

### The workers' movement in Bukovina (1896-1927): a brief contribution to recent Romanian historiography

Bratuleanu, Vlad

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Bratuleanu, V. (2020). The workers' movement in Bukovina (1896-1927): a brief contribution to recent Romanian historiography. *Perspective Politice*, 13(1-2), 75-91. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-86244-1>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-SA Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Weitergabe unter gleichen Bedingungen) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.de>

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-SA Licence (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>

# The workers' movement in Bukovina (1896–1927): A brief contribution to recent Romanian historiography

---

***Abstract:** During the past 30 years, Romanian historians have paid limited attention to the rich history of social-democracy in Romania, despite the opportunities offered to them by the fall of the communist regime. To be sure, the post-revolutionary period has yielded a good deal of published material concerning social-democracy, or more broadly, the history of the left in Romania – monographs, memoirs, various collections of documents, scholarly work, some of the latter very good. All things considered, research has yet to explore certain avenues of inquiry. There are still unaddressed questions in this field of study.*

***Keywords:** Bukovina, Austro-Hungarian Empire; Social-Democracy; Romanian left*

Up to now, recent historiography on Romanian social-democracy has focused primarily on the Social-Democratic Party of Romania (PSDR, formed 1927) and on the evolution of socialist and workers' organisations circumscribed to the geographical space of the Old Kingdom of Romania. Socialist-oriented developments in other areas inhabited by Romanians have received less attention, by comparison. This fact is all too evident in the case of the social-democratic workers' movement of Bukovina. Initially part of the greater Austrian so-

cial-democratic movement, it played an important role in the construction of PSDR after the Great Union of 1918. Yet, today there is only one major work published in Romania and devoted to this subject<sup>1</sup>. The few comprehensive monographs that belong to recent historiography only include a few sections dedi-

cated to the parties and other organizations that were active in Bukovina up to the initial stages of the Second World War. This neglect is disproportionate to the impact that the latter had on the broader Romanian movement both before and after 1927: the workers' unions of the former Duchy of Bukovina played an important part in the general strike of 1920 and the Social-Democratic Party in that province had a decisive influence on the drawing up of the 1927 party programme of the PSDR; also, many of the top leaders of the PSDR after 1927 were militants from Bukovina. This article aims to correct this obvious shortcoming in recent historiography. More to the point, this is an effort to recover the history of the Social-Democratic labour movement in Bukovina (1896-1927) and to bring a necessary contribution to the

---

**Vlad BRĂTULEANU**

PhD

Cercetător independent

vbratuleanu@yahoo.com

---

broader history of the left in Romania. The main objectives are: to construct the chronological evolution of the Social-Democratic Party of Bukovina (PSDB) and the related labour unions and other associations, to assess their strength (size, influence) and to evaluate their legacy. At the same time, this paper aims to challenge certain assumptions used by previous researchers – and this will provide an appropriate starting point.

## Outlining the context

Probably the first study by a historian concerning social-democracy in Bukovina dates back to 1978 and consists of an article published by Petru Rușindilar<sup>2</sup>. The author subsequently developed his research and published further results exactly twenty years later in a volume entitled *George Grigorovici și Social-democrația în Bucovina*. Yet his work on the subject can be considered unsatisfactory: the former piece, published during the communist era, is too burdened by national-communist discourse to be of much significance; the latter, though more ambitious and more honest, preserves the nationalist emphasis, while shying away from thorough inquiry into sensitive issues relevant to the chosen topic. There is also another important aspect that needs to be stated: Rușindilar's 1998 work largely focuses on the biography of George Grigorovici, *only one* of the most important leaders of local social-democracy and a Romanian patriot. In his work, other aspects, related to the development of the local movement as a whole are treated as secondary, or even marginal.

Rușindilar's general approach is typical of that used by historians who, after 1989, as Florin Abraham has pointed out, relinquished the pre-1989 rhetoric and adopted a stance in their writing that was both anti-communist and nationalist<sup>3</sup>. Rușindilar's perspective is echoed in the works of Stelian Neagoe and Vasile Niculae, who both praise Romanian socialist leader Grigorovici as a man devoted to the Romanian nationalist cause in Bukovina and other lands<sup>4</sup>. This sort of emphasis is of little use to those trying to understand the complexities of a multi-national workers' movement, as well as the particular nature of patriotic feeling among social-democrats in that part of the Austro-Hungarian empire. The social-democratic or socialist movement in Bukovina brought together members of five distinct nationalities – Germans, Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, Romanians – in one of the smallest and most ethnically diverse provinces of the Austrian half of the empire. This is one of the key factors in understanding the subsequent evolution of the workers' movement in Bukovina and its impact must be properly assessed.

## The autonomous Duchy of Bukovina around 1900

Towards 1900, the Austrian half of Austria-Hungary was a modern industrialized country. Yet, in terms of industrial growth rates, it occupied a middle position among great powers: it was ahead of England and France, but behind the Hungarian half of the empire, Germany or Russia<sup>5</sup>.

Its industrial heart lay in the western regions of Bohemia, Silesia, Lower Austria and Vienna<sup>6</sup>. The easternmost provinces, by contrast, were the least developed and their economy had a primarily agricultural character<sup>7</sup>. It was to this eastern periphery that Bukovina belonged, a small province of over 700000 inhabitants<sup>8</sup>, on the border with Russia and Romania, just south of the much larger Austrian province of Galizia. Yet, although it never caught up with the western provinces in terms of development, towards the turn of the century it was undergoing a

rapid transformation. The introduction of the modern railway system beginning with 1867<sup>9</sup> stimulated the growth of industry and by the 1890s, Bukovina had one of the densest railway networks in Europe<sup>10</sup>. Industrial train lines particularly fueled the development of the logging industry, possibly the biggest industry in the province both before and after 1918<sup>11</sup>. Mining and metallurgical engineering also benefitted from the revolution in transportation<sup>12</sup>; the food and construction industries flourished. Whatever the activity, however, small-scale businesses predominated. Industry expanded into towns, but it was significantly present in the countryside and in the mountainous regions of the south-west, where much of the timber was. It is true that due to specific local conditions (lack of capital<sup>13</sup> and coal<sup>14</sup>), it remained small, with a low degree of diversification, even after 1900. Nevertheless, the scale of development during the last decades of Habsburg rule should not be underestimated: in 1919, Bukovina was the second most industrialized of the provinces of Greater Romania, after the Banat region<sup>15</sup>.

Closely connected to industrial change was a process of rapid urbanization. During the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, towns grew both in size and in number. Migration was an essential factor in this process, as urban localities drew in residents from rural communities or other provinces. Larger towns, like Storozinetz or Czernowitz, witnessed spectacular demographic growth in this period, with the latter quadrupling its population. Czernowitz, the capital of the Duchy, became a cosmopolitan modern city, with 87.000 inhabitants in 1910<sup>16</sup>. Overall, change was especially dramatic in the 1900s<sup>17</sup> and by 1910, almost a quarter of the population of Bukovina (24%) lived in 16 urban centers<sup>18</sup>.

Naturally, the appearance of a modern proletarian class was strongly linked to these transformations, as it is clearly evidenced by the fact that by 1890, the most numerous contingents of the workforce were those employed in construction work and in the logging industry<sup>19</sup>. There are two interesting aspects, specific to Bukovina, which gave the local working class its particular character. The first is tied to the landscape: since almost half of the territory of the province was covered by forests, the surface available for agriculture was small, restricted to 30% of the land<sup>20</sup>; much of this arable land was in the hands of big landowners, so most of the peasants in Bukovina, who also constituted the overwhelming majority of the population, therefore, only owned small plots<sup>21</sup>. As a consequence, many of them were forced to turn to other activities to support themselves. A flourishing household industry blossomed, as numerous peasants became artisans. They took up trades that compensated for the underdevelopment of certain branches of industry<sup>22</sup>. Still, others looked for employment in factories and workshops, often performing seasonal or day work as unskilled labourers. These semi-rural workers seem to have constituted a significant proportion of the total workforce. The prevalence of temporary employment at the turn of the century is aptly suggested by the fact that in some branches, employers struggled to find skilled and long-term workers<sup>23</sup>.

The second aspect is related to ethnic heterogeneity: the workforce was also fragmented along ethnic lines with considerable numbers of Germans, Poles, Jewish, Ukrainians and Romanians employed in industry and crafts.

The majority of the men and women working in industry did not have easy lives: they worked very long hours, sometimes 12 to 16 a day, seven days a week; wages were low and employers often treated them badly, as the main social-democratic newspaper *Volkspress* would often claim; furthermore, by the 1890s Austria had social legislation that was ahead of its time, but this did not extend to all wage earners<sup>24</sup>; consequently, at the turn of the century, particularly in Bukovina, many (such as the employees in small businesses and those in the

logging industry) did not benefit from accident, invalidity or health insurance, let alone a public pension scheme<sup>25</sup>.

## **The birth of the workers' movement**

The social-democratic workers' movement in Bukovina emerged from among the ranks of skilled German workers in Czernowitz. It was printers returning from their apprenticeships in other parts of the Empire, who played a pioneering role, bringing socialist ideas and a militant attitude to the town. They were the first to build a modern trade union association<sup>26</sup>. By the middle of the 1890s, in the capital of the Duchy, elements of an incipient worker's movement were already apparent. In 1893, a socialist printer, Wilhelm Lehner, founded an educational club for working men and women. He also participated in the activities of another association, called *Vorwärts*, established one year later<sup>27</sup>. In 1896, an Austrian machinist from Vienna<sup>28</sup>, Franz Zeplichal, managed to transform *Vorwärts* into an ambitious general union organization<sup>29</sup>. In August of the same year, various socialist groups came together in the founding congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Bukovina, held in Czernowitz. The delegates adopted the Hainfeld party programme of the Austrian Social-Democrats as their own<sup>30</sup>. With this, they joined the wider Austrian socialist movement. The end result of several years of political agitation, the SDP of Bukovina bound together around 700 individuals<sup>31</sup> of various nationalities – mostly Germans, possibly some Romanians, Jews and Ukrainians<sup>32</sup>.

From the very beginning, the Bukovinians enjoyed the support of their more experienced Galician counterparts, at the time grouped into the Social Democratic Party of Galicia and Silesia, also part of the Austrian movement<sup>33</sup>. The relationship between socialists in these two provinces grew strong over time, culminating during the monarchy's last years.

One can easily assume that the timing of the founding congress of the SDP was purposely chosen in direct relation to the upcoming elections for the Imperial Council (Reichsrat) in Vienna, set for 1897, and also as a response to the recent passing of the electoral reform act, earlier that same year. The restrictive Austrian electoral system, based on 4 curiae, was amended to include a 5<sup>th</sup> one, the curia of universal male suffrage<sup>34</sup>. Following their comrades in the western parts of Austria, the Bukovinian social-democrats joined in the electoral struggle with Franz Zeplichal and Johann Witiuk – a Ukrainian printer – as candidates. Overall, the socialists in the entire Austrian half of the empire managed to send 14 deputies to the Reichsrat, but in Bukovina, Zeplichal and Witiuk lost<sup>35</sup>. The nascent movement suffered another setback the autumn of the same year when a strike by construction workers in Czernowitz ended in violence and arrests by the police. These two blows evidenced the major challenges and perils confronting the young labour organizations in the province.

During the next years, both the union and the party predominantly focused on organizational expansion. They succeeded in establishing numerous local organizations in both medium and small localities, significantly expanding their support base outside Czernowitz and recuperating the losses incurred after the 1897 strike. Concurrently, workers were relatively successful in the workplace: according to a prominent social-democratic leader, the period up to 1906 witnessed numerous strikes, most of them successful – collective bargaining, shortening of working hours and wage increases being gains that were made during this interval<sup>36</sup>. Yet, until 1905, the movement as a whole remained small, in spite of the fact that the social-democrats had almost no competition on the left<sup>37</sup>. It mainly represented the skilled proletari-

at of German and Jewish origin<sup>38</sup>, probably generally working in workshops and small-to-medium enterprises, while semi-rural workers and those belonging to other nationalities (especially Ukrainians), largely remained outside the social-democratic fold<sup>39</sup>. Statistics regarding the overall level of unionization clearly reveal the scale of this predicament: in 1904, only 2 in 100 industrial workers belonged to a union<sup>40</sup>. Two main causes are attributable to this failure: firstly, the inability of union and party to adapt their approach in order to win over both skilled and unskilled / rural labour; secondly, a lack of sufficient militants, particularly those who could speak the five local languages, an issue leaders of the movement periodically complained about.

Given the circumstances, the leadership of the SDP pinned their hopes on the twin processes of industrialization and proletarianization, as it believed that the fortunes of the movement were tied to those of industry – the more the latter developed, the more workers would swell the ranks of party and union<sup>41</sup>. However, actual change was to come from the political arena.

Right from the start, the SDP in Bukovina had campaigned for the abolition of the outdated Austrian electoral system based on curiae and for the introduction of universal suffrage for both sexes in local, provincial and central elections. By 1904, a host of other political groups and parties were also making similar demands. In the provincial parliament (the Diet, or Landtag), a multi-ethnic and cross-ideological coalition called the Liberal Alliance was formed, that sought to use universal suffrage to break a political majority made up of Romanian conservative boyars<sup>42</sup>. The reform act of 1896 only applied to elections for the Reichsrat, leaving the system of privileges intact at a provincial and local level. The Liberal Alliance aimed to win the elections in order to change the electoral law from within. The Social-Democrats joined the coalition and ran for the first time in provincial elections, in 1904. They failed to win any seats, yet the Landtag alliance signalled both a change in the political climate as well as the SDP's willingness to enter cross-class alliances. Curiously enough, an independent candidate, Josef Weidenfeld from Suczawa, ran as a social-democrat and won, thus becoming the first such politician to enter the provincial Diet<sup>43</sup>.

The second important change for the SDP came not from within, but from across the border. The Russian revolution of 1905 sent shockwaves throughout Austria-Hungary. In the Austrian half, the news that the tsar had conceded to the opening of the Duma, impelled the social-democrats to revive the fight for universal suffrage<sup>44</sup>. In Bukovina, the impact of the revolution was felt particularly strong, due to the province's position at the border with Russia. The steady clandestine influx of Russian refugees during 1905-1906<sup>45</sup> fueled an atmosphere of effervescence in socialist circles. Local Jewish social-democrats joined the revolutionary effort, collaborating with members of the Russian Jewish Bund and smuggling propaganda material through the north-eastern border crossing at Nowosielitza<sup>46</sup>.

In the meantime, as the campaign for the vote began anew, workers flocked to union and party organisations, significantly augmenting the numbers of the social-democrats<sup>47</sup>. Germans and Jews were soon outnumbered by Romanians, Ukrainians and Poles. By the end of 1907, labour and party organisations – which shared the same personnel – could count on more than 3000 registered members<sup>48</sup>.

Following these developments, a reorganization of the SDP and the labour union began. Over time, the party was turned into a federal structure made up of five national parties – German, Jewish, Polish, Romanian, Ukrainian, each with its own executive committee, and all united under a central body, the regional Executive Committee of the International Social-De-

mocratic Party<sup>49</sup>. Mimicking the wider Austrian Party, which had also been turned into a federation of national parties following the 1897 congress in Vienna<sup>50</sup>, each of the five sections of the so-called International was autonomous in terms of “national aspects”: each published newspapers in its national language and supported the creation of educational-cultural organisations<sup>51</sup>. Their level of autonomy was considerable, so much so that in the coming years, each section (except for the Romanian one) would become part of the same-language social-democratic parties in the other parts of Austria, all the while maintaining their membership in the central executive organization of Bukovina<sup>52</sup>.

The union organization was also transformed after 1905. The general union was turned into a federation of trade unions. Trade organisations were created and brought together under a Central Commission in Czernowitz, which had already been founded in 1904 to allow the unions more autonomy with respect to the party. Each trade organization under the Commission was at the same time affiliated to a Central Union corresponding to a particular trade, headquartered in Vienna. At a provincial level, a secretariat was created in 1905 to coordinate union and political activity<sup>53</sup>. George Grigorovici, a Romanian Bukovinan from Vienna, who was assigned by the Collective Austrian party (*Gesamtpartei*) to coordinate the fight for universal suffrage in the province, assumed leadership of the secretariat<sup>54</sup>.

It needs to be stressed that all these structural changes took place gradually between 1906 and 1910 and were incomplete: for example, while the federal unions became firmly established in Czernowitz, it seems that the previous model of mixed union organizations survived in some parts of the Duchy<sup>55</sup>.

## **(Male) Universal suffrage and electoral success**

As part of the campaign for universal suffrage, the Austrian party decided in October 1905 to call for a general strike. It was preceded by demonstrations and railway workers strikes on 31 October in Vienna and Prague. Then, on 28 November, a total of around 1 million people participated in protest demonstrations in Vienna, Prague and other parts of Bohemia<sup>56</sup>. In Bukovina, events were also impressive, albeit on a smaller scale. 6000 people, by some estimates, marched through Czernowitz on 12 November, led by the social-democrats. The latter adopted a memorandum which they ceremoniously presented to the mayor. Another meeting took place in Radautz that same day<sup>57</sup>. Coordinating their efforts with their colleagues in Vienna, the social-democrats then launched a general strike on 28 November. Czernowitz was again at the forefront of the campaign. Shops stayed closed that day, there were public gatherings and a procession<sup>58</sup> which brought together 13000-15000 participants, according to local newspaper *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*<sup>59</sup>. For a city of fewer than 100000 inhabitants, this was obviously a significant and intimidating turnout. At one of the public gatherings, Jewish social-democratic leader Jakob Pistiner read a resolution which demanded that the parliament and government in Vienna agree on a reform to allow universal voting rights. There were also smaller demonstrations and public gatherings in Radautz and Storojinetz<sup>60</sup>.

The events on 28 November revealed the newfound strength of the workers' movement in Bukovina. However, in spite of the country-wide public pressure, no electoral reform was adopted during 1906. Documents show that the Austrian party had decided on a second mass strike and that the Bukovina section complied and had started to prepare for a general strike focused mainly in Czernowitz<sup>61</sup>. The strikes never took place: in January 1907 male universal

suffrage for the Reichsrat was voted into law<sup>62</sup>. The workers' movement had forced a turning point in Austria's history: with an increase in the total number of voters from 13% to 69%, masses were truly entering the political arena<sup>63</sup>.

Under the new reform bill, the former curiae were replaced by electoral districts allocated per national group. Each of the latter was to send one deputy to the Reichsrat. There were 14 such districts in Bukovina: 5 for the Ukrainians, 5 for the Romanians and 4 for the Germans and Jews. Two social-democrats decided to run in two of the latter: Czernowitz West and Czernowitz East<sup>64</sup>. They were the Romanian George Grigorovici and a Jewish militant from Vienna, Jakob Brod<sup>65</sup>. Grigorovici won with 35435 out of 6053 votes and became the first and only representative of the Bukovinan social-democrats in the Reichsrat<sup>66</sup>. At the Austrian level, the social-democrats became the biggest opposition party, with 87 deputies<sup>67</sup>.

The victory was immense for the workers' movement, yet universal suffrage only applied to elections for the central legislative assembly in Vienna. In the years up to the start of the First World War the focus of social-democrats in Bukovina and elsewhere would be the extension of the universal right to vote to local and provincial institutions and to women.

The Reichsrat elections of 1907 generated renewed enthusiasm for universal suffrage in the Landtag and debates on this topic started again in 1908<sup>68</sup>. An electoral reform at the provincial level was approved by the emperor only in 1910. Reflecting the intensity of the nationality struggle in Austria at the time, the so-called "electoral Ausgleich" in Bukovina was based on the Moravian compromise of 1905. Just as with the 1896 Reichsrat reform, a universal suffrage curia was added to the previously existing ones<sup>69</sup>. Most importantly, however, was that candidates and electorate were split into five electoral bodies on national criteria<sup>70</sup>. Members of a particular nationality could only elect candidates belonging to the same national group<sup>71</sup>. Though these changes were less than what the social-democrats had demanded, they nonetheless chose to run for the Landtag elections of 1911. The results were poor: only one out of the six social-democratic candidates (Grigorovici and Zeplichal among them) won, the Ukrainian Nikolai Hawryszczuk<sup>72</sup>. Grigorovici would nonetheless be again elected deputy of the Reichsrat that same year.

The social-democrats also invested considerable energy in the fight for local councils in 1908-1909. They had participated in local elections as early as 1898 and already had a specific political programme at the start of the 1900s. The 1906 version of this programme, designed with the administration of Czernowitz in mind, first and foremost demanded greater local autonomy as well as proportional representation and the right to vote for all inhabitants of both sexes who had reached the age of 20. Under their proposal, the local community, through its institutions, would take control of public services and administer them for its own benefit. The community would buy up unused land in the city and use it to build affordable housing; create a so-called Housing Police (Wohnungspolizei), to make sure that housing conditions, especially for rental housing, are adequate; establish an employment agency, a minimum wage for municipal workers as well as care institutions for the poor (coupled with the demand in parliament for a state-funded old-age pension scheme); organize food provisioning for the city, to make sure all inhabitants have access to basic foodstuffs; takeover pharmacies, public transport, water and electricity supply from private owners, among other measures<sup>73</sup>.

Thanks to the approval by the emperor of a universal male suffrage reform for local elections in March 1909<sup>74</sup>, the social-democrats managed to score a great victory in Suczawa the



same year, securing 8 local councillor seats as well as the vice-mayorship of the town, their first success in local elections, according to the social-democratic press<sup>75</sup>.

Unlike the previous ones, the fight for the extension of voting rights to women was completely unsuccessful – it was only after 1918 that women would be allowed to vote in Austria. Judging by the composition of the party leadership in Bukovina, few women were present in the workers' movement. There were, however, women's organisations within the numerous educational clubs affiliated to the five national sections of the party in Bukovina and it seems women were involved alongside men in the campaign for the 1907 elections. In 1911 a public gathering for the enfranchisement of women brought together several thousand women<sup>76</sup>. At the forefront of the fight was Tatiana Grigorovici, one of the leaders of the social-democrats, who also happened to be the wife of George Grigorovici. Of Jewish-Russian descent, she had been part of the Austro-Marxist group in Vienna, which also included some of the most important social-democratic leaders in Austria. She was aware of the efforts of the suffragette movement in Great Britain, also pointing out that women's demands had always been supported by the Austrian social-democrats<sup>77</sup>. She demanded equal rights for the two sexes, but also maintained that only socialism and the elimination of exploitation could solve the social and economic issues that affected women in particular<sup>78</sup>.

## The National Question and War

Bukovina was largely spared the national struggle prevalent in the rest of Austria-Hungary around the turn of the century. In this corner of the empire, relations among national groups were more moderate than elsewhere, most likely due to the extraordinary ethnic diversity of the Duchy, which induced a spirit of cooperation across linguistic and confessional boundaries<sup>79</sup>. There were some tensions between nationalist Ukrainians and Romanians, especially over the disputed region of northern Bukovina<sup>80</sup>, but these did not spill over into open conflict before the end of Habsburg rule.

Good interethnic relations also prevailed within the labour movement. The local social-democrats adhered to the decisions of the 1899 Brünn congress of the *Gesamtpartei*, which had put forth the idea of a future federalization of Austria-Hungary based on national criteria<sup>81</sup>. As the newspaper of the Romanian section, *Lupta*, boasted, the social-democrats considered themselves the true defenders of the interests of all nationalities in Austria!<sup>82</sup> It can be noted, however, that *Lupta* (which most likely printed the views of its editor, G. Grigorovici) saw no inherent tension in the defence of internationalism and the nurturing of national identity<sup>83</sup>. Also, especially after 1907, the Jewish social-democrats slowly gravitated towards the idea of non-territorial national autonomy, as formulated by Karl Renner and Otto Bauer and filtered through the Jewish parties of Russia and Galicia<sup>84</sup>. In any case, after the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and with increased military spending, the social-democrats re-iterated their internationalist creed. In 1911, with the occasion of the 1 May celebrations, Reichsrat deputy Grigorovici not only praised the unity and internationalism of the movement but also denounced nationalism<sup>85</sup>.

It was only towards the end of the Great War that the unity of the workers in Bukovina was broken. In October 1918, as Austria-Hungary was disintegrating, Ukrainian and Romanian social-democrats supported opposing nationalist factions trying to win control over Bukovina<sup>86</sup>. Ukrainian representatives of the working class such as Yosip Bezpalko and Landtag deputy Hawryszczuk, among others, declared their support for the takeover of power by the Ukraini-

an National Council. During the brief occupation of Czernowitz by Ukrainian legions formerly of the imperial army, Bezpalko was appointed mayor<sup>87</sup> and he used this position to rally support for the Ukrainian cause<sup>88</sup>. Romanian social-democrats, on the other hand, allied themselves with the Romanian National Council, which not only opted for the unification of Bukovina with neighbouring Romania, but also asked the Romanian army to intervene. In this conflict, Polish and German social-democrats sided with the Romanian social-democrats, while the Jewish ones remained neutral<sup>89</sup>. Following the military occupation of Bukovina by Romanian troops, the Ukrainians were forced into inactivity, though the party resurfaced later in 1919<sup>90</sup>.

## Adapting to a new institutional and political context

After 1918, the political elites of the Romanian state, which had more than doubled its size as a result of territorial acquisitions, took it upon themselves to construct new political institutions that could accommodate the new status-quo<sup>91</sup>. The social-democrats of Bukovina wanted to have a say in the process. Their main concern was safeguarding the social legislation and political rights won during the reign of Franz Joseph, which they viewed as superior to those in Romania at the time<sup>92</sup>.

They challenged the views of the National Liberal Party in Bucharest, whose nationalism and plans of administrative centralization threatened to annul all the decision-making powers and privileges of the former Duchy of Bukovina, as well as the aforementioned gains. Thus, the social-democrats became the defenders of autonomy in a wider political dispute between parties of the new provinces and the elites of the Old Kingdom of Romania led by the liberals and their allies, which centred on the drafting of a new constitution.

Questioning the legitimacy of Romanian authorities in Bukovina and denouncing what amounted to military rule in the province, the social-democrats demanded a new constitution that would allow some form of self-government to the former Duchy. For Jakob Pistiner, the keyword was decentralization: the state should be structured on a bottom-up basis, self-government should be the rule for all administrative entities, starting with the local community; separately, some form of cultural autonomy should be granted to national minorities.<sup>93</sup> George Grigorovici also spoke about decentralization and autonomy. Pointing out that Bukovina was not a conquered land with an inferior status, but a province which had willingly joined Romania, he considered that the state should be given a federal structure<sup>94</sup>. Their views were very similar to those of the Peasant Party, which was also left-leaning and which came up with its own constitutional draft<sup>95</sup>. On a provincial level, the social-democrats sided with Romanian nationalist Iancu Flondor, the former president of the Romanian National Council, who favoured a process of national integration that would allow for autonomy and also consider the needs of non-Romanians<sup>96</sup>. In the end, the adoption of a new fundamental act in 1923 marked the defeat of all supporters of autonomy and the victory of centralism: Romania was proclaimed a national, unitary and indivisible state<sup>97</sup>.

## Strength and decline

At the start of 1919, the worker's movement was in disarray. As Jewish leader Joseph Kissman put it, during the last months of the war, the social-democrats had mostly focused on al-

leviating the dire conditions of the local population of Czernowitz, especially in the areas of housing and food provisioning<sup>98</sup>. However, possibilities for meaningful political and union work were limited at the beginning of Romanian rule, for two main reasons: first, organisations outside of Czernowitz were either inexistent or had very few members<sup>99</sup>; second, a state of emergency had been extended over Bukovina (and would largely remain in place until 1928<sup>100</sup>) and other parts of the country; under these circumstances, public meetings were restricted and the press was censored, while workers and their organisations were subjected to harassment<sup>101</sup>, probably because of the intense anti-left atmosphere prevalent among political elites at that time<sup>102</sup>.

In spite of these difficulties, it is clear that during 1919-1920 the strength and influence of the movement grew considerably, as more and more inhabitants of the province, radicalized by post-war economic hardships and shortages of all kinds, veered towards the left of the political spectrum<sup>103</sup>. Bukovina had been greatly affected by the war, being occupied three times by the Russian army. Its industry and railway infrastructure had been devastated<sup>104</sup>. According to official documents of the Romanian authorities, the biggest post-war problems seemed to be the supply of food and the consequent dramatic rise in prices. These, coupled with the delay in the adoption of a country-wide land reform and reported abuses by civil and military authorities against the local population, fuelled the mistrust in the Romanian administration among various strata of the population in Bukovina.

Militants in the workers' movement helped and even instigated strikers, spoke out against military courts and censorship, denounced the Siguranța, who, they claimed, constituted little more than a political police, and defended the interests of non-Romanian nationalities, now mere minorities. As early as the middle of 1919, according to Pistiner, representatives of the workers staffed employment agencies, community kitchens, and ran 3 cooperatives. He claimed that, as of May of that year, there were 4000 dues-paying union and party members<sup>105</sup>. In 1920, 20 out of 40 local councillors in Czernowitz were social-democrats<sup>106</sup>.

In 1920, an electoral coalition of the social-democratic parties active in Romania at that time – the Socialist Party of Romania (in the Old Kingdom), the Social-Democratic Party of the Ardeal and the Banat (formerly part of the Hungarian social-democratic party), as well as the parties in Bukovina – won 23 seats in the (male) universal suffrage parliament. 5 of those went to the Bukovinans, representing over 30000 votes<sup>107</sup>. They used this victory to not only defend their core worker constituency, but also the rights of ethnic minorities in Bukovina. As a matter of fact, until 1922, the Ukrainian social-democrats in parliament were the only representatives of the interests of the Ukrainian population in Bukovina<sup>108</sup>. In this regard, it is worth mentioning that Ukrainian deputy Krakalia proposed a plebiscite for the areas of the province mostly inhabited by his own ethnic group. Pistiner, also a member of parliament, supported his colleague's demands<sup>109</sup>.

The strength of the movement in Bukovina was clearly displayed in the spring of 1920, when 20000 people joined the May Day events in Cernăuți<sup>110</sup>. The workers made another show of strength in September that year when they launched a general strike. During that event, Cernăuți was brought to a standstill in protest against measures taken by the Siguranța to expel two union leaders across the border. The fact that the two men were not only workers but also Jewish *Romanian citizens* suggests something about the complexity of social and ethnic tensions during that time<sup>111</sup>.

By the autumn of 1920, the workers' organisations all over the country were probably overconfident of their total strength. This might explain the disastrous consequences of the nationwide general strike in October. By that time, political and socio-economic grievances against the government of war-time hero General Averescu had multiplied considerably.

According to some sources, on 20th October 1920, roughly 400000 workers went on strike all over Romania. While in some areas the strike lasted almost three weeks, in most parts of the country, the walk-out was defeated by the authorities in a matter of days<sup>112</sup>. In Bukovina, it unsurprisingly only lasted 24 hours, considering that the province, unlike other parts of the country, had been under a continuous state of emergency since the end of the war<sup>113</sup>.

The repression of the general strike delivered a heavy blow to the workers' movement in Romania, one from which it would never quite recover. According to some historians, after the defeat of the strike, the movement lost its mass character<sup>114</sup>. Numerous workers left the unions for fear of state reprisals and persecution<sup>115</sup>. Furthermore, in the following parliamentary elections of 1922, the social-democratic alliance managed to secure only one seat. It fared even worse in the next round in 1926 when none of its candidates was elected.

In Bukovina, the consequences of the strike were less disastrous than in other parts. It is true that by 1921, union and party membership had dropped to 2000 dues-paying members in total<sup>116</sup>, roughly half of their 1919 numbers. Nonetheless, the Bukovinians were the only ones who managed to send a representative in parliament for the legislature of 1922-1926, in the person of Jakob Pistiner, elected with a multi-ethnic vote<sup>117</sup>. Also, starting with 1921, as the economic situation was improving, the social-democrats achieved some modest but real success in revitalizing local sections outside Czernowitz<sup>118</sup>. They also enjoyed popularity among the peasantry during this period for their support of the Land reform<sup>119</sup>. Equally important to all of the above, is the fact that, unlike in the Old Kingdom, the failure of the strike did not produce a split along social-democratic and pro-communist lines. The matter of international affiliation was settled in a 1921 union and party meeting and with 34% abstaining and only 6% in favour of the Comintern, the latter accepted defeat<sup>120</sup>. It is unclear how many communist sympathisers there were in Bukovina, but there is evidence they were mostly concentrated among the youth of the Ukrainian and Jewish sections of the movement<sup>121</sup>.

The general strike of October 1920 had one overall positive impact, in that it compelled the various social-democratic parties in Romania to unite in a single political entity. Some organisations favoured the creation of a centrally controlled party, while others, including the Bukovinians, preferred a federal structure, considering the significant differences between the various parties in the country<sup>122</sup>. For the time being, the latter view triumphed and the result was the creation of the Federation of Social-Democratic Parties in 1921. The Bukovinians staffed the Executive Committee and had an important say with regard to the international affiliation of the new structure, as the Federation joined the so-called „Second and a Half International” in Vienna, a middle ground between the defunct Second International and the Bolshevik Third International<sup>123</sup>. They also helped to secure the Federation's influence over Romania's labour unions, in the context of the split between communists and social-democrats<sup>124</sup>.

In the meantime, the Jewish party in Bukovina initiated its own country-wide alliance. In 1923, Jewish social-democrats in Bukovina, the Old Kingdom and Bessarabia formed the General Jewish Worker Bund in Romania. This political formation was rather unsuccessful and only had a small following outside of Bukovina, though one of its members, Joseph Kissmann, was elected to parliament in 1932, as a representative of several electoral districts in northern Bessarabia<sup>125</sup>.

Within the Federation, the calls for centralism never died out and the crushing electoral defeat of 1926 finally convinced the Executive Committee of the Federation to organise a congress to decide on a new organisational platform. Held in May 1927, it transformed the Federation into a unified political party, the Social-Democratic Party of Romania<sup>126</sup>. Bukovinan social-democrats were elected into its Executive Committee and other important structures<sup>127</sup> and contributed to the new party programme, taking inspiration from the Linz programme of the Austrian social-democrats. As the SDPR was organised into regional organisations, they also managed to retain a significant degree of autonomy and were also allowed to create distinct ethnic-based structures<sup>128</sup>. In 1936, one of the final years of parliamentary democracy in interwar Romania, 4 of the 15 members of the SDPR's Central Committee were from Bukovina. One of them (G. Grigorovici) also held the highest function in the party<sup>129</sup>.

The current research offers a more in-depth image of the social-democratic movement in Bukovina than previous studies have. This movement was in demographic and ideological respects very similar to those in other parts of Europe. What is essential to it, one might hypothesize, is what might be called the Bukovinan Experience, wherein the borderland position, as well as the ethnic diversity of the region, fostered a political disposition towards compromise and collaboration. It is this particular willingness to enter cross-class and ethnic-based alliances which assured the social-democrats their longevity and a level of prestige extending beyond the working class limits of an otherwise, by all standards, small movement. It is also the Bukovinan experience which influenced the social-democrats' federalism and views of decentralised societal organisation.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Petru Rușindilar, *George Grigorovici și social-democrația în Bucovina*, Ed. Fundației Constantin-Titel Petrescu, București, 1998; It is also worth mentioning that we could find no works authored by foreign researchers on this same topic.

<sup>2</sup> Petru Rușindilar, „Constituirea în 1896 a Partidului Social-Democrat din Bucovina și semnificația acestui eveniment”, în *Revista de istorie*, tom 31, nr. 7/1978, p. 1243-1252

<sup>3</sup> Florin Abraham, „Influența anticomunismului asupra istoriografiei române recente”, *Arhivele Totalitarismului*, nr. 3-4/2008, pg. 143

<sup>4</sup> Neagoe describes Grigorovici as a socialist who was “aware of the fact that, for all Romanians, the sun rises in Bucharest”, see Stelian Neagoe, *Cazul social-democrațiilor români*, Ed. Institutul de științe politice și relații internaționale, București, 2005, pg. 22; for Vasile Nicuale see Vasile Niculae, *O istorie a social-democrației române*, vol. II, Ed. Noua Alternativă, București, 1997, p. 45

<sup>5</sup> Siegfried Mattl, „Austria”, in Linden, Marcel van der; Jürgen Rojahn (Ed.), *The Formation of Labour Movements, 1870-1914: An International Perspective*, Vol. 1, Published by Brill, Netherlands, 1990, p. 296

<sup>6</sup> Mattl, idem, p. 298

<sup>7</sup> Kerstin S. Jobst, *Zwischen Nationalismus und Internationalismus: Die polnische und ukrainische Sozialdemokratie in Galizien von 1890 bis 1914. Ein Beitrag zur Nationalitätenfrage im Habsburgerreich*, Hamburg, Dölling und Galitz Verlag, 1996, p. 24, especially footnote no. 24

<sup>8</sup> By 1900 the province had 730190 inhabitants, according to official documents of the central government in Vienna; see *Die Handels, Industrie und Gewerbebetriebe von Galizien und Bukowina: Handelskammerbezirke Brody, Krakau, Lemberg, Czernowitz*, Volkswirtschaftlicher Verlag Alexander Dorn, Wien, 1903, p. XXXII

<sup>9</sup> Dumitru P. Ionescu, „Construirea Căilor ferate în Bucovina”, în *Revista istorică*, tom VI, nr. 9-10, p. 848

<sup>10</sup> Nicolae D. Ionescu, *Contribuții la istoria economiei forestiere din Bucovina*, Ed. Ceres, București, 1991, p. 74

<sup>11</sup> A. M., *Bucovina: date din punctul de vedere administrativ, politic, financiar, industrial, economic, agricol, scolastic, juridic, eclesiastic, etc.*, Editura Theodosiu Jonnitiu Fii, București, 1915, p. 20

<sup>12</sup> See Ionescu P., *idem*, p. 850, footnote 30

<sup>13</sup> Aurel Râșcanu, *Bucovina: Din punct de vedere industrial*, Institutul de arte Grafice și Editura „Glasul Bucovinei”, Cernăuți, 1922, p. 6

<sup>14</sup> *Die Handels, Industrie und Gewerbebetriebe von Galizien und Bukowina...*, p. XXXV

<sup>15</sup> Râșcanu, *idem*, p. 16

<sup>16</sup> Constantin Ungureanu, *Bucovina în perioada stăpânirii austriece, 1774-1918: aspecte etnodemografice și confesionale*, Ed. Civitas, Chișinău, 2003, p. 150

<sup>17</sup> Ungureanu, *idem*, p. 151

<sup>18</sup> Ungureanu, *idem*, p. 149

<sup>19</sup> *Die Handels, Industrie und Gewerbebetriebe von Galizien und Bukowina...*, p. XXXIII

<sup>20</sup> Camelia Cotos, *Populația Bucovinei în perioada interbelică*, Editura Demiurg, Iași, 2009, p. 96

<sup>21</sup> Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the peasantry owned only 23.26% of arable land in the province, see Cotoș, *idem*, p. 31; The great majority of land owners in Bukovina had less than 3 hectares each, see Ungureanu, *idem*, p. 152

<sup>22</sup> Rural artisans specialized in pottery and textile work, but also in furniture making, as wood processing was little developed aside from the production of timber, see Râșcanu, *idem*, p. 25, 107

<sup>23</sup> *Die Handels, Industrie und Gewerbebetriebe von Galizien und Bukowina...*, p. XXXV

<sup>24</sup> Mattl, *idem*, pp. 302-303

<sup>25</sup> Peter Autengruber, *Geschichte der österreichischen Gewerkschaftsbewegung bis 1945*, Verlag des Österreichischen Gewerkschaftsbundes GmbH, Wien, 2017, p. 51

<sup>26</sup> George Grigorovici, „Socialismul în Bucovina”, in *Viitorul Social*, anul 1, vol. 1, august 1907-ianuarie 1908, p. 77; also see Constantin Titel-Petrescu, *Socialismul în România*, Fundația social-democrată „Constantin-Titel Petrescu”, București, 2003, p. 312-313

<sup>27</sup> Jakob Pistiner, „Zehn Jahre *Volksprese*”, in *Volksprese*, X. Jahrgang, nr. 52, den 29 Dezember 1906, p. 1

<sup>28</sup> „Franz Zeplichal gestorben”, in *Vorwärts*, 25. Jahrgang, nr. 106, den 13 Mai 1924, p. 1

<sup>29</sup> Pistiner, *ibidem*.

<sup>30</sup> „Der 1. Parteitag der Bukowiner Socialdemokraten.”, in *Bukowinaer Rundschau*, XV. Jahrgang, nr. 2224, 1 September 1896, p. 3

<sup>31</sup> Rusșindilar, *George Grigorovici...*, p. 21

<sup>32</sup> Regarding the participation of Romanians in the founding of the party, see Nicolae Jurcă, *Istoria Social-Democrației din România*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1994, p. 59; according to the Bukovinan socialist Joseph Kissman, “Jewish workers played an important part in the pioneering work of the movement”, see Joseph Kissman, „Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Arbeiterbewegung „Bund” in der Bukowina”, translated by Jerome Silverbush, in Hugo Gold (editor), *Geschichte der Juden in der Bukowina*, vol. I, Tel Aviv, 1958, [http://www.jewishgen.org/yizkor/bukowinabook/buk1\\_127.html#Page129](http://www.jewishgen.org/yizkor/bukowinabook/buk1_127.html#Page129), accessed 22.12.2012

<sup>33</sup> A delegate of the party in Galicia attended the founding congress of the social-democrats in Bukovina, see Rusșindilar, *idem*, p. 22; the Galicians also allowed their counterparts to use their press publications until they could establish their own, see F., „Congresul socialist din Bucovina”, in *Lumea Nouă*, anul III, ediția a IIIa, nr. 708, 27 noiembrie 1896, p. 2

<sup>34</sup> A. J. P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy: 1809-1918. A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1964, p. 194

<sup>35</sup> Mattl, *idem*, p.310

<sup>36</sup> George Grigorovici, “Din mișcarea sindicală a Bucovinei”, in *Viitorul Social*, ianuarie 1908, anul I, nr. 6, p. 514

<sup>37</sup> The only other left-wing political forces that enjoyed some degree of influence in Bukovina were the Jewish Zionist workers’ organizations of Poale Zion and, for some time, the Radical Ruthenian Party of Galizia, which was viewed with sympathy by some in the Ukrainian population; regarding the influence of the latter, see Konstantin Krakalia, „Mișcarea socialistă ucraniană din Bucovina”, in *Socialismul*, anul XIV, nr. 139, 28 iunie 1920, p. 1

<sup>38</sup> It is relevant, for example, that the printers were the backbone of the party, as they were among the few who consistently paid their party fees, see „Die III. Bukow. Sozialdemokr. Landeskonferenz”, in *Volkspresse*, VIII. Jahrgang, nr. 32, 8. October 1904, p. 2

<sup>39</sup> At the SDP congress in 1904, socialists were forced to acknowledge that they had managed to make only little headway among Ukrainian workers, see „Die III. Bukow. Sozialdemokr. Landeskonferenz”, in *Volkspresse*, VIII. Jahrgang, nr. 33, 8. October 1904, p. 3

<sup>40</sup> L. I. Noel, „Organizarea proletariatului austriac”, in *România muncitoare*, an 2, seria 2, nr. 23, 6 august 1906, p. 2

<sup>41</sup> During the trade union congress of 1905 the social-democrats provided statistical data which they used to prove that industrialization was advancing in Bukovina, with a positive effect on the growth of the proletariat, see „Die Erste Gewerkschaftskonferenz”, in *Volkspresse*, IX. Jahrgang, Nr. 13, 1. April 1905, p. 3

<sup>42</sup> Mihai Ștefan-Ceașu, „Evoluția partidelor și grupărilor politice germane din Bucovina, în primele două decenii ale secolului al XX-lea”, in Vasile Ciobanu; Sorin Radu, (Coordonatori.), *Partide politice și minorități naționale din România în secolul XX*, vol. II, Editura Universității „Lucian Blaga” din Sibiu, Sibiu, 2009, pg. 335

<sup>43</sup> Mihai-Ștefan Ceașu, *Parlamentarism, partide și elită politică în Bucovina habsburgică (1848-1918)*, Ed. Junimea, Iași, 2004, p. 362

<sup>44</sup> Mattl, *idem*, p. 314

<sup>45</sup> For detailed accounts regarding Russian refugees in Bukovina during this period, see Direcția Județeană a Arhivelor Suceava, Fond Prefectura Județului Suceava, inventar 5, dosar 11/1906, f. 18-19

<sup>46</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>47</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>48</sup> There was no clear distinction between party and union membership: workers who joined the unions were also asked to join the party, so this number provides a pretty clear image of the size of the movement, see Grigorovici, „Socialismul în Bucovina”, *idem*, p. 78; also see Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>49</sup> Jakob Pistiner, „Organizațiile sindicale și socialiste”, in *Socialismul*, anul IX, nr. 97, 30 mai 1919, p. 1

<sup>50</sup> At the 1897 congress, the Austrian party decided to transform itself into a federation of six national parties – German, Czech, Polish, Ukrainian, Italian, Slovene; these were tied together by an all-Austrian Executive Committee, see Ephraim Nimni, „Introduction for the English-Reading Audience”, in Otto Bauer, *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*, Ephraim Nimni (editor), Minneapolis, London, University of Minnesota Press, 2000, p. XXIII

<sup>51</sup> Petrescu, *idem*, p. 315

<sup>52</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>53</sup> Petrescu, *idem*, p. 314.

<sup>54</sup> Petrescu, *idem*, pp. 313-314

<sup>55</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>56</sup> Mattl, *idem*, pp. 314-315

<sup>57</sup> „Ein Ehrentag”, in *Volkspresse*, anul IX, nr. 46, 18 noiembrie 1905, pp. 1-2

<sup>58</sup> „Der 28. November”, in *Volkspresse*, anul IX, nr. 48, 2 decembrie 1905, p. 2

<sup>59</sup> „Der 28. November in Czernowitz”, in *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung*, nr. 573, 29 noiembrie 1905, p. 3

<sup>60</sup> „Der 28. November”, in *Volkspresse*, anul IX, nr. 48, 2 decembrie 1905, pp. 2-3

<sup>61</sup> „Relatare despre conferința muncitorească de la Cernăuți din 11/24 iunie 1906. Pregătirile pentru greva generală în Cernăuți”, Ion Popescu-Puțuri, Augustin Deac, Ion Iacos (editori), *Documente din istoria mișcării muncitorești din România. 1900-1909*, Editura Politică, București, 1975, p. 395

<sup>62</sup> Mattl, *idem*, p. 315

<sup>63</sup> Ceașu, *idem*, pp. 214-215

<sup>64</sup> Ceașu, *idem*, pp. 211-213

<sup>65</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>66</sup> Ceașu, *idem*, p. 219

<sup>67</sup> Ceașu, *idem*, p. 211

<sup>68</sup> Ceașu, *idem*, pp. 372-373

- <sup>69</sup> Ceaușu, *idem*, p. 116
- <sup>70</sup> Radu Grigorovici, „Viitorul unei iluzii”, in Ștefan Purici (Editor), *Procese politice, sociale, culturale și economice în Bucovina: 1861-1918: aspecte edificatoare pentru o Europă unită?: materialele Conferinței științifice internaționale*, Rădăuți, 20-22 septembrie 2000, Suceava; Editura Universității din Suceava, 2002, p. 162
- <sup>71</sup> Radu Grigorovici, interview with dr. Victor Bărsan, 2000, the Grigorovici family archive
- <sup>72</sup> For the electoral results see „Die Landtagswahlen”, in *Volksprese*, anul XV, nr. 14, 8 aprilie 1911, p. 3; also see Ceaușu, *idem*, p. 390
- <sup>73</sup> „Soziale Kommunalpolitik”, in *Volksprese*, anul X, nr. 52, 29 decembrie 1906, p. 7
- <sup>74</sup> Ceaușu, *idem*, p. 374
- <sup>75</sup> „Din Suceava. Cei dintâi consilieri comunali socialiști”, in *Lupta*, anul III, decembrie 1909, no. 6-7, pp. 8-9
- <sup>76</sup> Petrescu, *idem*, p. 315
- <sup>77</sup> Tatiana Grigorovici, „Femeile și Întâi Maiu”, in *Viața Socială*, aprilie 1910, no. 3, p. 189
- <sup>78</sup> Tatiana Grigorovici, „Femea proletară și socialismul”, in *Calendarul Muncii pe 1907*, 1906, p. 112
- <sup>79</sup> Irina Livezeanu, *Cultură și naționalism în România Mare: 1918-1930*, București, Ed. Humanitas, 1998, p. 71; Börries Kuzmany, „Habsburg Austria: Experiments in Non-Territorial Autonomy”, in *Ethnopolitics*, 2016, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 52-53
- <sup>80</sup> Livezeanu, *idem*, p. 66
- <sup>81</sup> Trevor Vaughan Thomas, „Bohumil Smeral and the Czech Question 1904-14”, *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 11, no. 2/3, Special Issue: Conflict and Compromise: Socialists and Socialism in the Twentieth Century, July 1976, p. 81
- <sup>82</sup> See for example: „Pentru ce luptă partidul social-democrat”, in *Lupta*, anul I, 12 mai 1907, no. 11, p. 3
- <sup>83</sup> The editors of the paper claimed that since the Romanian social-democrats represented the interests of the largest part of the Romanian population in Bukovina, they would deserve to be called *nationals*, had the name not been already tainted by others, *Lupta*, anul I, 3 iunie 1906, no. 2, p. 1
- <sup>84</sup> Rick Kuhn, „The Jewish Social Democratic Party of Galicia and the Bund”, in Jack Jacobs (editor), *Jewish Politics in Eastern Europe: The Bund at 100*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2001, pp. 145-146; Kissman, *ibidem*.
- <sup>85</sup> „Die Maifeier”, in *Volksprese*, anul XV, nr. 18, 6 mai 1911, p. 2
- <sup>86</sup> Grigorovici, „Socialismul în Bucovina”, în *Socialismul*, 30 martie 1919, anul 9, nr. 60, p. 2
- <sup>87</sup> Radu Economu, *Unirea Bucovinei. 1918*, Editura Fundației Culturale Române, București, 1994, p. 17
- <sup>88</sup> Economu, *idem*, p. 13
- <sup>89</sup> Grigorovici, *ibidem*.
- <sup>90</sup> Krakalia, *ibidem*.
- <sup>91</sup> Keith Hitchens, „Romania”, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (Oct., 1992), p. 1067
- <sup>92</sup> According to some authors, around 1918 Romanian labour legislation was in its infancy. At that time, there were no legal provisions for the 8 hour work day or for collective bargaining. A ministry for labour was only created for the first time in 1920, see Alexandru-Murad Mironov, „Grigore Trancu-Iași și ‘protecția muncii naționale’. Politica socială interbelică între naționalism și combaterea șomajului”, in *Transilvania*, nr. 10-11/2014, pp. 64, 69; in 1920 the social-democratic parties in Romania vehemently attacked a new law proposal designed to regulate labour disputes, claiming it would severely restrict the right to strike. The law was one of the reasons that led to the general strike of 1920, see Eftimie Gherman, *Memorii. Contribuții la istoria mișcării socialiste*, Ed. Fundației „Constantin-Titel Petrescu”, București, 2000, p. 57
- <sup>93</sup> „Parlamentul. Discursul la Mesaj al tovarășului dr. Pistiner”, în *Socialismul*, anul XIV, nr. 162, 25 iulie 1920, p. 1
- <sup>94</sup> George Grigorovici, „Constituția sovietică și constituția democratică”, în *Noua constituție a României și Nouile constituții europene*, Tiparul Cultura Națională, București, 1923, pp. 69-70
- <sup>95</sup> Ioan Ciupercă, *Opoziție și putere în România anilor 1922-1928*, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 1994, pp. 89-90
- <sup>96</sup> Ștefan Purici, „Aspecte ale problemei minorităților naționale în Bucovina istorică între anii 1918 și 1940 (I)”, *Analele Bucovinei*, anul IV, 1/1997, p. 133



<sup>97</sup> Daniel Hrenciuc, „Integrarea minorităților naționale din Bucovina în România Mare: abordarea Național-liberală”, *Analele Bucovinei*, anul XIII, 1/2006, p. 68

<sup>98</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>99</sup> Arhivele Naționale Istorice Centrale, Fond Direcția Generală a Poliției, dosar 1/1920, f. 57

<sup>100</sup> Ștefan Purici, „De la Dieta Bucovinei la Parlamentul de la București (1918-1940)”, *Analele Bucovinei*, anul IX, 1/2002, p. 131

<sup>101</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>102</sup> Regarding this atmosphere, Irina Livezeanu wrote that the specter of bolshevism obsessively haunted Romanian authorities after the war, see Livezeanu, *idem*, p. 294; Pintilescu wrote that the state of emergency and the censorship during 1919-1920 were directly related to the perceived military threats posed by Bolshevik Russia and Hungary, as well as to internal social protest, see Corneliu Pintilescu, “Dezbateri publice privind decretarea stării de asediu în România (1918–1933)”, *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “George Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca*, tom LVII, 2018, p. 308-309

<sup>103</sup> Jakob Pistiner, ”Tactica noastră”, în *Socialismul*, anul IX, nr. 98, 31 mai 1919, pg. 1

<sup>104</sup> 75% of the industry in Bukovina had been destroyed by the war, see Râșcanu, *idem*, p. 13; with regard to the railway system, see Silviu Dimitrovici, *Istoria și organizația pădurilor „Fondului Bisericesc Ortod.-român” din Bucovina: lucrare prezentată cu prilejul congresului inginerilor silvici ținut la Cernăuți în zilele de 28-31 august 1922*, Institutul de arte grafice și editura Glasul Bucovinei, Cernăuți, p. 48;

<sup>105</sup> In his account, Pistiner made no mention of the Ukrainian party, which suggests the latter was still inactive at that time, see Jakob Pistiner, „Organizațiile sindicale și socialiste”,... *ibidem*.

<sup>106</sup> It is worth taking into account, however, that these had merely been appointed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, pending elections, see Economu, *idem*, anexa XXXVI, pp. 180-181

<sup>107</sup> Rușindilar, *idem*, pg. 127

<sup>108</sup> Mariana Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina. Die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918-1944*, R. Oldenbourg, München, 2001, p. 198

<sup>109</sup> Jakob Pistiner went even further than Krakalia, claiming all non-Romanians in parts of the province where they constitute a majority should have a say in this matter, see Hausleitner, *idem*, p. 191

<sup>110</sup> Arhivele Naționale ale Ucrainei, Arhivele Statului Regiunea Cernăuți, Fond 119, inv. 1, dosar 39, f. 63

<sup>111</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>112</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 120

<sup>113</sup> Kissman, *ibidem*.

<sup>114</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 121

<sup>115</sup> For example, before the strike, the miners’ union numbered more than 20000 members all over the country. After the strike, that number went down to 4000; see Gherman, *idem*, p. 60

<sup>116</sup> Hausleitner, *idem*, p. 201

<sup>117</sup> Hausleitner, *ibidem*.

<sup>118</sup> According to an official report concerning the state of the industry in Bukovina, by 1922 70% of previously destroyed factories had been rebuilt and additional others had started operating, see Râșcanu, *idem*, p. 14

<sup>119</sup> Hausleitner, *idem*, p. 197

<sup>120</sup> ASRC, Fond 119, inv. 1, dosar 49, f. 20

<sup>121</sup> Hausleitner, *idem*, p. 207

<sup>122</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 136; in an article published for the Bucharest newspaper *Socialismul* in 1919, G. Grigorovici wrote that he envisioned the creation of a political structure that would constitute an International of the united provinces of Romania, which would, at the same time, allow for the existence of national (ethnic) sections, see George Grigorovici, „Socialismul în Bucovina”, în *Socialismul*, anul 9, nr. 60, 30 martie 1919, pg. 2

<sup>123</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 139

<sup>124</sup> The Federation tried to persuade the Romanian trade unions, grouped into the General Council of Union Associations, to join the Amsterdam International, a trade union association which was under social-democratic influence. During the 1923 Congress of the General Council held in Cluj, Rudolph Gaidosch, the leader of the German social-democrats in Bukovina, pleaded in favor of the Amsterdam International. He was

subsequently elected among the leaders of the Council, Sorin Radu, *Ion Flueraș (1882-1953). Social-Democrație și sindicalism*, Ed. Nemira, Bucuresti, 2007, p. 165; for Gaidosch's speech, see the brochure *Noua îndrumare a sindicatelor din România: referatul Tovarășului Gaidosch și raportul tovarășului Sassenbach privitor la unirea internațională a sindicatelor; făcut la congresul sindical extraordinar din Cluj*, Editura Consiliului General Sindical din România, Cernăuți; București; Tiparul "Orient", 1923

<sup>125</sup> Kissmann, *ibidem*.

<sup>126</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, pp. 162-163

<sup>127</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 171

<sup>128</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, p. 167

<sup>129</sup> Jurcă, *idem*, pp. 240-241