that shed light on the Jewish population and culture in Chernivtsi—a theme that had been almost completely silenced in the past—were published in the 1990s. In addition to the cited collection of interviews edited and translated by Petro Rykhlo,<sup>246</sup> which focused primarily on the prewar years but was partially relevant for the Soviet period, it is necessary to mention here the collection *The Jews of Ukraine in 1943–1953* prepared by the archivist Mikhail Mittsel.<sup>247</sup> Along with a separate section dedicated to the repatriation of Jews from Northern Bukovina to Romania, Mittsel’s book contained a number of other documents, including top secret party documents related to the Jewish population of Bukovina.

The Soviet press of Chernivtsi *oblast’* was represented by two provincial and thirteen district newspapers. The major regional paper, *Radians’ka Bukovyna*, was published in Ukrainian; the second, a Moldavian-language variant of it, was published as *Bucovina Sovietică* (1944–1947) but became independent and was renamed *Adevărul Bucovinei*. A youth newspaper, *Komsomolets’ Bukovyny*, was also published in the early years of Soviet rule. Among the thirteen rural district newspapers only one—that of the overwhelmingly Romanian-populated Gertsia

district—was in Romanian. A short-lived propagandist “almanac,” *Vil’na Bukovyna*, was published in 1940–1941 and 1945–1946.

### **Historical Studies, 1944–the 2000s**

Until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the postwar Soviet period of the history of Northern Bukovina was studied only by Soviet historians. After the publication of several works dedicated to the annexation and the initial Soviet transformations, western researchers lost both access to necessary sources and, for the most part, the motivation to study the region’s recent history. Historians in Socialist Romania avoided this sensitive and problematic subject, leaving it to the ultimate victors to write the glorious history of their own transformation of the region. The first generation of the new historians of Bukovina belonged to the large wave of qualified party and Soviet personnel who moved from the eastern parts of Soviet Ukraine and the USSR, while authors from the younger generation were primarily historians trained at Chernivtsi State University.<sup>248</sup> Many histories of Soviet Bukovina were published by regional party leaders of high rank who became “part-time” historians by necessity or due to their ambition.<sup>249</sup> Although these works were primarily propagandist in nature and rarely scholarly, they served as the mandatory models and guidelines for professional historians who aligned their own writing with the standards, directions, and limits established by the party leaders.

After the collapse of the USSR, interest in the Soviet period in Bukovina (and in the history of Bukovina in general) grew among local Bukovinian historians. Unlike earlier periods of the region’s history recently revisited by scholars in Romania, Germany, and other countries, the Soviet period remained almost exclusively the domain of Ukrainian historians who had the best access to local archival sources. Tamara Marusyk, Vasyl’ Kholodnyts’kyi, and a group of other historians at Chernivtsi National University published studies of the repressions against Ukrainian intellectuals, Soviet repatriations and demographic policy, postwar famine, and social changes in early Soviet Bukovina.<sup>250</sup> These were a part of the larger, nationwide project of reconceptualizing twentieth-century Ukrainian history according to the official nationalist paradigm based primarily on the notion of collective national suffering. With few exceptions, these studies focused on the Ukrainian population of Bukovina or effectively equated the Ukrainians of Bukovina with the population of Bukovina. Even more importantly, the analytical framework of these historical works was based on the perceived dichotomy between the (Ukrainian) people and Soviet power. It resulted in a simplified and distorted picture of the complex and

multilayered relationships among the diverse population and various levels of Soviet authority in Chernivtsi province and the USSR in general.

For example, the articles by the most prolific Ukrainian researcher of the war-time and postwar transformations in Chernivtsi province, Vasyl' Kholodnyts'kyi, demonstrated the author's struggle between accounting for the facts found in the sources and complying with the official version of national history (and probably his personal ideological beliefs), which could hardly accommodate these facts. He generally portrayed the Sovietization of the province in the 1940s and early 1950s as a near total subjugation of the population by the Soviet regime. In several articles, though, Kholodnyts'kyi discussed the "mobilization" of a significant portion of the local population in Soviet, party, and NKVD organs and informants' networks and admitted the importance of the widespread promotion of locals to lower positions of authority throughout the province for strengthening Soviet power in the region. While characterizing OUN-UPA activity as a virtuous patriotic struggle, he briefly mentioned its "ruthless elimination of pro-Soviet elements"; he acknowledged the OUN-led mass extermination of the "native inhabitants" of many Bukovinian villages during the power vacuum of July 1941, but preferred to call the victims "local Soviet activists (mostly Jews by nationality)" and avoided discussing or even mentioning the anti-Semitism of OUN members or local non-Jews.

If Kholodnyts'kyi should be credited for including Jews among the "native inhabitants" of the province on many occasions, he remained rather firm in juxtaposing these "natives" with Romanian "colonists and administrators" in his discussions of population movements during the war and in postwar decades; at the same time, he mentioned Soviet cultural policies regarding the Romanian population of the province and even discussed infringements of their cultural rights by imposing the Moldavian language and Cyrillic alphabet instead of the traditional Romanian language and Latin script.<sup>251</sup> Whether this use of euphemisms and (even if unintentional) subscription to anti-Jewish and other nationalist prejudices was a legacy of Soviet ideological and historiographical norms or attributable to nationalist popular culture, it clearly indicated serious limits to the reconceptualization of the Soviet history of Northern Bukovina. In addition, a number of the studies cited above suffer from a limited source base and/or inadequate quality of research and writing, which was not an uncommon problem in post-Soviet regional scholarship.

Very few studies of the Soviet period in Bukovina were published outside Ukraine. Short but important works by Mordehai Altshuler appeared in the late 1990s in Israel, bringing back from long historical oblivion the mass "transfer" of Jews from Bukovina to Romania in 1945–1946 and the life of Jewish communities

in postwar Chernivtsi.<sup>252</sup> European and North American scholars have not studied Soviet Bukovina during the postwar period, with the exception of a short article dedicated to a local environmental disaster.<sup>253</sup> Interestingly, Yaroslav Bilinsky, the author of a standard voluminous study of post–World War II Soviet Ukraine, deemed it difficult or unnecessary to fit Bukovina and Transcarpathia—the two latest territorial additions to the republic—into the main text and gave a brief description of these regions and their incorporation into Soviet Ukraine in an endnote.<sup>254</sup>

## Conclusion

Although no up-to-date and complete bibliography of the region exists, significant bibliographical classification of publications about Bukovina was carried out, primarily by Erich Beck, who remains the dean of the region’s bibliography. Whereas the Austrian period, the longest in Bukovina’s modern history, is best represented both in documentary publications and historical studies, later periods are relatively less studied. Few documents from the interwar period were published but several serious recent studies have explored this era critically and comprehensively. A fair number of memoirs and other documents from World War II are available, although serious historical study of the period is clearly lacking. Finally, the state of documentary publications and historical studies of the Soviet and post-Soviet eras of Bukovina’s history leaves much to be desired. In addition, because most of the publications are in languages other than English, Bukovina is largely “lost in translation” for most North American researchers.

Bukovina itself as a distinct region and cultural phenomenon slowly disappeared throughout the twentieth century in the continuous historical interpreting and reinterpreting that accompanied the nation-building processes in the region. As is evident from this survey, when it comes to writing the history of a land caught between nations, the danger of subjectivity is especially strong. The discourse about Bukovina’s past, or rather the multiple controversial interpretations that tend to ignore each other, suggest that ideas of nationalism and territoriality, which have provided the major framework for conceptualizing of Europe’s past and present since the late eighteenth century, continue to dominate the historical discipline. A (linguistically equipped) student of Bukovina in search of an introduction to the region would be looking at a large variety of general studies and an even more striking number of period- and theme-specific studies, published at different times and in various places. The naïve researcher might be surprised to find quite divergent stories about the same region: many historical studies of Bukovina illustrate what might be called

the borderland syndrome of contesting shared land—different ethnic communities produce quite separate historical narratives. The narrowness and aggressiveness of such nationalizing, appropriative accounts grew with the general advent of nationalist ideologies through the last decades of the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century, when nationalism became almost inescapable as a dominant belief system in the world. Creating a coherent historical narrative—a national myth—was an important element of any nationalist ideology; another was to delineate and sanctify a nation’s territory. Territorial in essence, modern nationalism does not presuppose a sharing of the land, which doomed the adherents of different national ideas in Bukovina to be political rivals and those of them involved in writing histories to engage in polemics and simplification.<sup>255</sup>

Of course, such historians of Bukovina approach certain periods with concepts acceptable to, or dictated by, their national or ideological groups; they also prioritize or avoid some periods that are useful or, on the contrary, disturbing to their interpretations. The Habsburg period was studied extensively by all schools of Bukovina’s history; however, Austro-German input into this field is the most significant. The recent works on Austrian Bukovina are dominated by two different paradigms: the idealizing “consensus” model of Austro-German historians who are nostalgic for a tolerant, multicultural Bukovina under liberal Habsburg rule, and the nationalist Ukrainian and Romanian schools, which, though they both see Austrian rule as foreign and nationally oppressive, nevertheless compete with each other over absolute historical rights to the area.

The historiography of twentieth-century Bukovina is characterized by an even stronger polarization of rival interpretations and a growing tendency of “national” historians to dwell on their own history as opposed to the history of the entire region. This compartmentalization of historical study reflects the national divisions in Bukovinian society itself, divisions which intensified during the last decades of Habsburg rule and only grew stronger with time. The First World War is seen as the beginning of the end of Bukovina’s multiculturalism by a majority of Austro-German historians, whereas Romanian and Ukrainian authors view it as the decisive time for their respective national movements’ struggle for their native land. The interwar period is regarded as a triumph by Romanian scholars and as a catastrophe by both nationalist and Soviet Ukrainian historians. In their studies of the Second World War, Jewish historians are concerned primarily with the Holocaust in Bukovina, while Austro-German scholars are looking mainly at the issue of repatriation of Bukovinian Germans to the Third Reich and the life of emigrant communities.

Romanian and Ukrainian historians, in contrast, essentially ignore these problems and concentrate on diplomatic and legal issues, particularly focusing on legitimizing historical claims to the region. The less researched Soviet period was glorified by Soviet authors and either condemned or ignored by non-Soviet historians of the Cold War era. Finally, the post-Soviet Ukrainian interpretation of the Soviet period is essentially a hybrid of the Soviet and nationalist Ukrainian veneration of the “reunification” of Bukovina with “Mother Ukraine” according to the official primordial understanding of the Ukrainian nation promoted by the Ukrainian state until recently.

This simplistic summary presupposes exceptions that were pointed out in various sections of the guide. Although they are still the products of their ethnicity-based cultural and intellectual communities, a number of recent studies of modern Bukovina attempt to break or at least modify established paradigms. Many recent German studies, for example, cast doubt on the overidealization of multiculturalism and national consensus in Austrian Bukovina, while both Romanian and Ukrainian historians made steps toward appreciating the liberalism of the Habsburg period; several Ukrainian historians have studied repatriations and the repression of Germans and the Holocaust. A few scholars in the West published cutting-edge studies about Bukovina that began to transform the historiography of the region. However, the revision of Bukovina’s history in Bukovina proper and, more generally in the countries that inherited this region, Romania and Ukraine, rarely goes beyond the rhetoric of tolerance and diversity. A borderland trapped between national histories, Bukovina remains an intellectually contested land, and the actual place is getting lost in this contest.



Center for Russian & East European Studies  
University Center for International Studies  
University of Pittsburgh  
4400 W. W. Posvar Hall  
230 South Boquet Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260  
(412) 648-8716  
[www.ucis.pitt.edu/crees/cbpaper.html](http://www.ucis.pitt.edu/crees/cbpaper.html).

Ronald Linden, Bob Donnorummo, William Chase, Andrew Konitzer, Co-Editors  
Eileen O'Malley, Managing Editor  
Julie Tvaruzek, Editorial Assistant