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Rezumat: În primele decenii de după unirea din 1918, Ion Nistor – remarcabilul istoric și conducător al mișcării pentru apărarea drepturilor istorice ale românilor din Bucovina - s-a implicat în procesul de consolidare a României Mari. Într-o epocă de vitalitate și creativitate, ca și de dispute și diviziuni, el a fost chemat să contribuie la ceea ce s-a numit „integrarea completă a Bucovinei în noul stat românesc”. Studiul punctează câteva caracteristici ale activității desfășurate de Nistor între anii 1919-1933, insistând asupra principiilor politice care l-au inspirat în carieră, dar și asupra principalelor realizări în plan cultural.

Résumé: Les premières décennies après l’union de 1918, Ion Nistor – le remarquable historien et dirigeant du mouvement pour la défense des droits historiques des Roumains de la Bucovine – s’est impliqué dans le processus de consolidation de la Roumanie entière. Il a été appelé à contribuer dans une époque de vitalité et de créativité, ainsi que de disputes et de divisions, à ce qu’on a nommé “l’intégration complète de la Bucovine dans le nouveau Etat roumain”. L’étude ci-jointe souligne quelques caractéristiques de l’activité déployée par Nistor entre les années 1919-1933, tout en insistant sur les principes politiques qui ont inspiré sa carrière, mais aussi sur les principales réalisations en plan culturel.

Abstract: In the first decades after unification in 1918, Ion Nistor – the remarkable historian and leader of the movement for defending the historical rights of Romanians in Bukovina - was involved in the process of consolidation of the Great Romania. In an era of vitality and creativity, as of disputes and divisions, he was asked to contribute to the so-called ”full integration of Bucovina in the new Romanian state." The following study points out some characteristics of Nistor’s activity between 1919-1933, focusing on the political principles which inspired him in his career, as well as the main cultural achievements.
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1 This article is dedicated to the memory of Ladis K. D. Kristoff (1918-2010), son and friend of Bucovina.

„Codrul Cosminului”, XVII, 2011, Nr. 1, p. 117-148
I. INTRODUCTION – In a previous study, I examined the life and work of Ion I. Nistor (1876-1962) in the cultural development of late 19th century and early 20th century Habsburg Bucovina, particularly in connection with the founding of modern Romanian historiography on the region and in the evolution of political life in Bucovina prior to and during World War I. This culminated with the union of Bucovina with the Romanian Kingdom (the Regat) in November 1918 and his entry into the first post-war cabinet of Ion I. C. Brătianu on 18 December 1918.

At age 42, Ion Nistor had already compiled an impressive curriculum vita. He had developed a familiarity with most of the principal languages of the region. He had completed a doctorate in history at the University of Vienna, then passed an exigent habilitation exam and was named a docent in South-East European history at the same university. In 1912, he had been named to the first chair of South-East European history at his alma mater, the German University of Cernăuți, which really amounted to a chair on Romanian history. His scholarly productivity was significant enough that by 1911 he had been elected a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy and a full member in 1915. At the same time he was in the forefront of the Romanian national movement of the early 20th century—both cultural and political—and was a key player in the unions of Basarabia and Bucovina with the Regat in 1918.

In the end, as N. Iorga pointed out in 1918, Nistor's activities in this era had been crucial for Bucovinian Romanian national development in three major ways: as an inspired and persistent historian/educator defending Romanian historical rights; as an animator (along with Sextil Pușcariu) of the new wave of Romanian nationalism in Bucovina which looked away from Vienna toward the Romanian Kingdom; and, thirdly, as a leader of the Bucovinian national movement through the first two decades of the 20th century which brought about the Union of 1918 through the dramatic events of the world war.

The present analysis deals with Nistor's activities and contributions which followed during the exhilarating era of building the new, Greater Romania that had

---


4 This was a characteristic of Romanian militant historiography, namely deliberately engaging in “consciousness raising” by tackling “burning issues.” See Al. Zub, Istorie și istorici în România interbelică [History and Historians in the interwar Romania], Iași, Junimea Editure, 1989, p. 100.

emerged from the War. A subsequent study will cover the remainder of Nistor's life and work during the world crisis of the 1930s and the concomitant onset of the Era of Tyrannies; Romania's slide into the tragic events of World War II; through his final days under the Romanian Communist regime, including a stint in the Romanian gulag.

II. ION I. NISTOR IN INTERWAR ROMANIAN POLITICAL LIFE, 1918-1933

– Ion Nistor's political involvements in interwar Romania were extensive, so much so that by 1928, he had served enough time as a cabinet minister to become a “senator for life by right”. When the war ended, Ion I. Nistor, the implacable integral...
unionist and nationalist,\(^9\) found the political situation in the new Romania favorably aligned. As the leader of a new Bucovinian political party, the Partidul Democrat al Unirii din Bucovina (PDU),\(^10\) his cooperation was avidly sought by various political formations in the old Romanian Kingdom. Ignoring N. Iorga's counsel to the contrary, he became a collaborator of the powerful leader of Romania's Partidul Național Liberal (PNL), Ion I. C. Brătianu, a man who dominated interwar Romanian politics until his death in 1927.\(^11\) In 1919, Nistor was elected to the first post-war Romanian Parliament (along with 19 other members of the PDU),\(^12\) and was a member of every succeeding Parliament until the Royal dictatorship disbanded it in 1938.

Nistor was named minister without portfolio for Bucovina on 18 December 1918, in the first post-war Brătianu cabinet, along with Iancu Flondor.\(^13\) Flondor was to coordinate matters in Cernăuți\(^14\) and Nistor was Bucovina's advocate in the

---


\(^10\) The PDU functioned between September 1919 and January 1923. It had developed from the Nistor-led Comitetul Refugiaților Bucovineni (1914-1918) [Bucovina’s Refugee Committee] and the group around “Glasul Bucovinei” [The Voice of Bucovina] which emerged in October 1918 and spearheaded the Union in November 1918. See Partidul Democrat al Unirii din Bucovina [Democratic Union Party of Bucovina] in Ioan Scurtu, Ion Alexandrescu, Ion Bulei, and Ion Mamina, *Enciclopedia de istorie a României* [Encyclopedia of Romania’s History], revised edition, Bucharest, Merona Editure, 2001, pp. 184-185.


București government; the Bucovinian Romanians, thus, had a considerable degree of local authority in shaping the fate of Romania's new province. Nistor's appointment was a significant indicator of Romania's intentions for Bucovina because on 10 December 1918, he had published a piece on “Homo Bucovinensis” which denounced the idea of a multi-cultural Bucovina, which he described as an attempt “to erase all traces of the past and to smother the national consciousness of the native population.” Obviously, Nistor's mission under the new regime would be to reverse all of that, as what he would call the “de-annexation process” unfolded.

Collaboration among the Bucovinian Romanians collapsed almost as soon as they had managed to bring about the Union of Bucovina with the Regat. Nistor had written to Pușcariu that “As soon as the external threats cease, internal political struggles will breakout with an precededent vehemence...In Bucovina, there is already a struggle of principle between the new and the old.” However, he was confident that “The new will triumph.” The “Glasists” of Nistor, Pușcariu, Tofan, and others who favored unconditional union clashed with the “Bucovinians” of Flondor and others who wanted greater local autonomy. Nistor and Flondor were soon at loggerheads-part of the continuing centralist/autonomist debate in Bucovina.


The two groups were so named after their respective journals, “Glasul Bucovinei” [The Voice of Bucovina] and “Bucovina”. Tofan’s death at age 40 in 1920 was a significant loss for the Glasists. Pușcariu, Memorii [Memoirs], 1978, pp. 512-513.

The centralists triumphed and Flondor resigned on 15 April 1919. Ion Nistor was now named sole Minister Delegate for the administration of Bucovina, a post he held through several ensuing governments until he resigned in May 1920, and which made him the principal architect of the transition of Austrian Bucovina to an integral part of the new Romania.

In 1922, Ion Nistor returned to the government in the Brătianu long cabinet (19 January 1922-29 March 1926), despite growing personal misgivings about King Ferdinand. In January 1923, following the finalization of Brătianu's project for the 1923 constitution—which marked the effective end of the post-world war transitions—Nistor's PDU merged with the PNL and Nistor began a long, formal leadership role in the PNL and PNL-led governments. His rationale, communicated in Parliament in
February, was that the new constitution would make regional parties no longer necessary. Nistor later wrote that "long collaboration with the liberals convinced me of the sincerity of their nationalism, of the seriousness of their administrative work, and of the interest which they showed for Bucovina. The concept of social harmony of their ideology corresponded fully with my sentiments. I remained always faithful to my nationalist convictions, preached to our generation by Nicolae Iorga as well as the Partidul Naţional Liberal, whose doctrine and ideology was founded on the national idea."  

It was also, unfortunately, the case that Nistor seems to have been won over by the Brătianu/PNL position on elections, which was that they needed to be "guided" because the newly-expanded Romanian electorate was too inexperienced and uneducated. According to Iorga's Memoirs, King Ferdinand agreed. In 1922, he "supposedly said that he preferred barbarian elections which saved civilization to civilized elections which enthroned barbarianism." Better rigged elections for the right cause than to take a chance on honest but unpredictable ones! Nistor concurred. In a March 1922 article he wrote that Romania first needed "elections with the army, then good administration, and then everyone will be happy." This seems to have been a consensus view of the Romanian elite, which of course carries the primary responsibility for the eventual failure of the interwar Romanian political system.

---

27 Ion Ciupercă, *Relații între partidele politice burgheze în timpul elaborării Constituției din 1923* [Relations between the Bourgeois Political Parties during the Drafting of the 1923 Constitution], in "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie A. D. Xenopol," vol. 10 (1973), pp. 353-354. This sentiment was shared by Ion Inculeț, leader of the Partidul Țărănesc din Basarabia [Peasant Party from Basarabia].


because of this and other foibles.  

Nistor's political mandate had been and was to facilitate the complete integration of Bucovina into the new Romanian state. This concentrated on the “Romanianizing” of Bucovina (including the police and judicial systems, the administrative framework, resolution of church issues, educational concerns, and encouraging the migration of ethnic Romanians from elsewhere in Romania), as well as agrarian reform. These efforts, according to Nistor, included the promotion of Romanian as the official language, increasing the number of ethnic Romanians in the police and judiciary, establishing new administrative units, nationalization of the railroads, supporting the continuation of the Metropolitanate of Bucovina, and moving control of the Fondul Bisericesc to Bucovinian Romanian church authorities.

Nistor's ideas about education as well as his foundational political beliefs were clearly set forth in a lecture on “Învățământul în viitoarea Constituție,” delivered 22 May 1922 as part of an Institutul Social Român lecture series dealing with the proposed new Romanian constitution. Nistor declared that “The freedom of education is complete, as long as this doesn't affect public order or moral good.” In other words, freedom of education was not very complete at all. The educational problem for post-war Romania arose, Nistor argued, from the need to merge schools from Russian, Austrian, and Magyar systems: “These differences...need to disappear in order to create a unitary educational regime.” Romania also needed to cope with new religious issues, ethnic issues, and international law issues, all of which had


34 It should be stressed that “Romanianization” in 1919-1924 did not have the sinister connotation which it did in 1941-1944.


37 Published as Ion Nistor, Învățământul în viitoarea Constituție [Education in the Future Constitution], in D. Gusti et al., Noua Constituție a României. 23 de prelegeri publice [The New Romania’s Constitution. 23 Public Lectures], Bucharest, Cultura Națională [The National Culture], n.d. [1923], pp. 365-374.
arisen from the expansion of the Romanian national state in 1918.\textsuperscript{38} This led Nistor to a brief exposition of his political credo: “Mankind has evolved ceaselessly from the Declaration of the Rights of Man and from the exaggerated cult of individual liberty, and has arrived at the conviction that the individual is part of Society and that, as a consequence, he needs to accustom himself to subordinate individual interests and ambitions to the general requirements and interests of the State and Society...The principle of absolute liberty is not applicable in our private lives and even less in the institutions of State which have the high task of educating citizens. Liberty properly understood cannot and must not undermine the limits of the law.”\textsuperscript{39} This is an excellent summary of the tenets of a collectivist post-war Romanian “social” liberalism that had “evolved” into a virtually unrecognizable, diametrical opposite of what liberalism had meant in the 19th century.\textsuperscript{40} They were also tenets that would not serve Ion Nistor, Romanian liberalism, or freedom and democracy well when the era of tyrannies dawned in the 1930s.

Nistor’s principles were completely compatible with an authoritative contemporary (February 1923) statement on the PNL’s principles by Liberal leader I. G. Duca, which identified “true” liberalism with progress and progress with change.\textsuperscript{41} Liberalism “is in its essence a doctrine of progress, not a rigid formula...”\textsuperscript{42} According


\textsuperscript{39}Nistor, Învățămîntul [Education], pp. 365-366. Capitals in the original.

\textsuperscript{40}See my Romanian Liberalism, 1800-1947: Definition, Periodization, and a Research Agenda, in “Xenopoliana”, vol. 13 (2005), pp. 11-12. For an attempt to explain how this happened, see my The Strange Death of Romanian Liberalism, in Liviu Brătescu, ed., Liberalismul românesc și valentele sale europene [Romanian Liberalism and its European Valences], Iași, PIM Editure, 2011, pp. 143-157. In 1921, D. Drăghicescu, Partide politice și clase sociale [Political Parties and Social Classes], Bucharest, n. p., 1922, p. 83, was arguing that the PNL couldn’t survive if it remained simply liberal. Because of Romania’s backwardness, the PNL had to become a “social-liberal” party. Much the same tack was taken by Ștefan Zeletin’s, Burgheria română. Originea și rolul ei istoric [Romanian Bourgeoisie. Its Origin and Historical Role], Bucharest, Cultura Națională [National Culture], 1925, which first appeared as a series of lectures in 1922, and his Neoliberalismul. Studii asupra istoriei și politicei burgheziei române [Neoliberalism. Studies on Romanian History and Bourgeoisie’s Politics], Bucharest, Pagini Agrare și Sociale [Agrarian and Social Pages] Editure, 1927. For a critical analysis, see my Procesul dezvoltării naționale române [Romanian National Development Process. Stefan Zeletin’s Contribution], in “Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie A. D. Xenopol” [Yearbook of the Institute History and Archeology A. D. Xenopol], vol. 14 (1987), pt. 1, pp. 365-374. Also useful is Ion Agrigoroaiei, Despre neoliberalismul românesc. Teze și idei [About Romanian Neoliberalism. Theses and Ideas], in “Xenopoliana”, vol. 13 (2005), pp. 103-112.

\textsuperscript{41}I. G. Duca, Doctrina liberală, [Liberal Doctrine] in D. Gusti et al., Doctrinele partidelor politice. 19 prelegeri publice [Doctrines of Political Parties. 19 Public Lectures], Bucharest, Cultura Națională, n.d. [1923], pp. 103-110.

\textsuperscript{42}Duca, Doctrina liberală, [The Liberal Doctrine] in Gusti, Doctrinele partidelor politice [Doctrines of Political Parties], 1923, p. 108.
to Duca, Romanian liberalism's four foundation stones were order, democracy, nationalism, and social harmony.\textsuperscript{43} It supported private property and capitalism, but “in terms of political economy, Romanian liberalism has left behind the Manchesterian formula of \textit{laissez faire, laissez passer} in favor of interventionism....Absolute liberty is a necessity in the organizational stage of the economy of the State” but “Interventionism is born out of the complexities of the modern State...as a condition of progress....Finally, on the social front, Romanian liberalism has moved from an all-powerful individualism to the gradual and rising limitation of the individual in the face of the needs of justice and of general equilibrium.”\textsuperscript{44}

Both Nistor and Duca demonstrated exactly what Lord Acton had argued in the middle of the previous century in his trenchant article on “Nationality”: \textsuperscript{45} “The greatest adversary of the rights of nationality is the modern theory of nationality. By making the State and the nation commensurate with each other in theory, it reduces practically to a subject condition all other nationalities that may be within the boundary. It cannot admit them to an equality with the ruling nation which constitutes the State, because the State would then cease to be national, which would be a contradiction of the principle of its existence. According, therefore, to the degree of humanity and civilisation in that dominant body which claims all the rights of the community, the inferior races are exterminated, or reduced to servitude, or outlawed, or put in a condition of dependence....The theory of nationality, therefore, is a retrograde step in history.....The settlement at which it aims is impossible....it can never be satisfied and exhausted, and always continues to assert itself....”\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{43}Ibidem, pp. 103-106.


\textsuperscript{46}Nistor and Duca did not differ substantially from the views of Iuliu Maniu, the leader of the Partidul Național Român [Romanian National Party] in Transylvania, who wrote in 1924: “The national idea, the ideal of national unity...is the most perfect form of human organization because it has as its basis the unity of language, customs, thought, traditions, and aspirations, which characterize and naturally constitute a nation and the most perfect form of political organization, which is called the State.” From this, it follows that each national state is unique and “the defense and development of these qualities is not only a right but also a duty.” Iuliu Maniu, \textit{Problema minorităților} [The Minorities Problem] in D. Gusti et al., \textit{Politica externă a României. 19 prelegeri publice} [Romania’s Foreign Policy. 19 Public Lectures], pp. 224-226. Even Gusti himself emphatically emphasized that “The
Applying these principles to educational policy, Nistor opined that in “the stage of cultural development in which we find ourselves today, absolute liberty in education...without any sort of regulation by the State, would have disastrous consequences for our cultural development and for the binding together of our State life. Not even the Bolshevik regime understands liberty in an absolute sense.”

Education had the role of civic instruction, especially “cultivating and strengthening the feeling of solidarity in the hearts of the new Romanian citizens, of whatever language, race, or religion they might be, and to awaken their sentiments of belief and allegiance toward the new country.” It also had, he wrote, the role of protecting Romanians against “absurd and dangerous social agitation...[and] to guard them against the temptation of anarchist and subversive ideas.” Therefore, the new constitution should “establish...the right of State control and direction in all questions related to education and public instruction” whether public or private.

In connection with the use of minority languages, Nistor argued that such should be allowed in primary schools, but students must be required to “know the language of the State.” Beyond primary education, the state would not provide education other than in Romanian, though minorities could establish schools in their own language as long as they “gave the cultivation of the Romanian language and history its appropriate attention”.

Finally, education should be both compulsory (because of the low level of general education and literacy) and free. These would be the responsibility of the State, which should centralize education and organize it on unitary lines. Within this framework, university autonomy should be fairly broad. At the same time, “Religious education will be taught in all schools by teacher-priests from the church of the students.”

How did this work out in Bucovina? The number of Romanian schools was sharply increased, ethnic Romanian teaching staff was brought in from elsewhere in Romania, and public minority educational institutions and options drastically reduced. The effect of these activities was uncertain. Livezeanu writes that by “the mid-1930s, the strong-arm methods used in northern Bukovina certainly had not produced

motto of the Institutul Social Român...was and remains: “Pro Scientia et Patria”, in Prefață [Preface] in Gusti, Politca externă [Foreign Policy], 1924, p. vi.

It should have been pretty clear even by 1923 that the Bolsheviks were hardly advocates of liberty in any meaningful sense of the word.


Nistor was, however, of the opinion that “confessional schools are an anachronism in modern Society.” (p. 374). This is interesting because the odds were that minority schools would in all likelihood be confessional.

For a summary, see Ciachir, Din istoria Bucovinei [From the History of Bucovina], 1993, pp. 98 ff.; and Livezeanu, Cultural Politics, 1995, pp. 59 ff.
Romanization. Perhaps they had even back-fired.”52 This was because both the Romanian authorities and ethnic minorities conceived of reforms in this area as a zero-sum game: encouragement for some meant discrimination against others. Unfortunately, as Charles and Barbara Jelavich wrote, by 1922 “The future pattern of Romanian politics was largely to be determined by the insensitive treatment of their new, and often more highly developed provinces.”53

The difficulties were exacerbated by the fact that non-ethnic Romanians constituted the majority in many urban areas, with the population of Cernăuţi being more than 50% Jewish. “Many of the issues raised by Bukovinian Jews in the mid-1920s were two-sided,” Livezeanu concludes. “Measures that they interpreted as punitively anti-Semitic may have been adopted not so much against the Jews as for the Romanians, although the negative, sometimes brutal, effect on Jews is undeniable.” In the end, “Romanization of Bukovina’s school system was thorough, it transgressed the Minorities Protection Treaty of 1919, and it impinged on all non-Romanian ethnic groups...even on Romanians whose loyalty to the center may have been questionable.”54

On the other hand, in the area of agrarian reform, changes went fairly smoothly. Henry L. Roberts summarizes: “Land reform in Bucovina was made under

---

52 Livezeanu, Cultural Politics, 1995, p. 66.
54 Livezeanu, Cultural Politics, 1995, p. 74. See also pp. 79 ff. for a discussion of the 1926 baccalaureate exam scandal, which raised the question of whether or not this exam was used as a kind of Numerus Clausus to restrict the number of non-ethnic Romanians in Romanian higher education. It also produced one of the first political murders connected with the extremist followers of Corneliu Codreanu as the leader of a Jewish student protest in Cernăuţi, David Fallik, was assassinated by Neculai Totu, one of Codreanu's associates. Totu was subsequently acquitted in ten minutes on the grounds that his “defense” of the country was a “moral act”.

more peaceful circumstances than elsewhere and was more carefully worked out.”

The result was to increase the number of landed peasants and to dispossess large landholders who were non-ethnic Romanian. In so far as this created a wealthier peasantry, Romanian liberalism and nationalism were strengthened. Whether this created an economically viable peasant class was debatable. In 1945, Hugh Seton-Watson concluded “It had been hoped that the Land Reform would solve the Peasant Problem, and that the masses, socially satisfied, would form a stable basis of the State. These hopes were not justified. The economic developments of the inter-war period created new problems, and by 1939 the situation of a large part of the Eastern European peasantry was worse than it had been in 1914.”

In church affairs, Nistor and his Glasist Bucovinian colleagues were more protective of local privilege than they were on most other issues. Romulus Cândea wrote “Our church is free of an exaggerated centralism which dominates in the Catholic Church; neither is it endangered by the corrosive individualism of the protestant church.” At the same time, the Romanian church is “a national church in the State, which the State will sustain and defend, just as the church will defend and sustain the State in times of great danger, and will educate the citizenry in faith and respect for the law.” A battle was waged to preserve and to put the Metropolitanate of Bucovina on an equal footing with other Romanian bishops/metropolitans. This was achieved when the Romanian Church was raised to a Patriarchate in 1925. The Metropolitanate of Bucovina finally took control of the Fondul Bisericesc, and the

---

55 Roberts, Rumania, 1969, p. 36.
56 For details, see David Mitrany, The Land and the Peasant in Rumania. The War and Agrarian Reform (1917-21), London and New Haven, Oxford University Press/Yale University Press, 1930 and Dumitru Șandru, Reforma agrară din 1921 în România [Land Reform of 1921 in Romania], Bucharest, Academy Editure, 1975.
57 Seton-Watson, Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1967, p. 80. The political effects are summarized on p. 216: “Democracy could not flourish in such an atmosphere.” Charles and Barbara Jelavich concur: “Undoubtedly, the major problem of the new Balkan nations was economic, not political, a fact that was neither clearly defined nor even recognized. From their establishment the states were not truly economically viable units on a modern level.” Jelavich, Balkan National States, 1977, p. 322.
58 R. Cândea, Organizația bisericească în Constituție [Church Organization in the Constitution] in Gusti, Noua Constituție [The New Constitution], 1923, p. 347. In 1933, Nistor published Rolul politic și social al bisericii în trecut și prezent [Political and Social Role of the Church in the Past and Present] in Biserica și problemele sociale [The Church and the Social Problems], Bucharest: Cărțile Bisericești [Religious Books] Editure, 1933, pp. 167-190. Interestingly, the new constitution institutionalized religious privilege as Orthodoxy and the Greco-Catholic churches were identified as “national cults”, ethnic churches were “minority cults”, others, such as the Baptists, were merely “tolerated sects”, and still others, such as the Jehovah's Witnesses, were “prohibited sects”. Olimp Căciulă, Cultele în România [Cults in Romania] in D. Gusti (ed.), Enciclopedia României [The Encyclopaedia of Romania], vol. 1, 1938, pp. 417-442.
59 Nistor, Istoria Bucovinei [The History of Bucovina], 1991, pp. 415-416. As had become his modus operandi, Nistor contributed to this result both politically and through research and
Theological Faculty attached to the University of Cernăuți was able to continue the proud traditions that it had established in the 19th century.\textsuperscript{60}

In 1924, Nistor was charged with leading a Romanian delegation to Vienna dealing with implementation the peace treaty with Austria and to resolve financial and cultural issues that had been left unsettled—among others, the retrieval of art objects and archives related to Bucovina. “With the signing of these conventions, I was able to save Bucovina from diverse payments...and was able to return to Romania the deposits of the Fondul Bisericesc what had been evacuated [in the war] to Salzburg.”\textsuperscript{61}

At the same time, Ion Nistor was becoming disenchanted by the demands of his political work. According to Sextil Puşcariu, by 1924, Nistor had become “disgusted “ with politics and would likely have been happier to return full-time to his scholarly work and professorship. On the other hand, he seemed to enjoy the hectic pace of political life in Bucureşti.\textsuperscript{62} Puşcariu’s observations might have been more a reflection of his own hostility to political life than that of Nistor, since by the mid-1920s he had come to feel that Romanians “have too much politics. So much so, that we haven't time to do much else.”\textsuperscript{63} As early as 1921, Puşcariu had been dismayed that his friends Nistor and Al. Lapedatu had “thrown themselves completely into politics” and questioned their unflagging devotion to the Brătianus.\textsuperscript{64} Nistor, he wrote, was even arguing that “politics could not be pursued merely in theory, but only through fierce scholarship, publishing \textit{Istoria Fondului bisericesc din Bucovina} [The History of the Church Estate of Bucovina], Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei, 1921, 69 pp, to bolster his cause and case. See below for more.


\textsuperscript{63} Puşcariu, \textit{Memorii}, 1978, p. 647, entry for 14 February 1926. In 1922, when Octavian Goga tried to interest him in politics, Puşcariu noted that “I told him what I thought about politics and believe I convinced him that I am immune.” (p. 527, entry for 6 June 1923).

\textsuperscript{64} Puşcariu, \textit{Memorii}, 1978, p. 527, entry for 31 May 1921. When Ion I. C. Brătianu died, Puşcariu recalled that Brătianu had tried hard and unsuccessfully to get him into politics. He characterized the PNL leader as “lacking in sentimentalism, without any moral scruples, coldly calculating, and alone. True friends he appeared not to have, intentionally...” (\textit{Memorii}, 1978, p. 794, entry for 29 November 1927).
combat with one’s adversaries and with an iron party discipline.” In any event, Nistor stuck it out as long as the PNL held power.

Leaving office with the fall of the Liberal cabinet in March 1926, Nistor returned with Brătianu in June 1927 as Minister of Public Works, holding the same post in the Vintilă Brătianu cabinet which took over following I. I. C. Brătianu's death in November 1927. In the interim – between 1926 and 1927 – the Polish-Romanian border negotiations found Ion Nistor busily doing research on the issue, giving public lectures, and defending the 1918 boundaries of Bucovina.

The PNL government finally fell for good in November 1928 – having lost their most dynamic leader and also undermined by the death of King Ferdinand in July 1927. They were replaced by the Partidul Național Țăranesc (PNȚ), and would not return to office until late 1933...in vastly changed circumstances. Ion Nistor's efforts had made significant – though not always salutary – contributions to the 1920s Romanianization of Bucovina. According to Bozgan, “The true integration of Bucovina into the Romanian Kingdom occurred following the adoption of the new constitution of March 1923 and especially after the promulgation of laws for administrative unification and decentralization [sic] in 1925.” Ion Nistor had been the point man for the government on Bucovinian issues throughout this period.

In 1929, in a lecture at the Romanian Academy celebrating the Union of 1918, Nistor argued that “appreciable progress” had been made in Bucovina under Romanian rule, politically, socially, culturally, nationally, and economically. Not only had the reopening of the borders with the rest of Romania led to a revival of Bucovinian industry and culture, but agrarian reform had contributed to “the improvement of the conditions of the peasantry.” Indeed, “there was no area of administration which did not demonstrate the constructive and creative work of Romanian rule...” This was an overly optimistic assessment, as the 1930s was to demonstrate, but substantial changes has been accomplished nevertheless.

On the negative side, “the centralist policies of the Liberal government after the Union of 1918 struck at the interests of the ethnic communities of Bucovina...[they perceived] the phenomenon of romanianization as a direct attack on their cultural, political, and educational identities....The Liberals' approach to minority problems reflected an exaggeration of the national ideal, which in practice led to errors and

---

65 In a conversation with Vasile Pârvan, shortly before Pârvan’s death, both Pârvan and Pușcariu were saddened that Nistor and Lapedatu “were so absorbed by politics and losing contact with science ... seduced by the mirage of ‘Power.’ Memori, 1978, p. 789, entry for 28 June 1927.


67 Bozgan, Preliminari (II) [Preliminaries], 1994, p. 348. The Romanian cabinet continued to have a minister for Bucovina until 1932.

excesses which considerably overshadowed the positive parts” of their program.\textsuperscript{69} It also perpetuated ethnic hostilities which would not bode well for the future.

III. ION I. NISTOR: HISTORIAN, SCHOLAR, AND CULTURAL LEADER, 1919-1933 – Ion Nistor emerged from the First World War not only as significant politician, but also as an important intellectual leader. He was one of the most active members of the Romanian Academy in the Interwar era. He was the principal figure in the conversion of the German K. u. K. Franz-Joseph Universität into a new Romanian University of Cernăuţi. And he was the leading light of Bucovina historians, operating from an important base which he established at the University in a new Institutul de Istoria și Limba with its own journal, Codrul Cosminului.

The University had been created in 1875, partly to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Austrian annexation of Bucovina from Moldova.\textsuperscript{70} Despite the fact that Romanians constituted nearly 40% of the population of Bucovina and were the largest ethnic group in the province, the University's faculty and students included very few ethnic Romanians. The problem here was similar to that at Cluj, where an overwhelmingly Magyar university had been Romanianized in 1919, and in Strasbourg, where a German university had been taken over by the French after World War I and transformed into part of the French university system.\textsuperscript{71}

In his 1922 discussion of education in the new Romanian state, Nistor would argue that the State should centralize education and organize it on unitary lines.

\textsuperscript{69} Hrenciuc, Integrarea minorităților naționale din Bucovina [The Integration of National Minorities from Bucovina], 2006, p.175.

\textsuperscript{70} For the early history of the University of Cernăuţi, see Michelson, Nistor and the Development of Romanian Historiography, 2010, pp. 64 ff. For the end of the German university, see Erich Prokopowitch, Gründung Entwicklung und Ende der Franz-Josephs-Universität in Cernowitz (Bukowine-Buchenland), Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Piepersche, 1955. For the interwar era, see Mircea Grigorovita, Universitatea din Cernăuţi în perioada interbelică (I, II), [University of Chernivcy in the interwar period], in Glasul Bucovinei [The Voice of Bucovina], vol. 2 (1995), nr. 2, pp. 120-130 and nr. 3, pp. 68-78 and Universitatea din Cernăuți în perioada interbelică [University of Chernivcy in the interwar period], Suceava, Muşatinii Editure, 2005; Rodica Iaţencu, Consideraţii asupra evoluţiei Universităţii din Cernăuți în perioada interbelică (I & II) [Considerations on the evolution of the University of Chernivtsi in the interwar period], in “Analele Bucovinei” [The Annals of Bucovina], vol. 5 (1998), pp. 135-151, 351-365; and Eugen Pitei, Vladimir Trebici, and Dragoş Pusu, Universitatea din Cernăuți (1880-1938) [University of Chernivcy], Ploieşti, The Foundation Gh. Cernea, 2010.

However, within this framework, university autonomy should be fairly broad.\textsuperscript{72} This reflected his practice in 1919-1920. Reorganization of the university occurred in two phases: an improvisational phase from January 1919 to 1920, and the transitional phase in 1920, culminating with the inauguration of the Romanian University on 24 October 1920. Ion Nistor, by his own account, assumed the task of reorganizing the university because Puşcariu had been called to do the same in Cluj.\textsuperscript{73} In January 1919, he organized a gathering of the Romanian professors at the University. This ad-hoc group (though everyone knew that Nistor was the Bucureşti cabinet minister for Bucovina) issued a four point program: 1) that the University should be continued; 2) that all faculties should be Romanianized; 3) that non-Romanian speakers should be given a specified time in which to learn Romanian or be replaced; and 4) that the University should keep its Faculties of Theology, Law, and Philosophy.\textsuperscript{74}

Nistor followed with a memoir to the Ministry of Education, setting forth a list of candidates for appointments at Cernăuţi, including among others Radu Sbiera (Latin), D. Marmeliuc (Greek), Vasile Grecu (Byzantinology), Ştefan Ciobanu (Slavistics), and Teofil Sauciuc-Sâveanu (Ancient History and Archaeology). He was also able to convince his political allies that Bucovina not only deserved a university (along with those at Bucureşti, Iaşi, and Cluj), but that there were adequate personnel resources for a fourth Romanian university.\textsuperscript{75}

The University resumed classes in February 1919 on an interim basis. From Nistor's perspective, the Romanianization of the University was "even more difficult to resolve" than that of primary and secondary schools because almost all of the professors were non-Romanians who didn't know any Romanian.\textsuperscript{76} In fact, out of 56 professors from the pre-war University, only four eventually agreed to the


\textsuperscript{73} Nistor, \textit{Istoria Bucovinei} [The History of Bucovina], 1991, p. 411. See also Bozgan, \textit{Preliminarii (II)} [Preliminaries], 1994, pp. 349-350. Nistor and Puşcariu's close ties lead to the reasonable supposition that they frequently interacted on university issues and perhaps competed for the same human and monetary resources, but there is little hard evidence to that effect. Puşcariu was a very successful bargainer with key educational and budget bureaucrats; on the other hand, Nistor was actually a member of the cabinet and presumably able to exert considerable leverage for Cernăuţi. Puşcariu, \textit{Memorii} [Memoirs], 1978, pp. 628-629; Puşcariu to Nistor, 22 August 1919, in Olaru, \textit{Sextil Puşcariu. Scrisori} [Letters], 1994, p. 8.


\textsuperscript{76} Ion Nistor, \textit{Istoria Bucovinei}, p. 410.
Romanianization conditions set forth in 1919-1920.  

Nistor was, however, assisted by the Romanian professors of the Faculty of Theology, whose Prof. Vasile Tarnavschii handled the duties at the rectorate, and by Romanian students who came from other parts of the new Romania (mainly Basarabia). In September 1919, a law was passed based on Nistor's recommendations, which became the basis for the transformations that followed. In 1922, the basic statutes of the University written by Nistor were ratified. The fact that Cluj was being Romanianized at about the same time and that the war and its aftermath (including the Spanish influence epidemic) had taken a heavy human and material toll on Romanian resources made it all the more impressive that between fall 1919 and fall 1920, the process was successfully completed and a respectable faculty recruited. One additional and ironic impetus came with Nistor's resignation from the government in May 1920, which had the unanticipated consequence of giving him more time to focus on the transformation of the University.

On 24 October 1920, the Romanian University of Cernăuți was officially inaugurated in the presence of King Ferdinand and Queen Marie; Nistor, as the new rector, delivered the principal inaugural address. He noted, among other things, his pleasure that at last the Romanian majority in Bucovina had their own university which would allow them not only to fulfill the dreams of their parents, but also marked the decisive end of 150 years of foreign domination. “Centuries of struggle which we have carried out to defend our national existence have consumed much intellectual energy....with the achievement of our national unity, a new epoch in the history of our people has begun in which our energies...can be concentrated on a useful scientific and cultural rivalry with the other peoples of the world...the new epoch will be governed by cultural and social ideals.”

Nistor went on to declare that education at the University also included the task of “character formation, because a nation has a greater need for character than for geniuses.” Finally, the University had a national mission: “in the boundaries of a unitary national state as ours...[and] as an emanation of the state, it naturally can be

---

80 Mihai Ștefan Ceaușu, *Tabel cronologic* [Chronology Table], 1993, p. 17. It is interesting to note that Nistor’s loyalty to Bucovina led him to rebuff attempts to lure him to the University of Iași. See Zub, *Istorie și istorici în România interbelică* [History and historians in the interwar Romania], 1989, p. 181; Bozgan, *Preliminarii (II)*, 1994, p. 350.
81 Quoted in Nistor, *Istoria Bucovinei* [The History of Bucovina], 1991, pp. 411-413. See also Nistor’s, *Cuvîntările d-lui Ion I. Nistor, rectorul universității*, [The speeches of Mr. Ion I. Nistor, vice-chancellor of the University] in *Inaugurarea Universității românești din Cernăuți 23-25 octombrie 1920* [The Grand Opening of the Romanian University from Cernivcy], Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei, 1922, pp. 15-25, 44-49. Dimitrie Onciul, who responded on behalf of the Romanian Academy, agreed that “the power of culture” was more than “power of historical rights or the power of military might.” Quoted in Bozgan, *Preliminarii (II)*, 1994, p. 351.
nothing other than national,” though he also pointed out that academic freedom was important to the function of a university.82

As rector of the University in 1920-1921 (and again from 1933-1940) and as a primary cultural leader in Bucovina, local autonomy for the University was always important to Ion Nistor. Thus, in 1926-1927, he was a leader in a battle to maintain university rights and autonomy against an effort by the Minister of Education in the last Averescu government (1926-1927), Petre P. Negulescu. The minister was attempting to increase control of the universities from București and also to transfer authority to the ministry over the extensive properties held locally by the universities which had given them some freedom of action vis a vis the central government.83 Romulus Cândea, Nistor, and Maximilian Hacman went public with the dispute through the publication of a book entitled Universitatea din Cernăuți și loviturile politicianste ale d-lui P. P. Negulescu.84 In the event, Negulescu resigned, but this would not be the last effort to curb university autonomy in the interwar era.85

To celebrate 15 years of the Union of Bucovina and the Regat, King Carol II visited Cernăuți, was given an honorary doctorate, and made the patron of the University, which now became known as “Universitatea Regele Carol a II-lea din Cernăuți”. His address emphasized the turnabout in the University from its 19th century founding.86

Nistor was elected rector once again in 1933, a post that he was to hold until the occupation of Bucovina by the USSR in June 1940. Land had been acquired to build a new Faculty of Arts and Letters building, which was inaugurated in 1935, and the library of the University was grown to the point where by the 1930s it was exceeded in scope only by the Library of the Romanian Academy. A new building for the library would soon be underway as well.87 (The fact that Nistor was back in the

83 For a listing of the holdings of the University of Cernăuți, see Grigorovița, Universitatea din Cernăuți, [University of Cernivcy], 1995, pp. 126-128.
84 Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei, 1926, 60 pp. Negulescu was minister from 30 March to 8 July 1926, when he was replaced by Ion Petrovici.
85 And there were, of course, numerous benefits garnered for the University of Cernăuți by Nistor when he was a government minister, including the acquisition of 6000 square meters of land in central Cernăuți for a new building, the 1924 recognition of the University as a legal corporation, and a 1925 law which extended the benefits of the 1898 Haret law to Bucovinian schools. Bozgan, Preliminarii (II), [Preliminaries (II)], 1994, p. 351.
86 Bozgan, Preliminarii (II), 1994, p. 352; and Carol II, Cuvântare rostită cu prilejul proclamării Majestății Sale ca Doctor Honoris Causa al Universității din Cernăuți, 25 May 1933, [Speech said with the privilege of proclaiming His Majesty as Doctor Honoris Causa at the University of Cernivcy, 25 May 1933] in Carol II, Cuvântările Regelui Carol II [The Speeches of King Carol II], 1930-1940, Bucharest, The Foundation for Literature and Art King Carol II, 1940, Vol. 1, pp. 232-235. This was the first time that Carol had visited Bucovina as King.
87 Bozgan, Preliminarii (II), 1994, pp. 352-353; Eugen I. Păunel, Boabe de Grâu [Wheat Berries], in “Biblioteca Universității din Cernăuți” [Library of Cernivcy University], vol. 4 (1933), nr. 4, pp. 225-239; and Mircea Grigorovița, Biblioteca Universității din Cernăuți
government by December 1933 doubtless helped.)

In short, Ion Nistor was unquestionably the founding father and the leading mover and shaker at the University of Cernăuţi in the interwar era. In the period under consideration here, 1919-1933, he reorganized, expanded, and stabilized the University. His political influence brought to the University resources and facilities and his scholarly example inspired his colleagues. However, as the Fallik episode of 1926 portended, the clouds of extremism and anti-Semitism were gathering in Romania and nowhere with scarier importance than at the universities, several of which were actually closed down periodically because of radical student protests. By 1933, one scholar noted, a “majority of Romanian students...were adepts of the Legionary Movement.” In addition to old-time Romanian politicians and nationalists, such as Nistor and Iorga, there were plenty of new radical and racial nationalists at the universities; among those at the University of Cernăuţi were such unsavory characters as professors Traian Brăileanu (Sociology) and Dragoş Protopopescu (English), both of whom were activists in the Legionary Movement.

In his efforts to build the new University, Ion Nistor of course gave particular attention to the Faculty of History, where “he succeeded in creating a school of young scholars working to explain and elaborate national history.” The unifying factors in this group were 1) what Al. Zub has called “creative localism,” that is a shared sense of the priority that had to be given to regional historiographical concerns; and 2) the force of Ion Nistor's personality, what Zub identified as “a hegemony of influence and reputation”, something which Nistor certainly exercised through his achievements, his rigorous historical method and work ethic, as well as his commitment to history as an arm of national struggle.

The expanded department consisted of chairs in History of the Romanians,
World History, Ancient History, Byzantine History, the History of Art, South-East European History, Auxiliary Sciences of History. A significant and talented group of specialists joined Nistor in Cernăuți. Vasile Grecu was an outstanding Byzantinist and later a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, who joined the department in 1920. Romulus Cândea, also later a corresponding member of the Academy, moved over from the Theological Faculty in 1922 to the chair of World History. Nicolai Grămada became professor of Auxiliary Sciences of History in 1928. All three were close to Nistor. Teofil Sauciu-Săveanu became professor of Ancient History in 1919, Dimitrie Marmeliuc, took over the chair of Greek in 1920, while Al. Tzigara-Samurcaș became the professor of Art History in 1927. They were subsequently joined by others such as Leca Morariu, linguist and literary historian in 1927; Grigore Nandriș, Slavist and later a professor at the University of London in 1929; Teodor Bălan, archivist and modernist in 1932; and Ilie Corfuș, medievalist and specialist in Romanian-Polish relations in 1936.

In February 1922, Nistor founded and led an Institute of Romanian History and Language as part of the Faculty of Letters, and in 1924, this institute began to publish a journal, Codrul Cosminului, under Nistor's editorship. The Institute and the journal became the center of historical work in Bucovina. The journal appeared in ten volumes between 1924 and 1939. Nistor's own work was the backbone of the

93Popescu-Spineni, Instituții [Institutions], 1932, p. 191.
94See Personalul didactic [Didactic personnel] in Ion Nistor (ed.), Anuarul Universității Regele Carol al II-le din Cernăuți pe anul de studii 1936-1937 [Yearbook of the University King Carol II of Cernivcy in 1936-1937, Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei, 1937, pp. 92-99 for bio-bibliographical notes on those who were still at the University in 1936.
96Cândea, Romulus, in Rusu, Membrii Academiei [Academy Members], 1999, p. 111.
98See also Constantin C. Giurescu (ed.), Istoria învățământului din România. Compendiu [The history of teaching in Romania. Compendium], Bucharest, Pedagogical and Didactical Editure, 1971, p. 315.
publication; this is reviewed below. Nistor, as editor, was ably seconded by Vasile Grecu, who served as secretary. Among those who contributed to the journal, in addition to Nistor and Grecu, were Romulus Cândea, Leca Morariu, N. Iorga, N. Grâmada, D. Marmeliuc, Vasile Bogrea, Victor Morariu, Claudiu Isopescu, Radu Sbiera, Teofil Sauciu-Sâveanu, and others. As Grigoroviţă notes, “The collaborators of Codrul Cosminului were names with resonance in Romanian scholarship.”

The journal focussed on Bucovinian and Moldovan history, but included literary and linguistic studies, necrologies, and a comprehensive bibliographic section on books and articles and reports on the activities of the institute.

At about the same time, January 1925, Nistor and his collaborators resumed publication of the outstanding Bucovinian cultural periodical, Junimea Literară, which had ceased publication in 1914. It now carried the sub-title “Review of Literature, Art, and Science”. Nistor was again the editor in chief. His commemorative and historical articles were a highlight of the journal; some of these are discussed below. Appropriately for a man editing Bucovina's leading literary and arts magazine, Ion Nistor was also heavily involved in the promotion of music and theater in Cernăuţi. He was among those responsible for the establishment of a music conservatory (1924) and a national theater (1925) in Cernăuţi.

Another part of his mission was as a popularizer of historical and cultural themes. He was an avid promoter of the Romanian tendency toward “anniversaromania”, the excessive commemoration of key events and personalities. This may have been inevitable for a historian-patriot. He participated in the popular education outreach of the University, beginning in the early 1920s.

---

103 Typical of his interest in music was La semicentenarul morţii lui Ciprian Porumbescu, [50 years from the loss of Ciprian Porumbescu], in “Junimea Literară”, vol. 22 (1933), nr. 7-9, pp. 150-160.
106 Nicolae Stoicescu, Istoricul Ion I. Nistor (1876-1962), in “Revista de Istorie”, [The History Review], vol. 29 (1976), p. 1976. This was a calling to celebrate great events and personalities “with warmth, inspired by the sacred sentiment of love for the country and its glorious past”.
107 E. Grigorovoiţa, Învăţămîntul în Nordul Bucovinei [Teaching in the North of Bucovina], 1993, p. 162.
venue nationally was Romanian radio, where between 1929 and 1933, he spoke on half a dozen occasions, dealing with such subjects as the death of King Ferdinand (1929), the Union of Bucovina (1930), Monasteries in Bucovina (1931), and Alexandru cel Bun (1932). Amidst this plethora of political, educational, and cultural activities, Ion Nistor continued to carry out an active program of scholarly work. In the first place, as one of Romania's leading historians, Ion Nistor was an important and active member of the Romanian Academy between 1919-1933, serving as President of the Historical Section (1929-1932).

What was the nature of the Romanian Academy in this era, besides its scholarly mandate? The Academy, Al. Zub has written, was “a forge of spirituality, of scholarly initiative, but also a center of patriotic radiance, always active and always conscious of the needs of 'a people besieged by merciless enemies', as N. Iorga defined the people, a people whose history was so often unnaturally cruel, and precisely because of this needed historians to guide it.” Such militant history “deserved to be a source for civic education. This is precisely what historians tried to do under the cupola of the Romanian Academy.”

It was a task that Ion Nistor was born to carry out. He was one of those historians that N. Iorga called “the broadcasters of ideals”, contributing to “the crystallization of national consciousness, an always open question, but particularly then, in the period between the great wars, of an acute motivation.”

At the Academy he spoke or gave papers on ten occasions: 14 May 1919 at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Academy (on behalf of Bucovina); 21 December 1923 on Dimitrie Cantemir; 9 June 1927 commemorating the Romanian War for Independence; 11 May 1929 on the 10th anniversary of the Union of 1918; 24 January 1930 on the decorations of Avram Iancu and his men; 16 May 1930 on a Romanian spy in 1683 at Vienna; 26 June 1931 to celebrate N. Iorga's 60th birthday; 18 March 1932 on the Greco-Romanian churches and school in Vienna; 26 September 1932 on Moldovan-Ukrainian relations in the 17th century; and 27 January

---


110 Zub, *Istorie și istorici în România interbelică*, [History and historian in the inter-war Romania], 1989, p. 117.


112 Nistor evoked the sacrifice of those who had brought about the Union of 1918 and proposed the creation of a column of remembrance modelled after Trajan's column. Zub, *Istorie și istorici în România interbelică*, 1989, p. 109.

113 Parts of this speech are quoted in Nistor, *Istoria Bucovinei* [The History of Bucovina], 1991, pp. 417-418.
1933 on Todleben's correspondence from Plevna.\textsuperscript{114} Most of these will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{115} Possibly Ion Nistor's most important contribution to the Academy was begun in this era with the editing and publication in 1922 of Vol. 19, Pt. 1, of the Hurmuzaki Documente privitoare la istoria românilor series, under the title Corespondență diplomatică și rapoarte consulare austriace (1782-1797).\textsuperscript{116} This was the first of seven massive volumes in the series edited by Nistor, only five of which were published.\textsuperscript{117}

One other contribution that Nistor made to the Academy came in 1923, when he was instrumental in reconciling the Academy and N. Iorga, who had resigned in fury at what he considered a personal affront from his colleagues.\textsuperscript{118} Nistor was part of a delegation of four that convinced him in the end to agree to let bygones be bygone and return to the Academy.\textsuperscript{119} This seems to fit the picture of Ion Nistor as an irenic personality, a bridge builder rather than a polarizer, a man with a sense of balance and humor “that have always overcome the miseries of life.”\textsuperscript{120}

Ion Nistor's beloved Bucovina was, naturally, the focus of much of his work between 1919 and 1933. His research - such as a revised and expanded translation of his 1916 book on Bucovina, Der nationale Kampf in der Bukowina (which was

\textsuperscript{114} Most of these were subsequently published in Academia Română. Memoriile Secţiunii istorice. [“Romanian Academy. Section of History Memoirs”]. For Nistor and the Academy, see Dorina N. Rusu, Istoria Academiei Române. Repere cronologice [The History of Romanian Academy. Chronological References], Bucharest, Academy Editure, 1992, passim; and Rusu, Membrin Academiei [Academy Members], 1999, p. 376.

\textsuperscript{115} Many of these, as Grecu notes, owed to Nistor’s skill in turning “chance discoveries” into useful studies. See Vasile Grecu, Ion I. Nistor ca istoric [Ion I. Nistor as a historian] in Maximilian Hacman et al., Omagiu lui Ion I. Nistor [Tribute to Ion Nistor]. 1912-1937, Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei [The Voice of Bucovina], 1937, p. 41. This was due, I think, to Nistor's grasp of the big picture and details at the same time. This enabled him to find contexts for materials that others might just have skipped over.

\textsuperscript{116} Bucharest, Academia Română, 1922, iv + 916 pp. This was only fitting since Nistor’s 1916 Academy inaugural had emphasized the importance of the Hurmuzakis for Romanian national development. See also his Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki, in “Junimea Literară”, vol. 13 (1924), nr. 1-2, pp. 1-3.


\textsuperscript{118} Iorga, Memorii (încoronarea și boala Regelui) [Memoirs (the King’s coronation and sickness), n.d., Vol. 4, p. 84.

\textsuperscript{119} Details in Pușcariu, Memorii [Memoirs], 1978, pp. 630 ff. He points out that the Academy actually had no provision for resignations and therefore did no thing, which irritated Iorga even more. Pușcariu has quite a few acid remarks about Iorga’s personality. At least part of the slight was self-created.

\textsuperscript{120} Pușcariu to Nistor, 13 Jan. 1921, in Olaru, Sextil Pușcariu. Scrisori [Letters], 1994, p. 133.
actually published in 1918)—provided ammunition for the Romanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. In 1921, his book on *Istoria Fondului bisericesc din Bucovina*, as discussed above, contributed to church reform and reorganization in postwar Bucovina. At the same time, it presented historical arguments to counter Russian claims on the Fond.

Nistor also continued to pursue the Ukrainian problem and Romanian-Slavic relations as they related to Bucovina and to Moldova. In 1924, his “Românii transnistrieni,” dealt with the numerous Romanian settlements on the left bank of the Nistru and even beyond the Bug River. The study included an ethnographic map and Nistor estimated that the number of Romanians on the other side of the Nistru might be as many as 500,000. The concluding section dealt with the founding of the Moldovan Autonomous Region in the USSR in 1924. In 1926, he published “Bejenarii ardeleni în Bucovina,” which dealt with the ethnic and cultural impact of Transilvanian Romanian refugees in Bucovina, especially on promoting unity among Romanians. (This was a follow up to his 1915 piece “Emigrările de peste munte.”)

In 1933, his “Contribution la relațiunile dintre Moldova și Ucraina în veacul al XVII-lea,” covered Ukrainian-Moldovan relations between 1642-1678 based on Russian documents, some 69 of which were included in a resume.

In 1928, Nistor of course participated actively in academic celebrations of the Union of 1918. In addition to works related to the University of Cernăuți already mentioned, he edited *Unirea Bucovinei - 28 Noiembrie 1918. Studii și documente,* with a 70+ page introduction and 140 pages of Austrian documents, and had the lead item in Ion Nistor, *et al, Zece ani dela Unirea Bucovinei. 1918-28,* entitled “Zece ani

---


122 See Grecu, Nistor ca istoric [Nistor as a historian], 1937, p. 30.

123 Nistor, *Istoria Fondului bisericesc* [The History of the Church Estate], 1921.

124 Codrul Cosminului*, vol. 1 (1924), pp. 461-565. Because of the inaccessibility of this journal, I have usually drawn on the skillful summaries proved by Grecu, Nistor ca istoric [Nistor as a historian], 1937, passim.

125 *Codrul Cosminului*, vol. 2-3 (1925-1926), pp. 443-553.


128 Nistor’s Drepturile noastre asupra Hotinului [Our rights over Hotin], Chișinău, Biblioteca Istorică Pentru Istoria Basarabiei [The Historical Library for Basarabia’s History], 1918), 31 pp. also dealt with Ukrainian territorial claims.

129 Bucharest, Cartea Românească [The Romanian Book], 1928, published by the I. I. C. Brătianu Foundation.
de la unirea. Intrarea armatei române în Bucovina.” He also wrote a brief piece on “Regele Ferdinand și Unirea”. In 1930, he published “Zece ani dela moartea lui Gheorghe Tofan,” an homage to his prematurely departed colleague, friend, and fellow Bucovinian nationalist.

1927 saw the publication of “Consecințele războiului pentru neatârnare asupra Românilor din Bucovina și Basarabia,” in connection with the 50th anniversary of Romanian independence. He also gave a paper at the Romanian Academy in June 1927 which was published as “Răsunetul răsboiului din 1877 în Bucovina și Basarabia.” The thrust of these articles was two-fold: 1) that Romanians everywhere were unionists whose natural desires had been thwarted by neighboring empires; and 2) that Romanians in the “subjugated” provinces were powerfully affected by the war for Romanian independence, an event which contributed significantly to national awakening in Bucovina and Basarabia and to a growing sense of solidarity among Romanians outside the Regat with the so-to-be Romanian kingdom. On the other hand, both the Russians and the Austrians had been alarmed that a possible Romanian “Piedmont” had arisen and increased oppressive de-nationalization efforts, while the Russians further despoiled its erstwhile ally against the Turks by seizing Southern Basarabia. Finally, in connection with the war of 1877-1878 (though not with Bucovina), in 1933, he published “Din corespondența lui Todleben dela Plevna” 31 letters from the Baltic German Russian general preceded by a 26 page discussion. Other articles on Bucovina which merit mention here include: two pieces on Jan Sobieski and the Romanians: “Lagărele dela Lențe și Serăuți și 'Campaniile Bucovinene' ale regelui Sobieski. Cu două planșe

130 Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei [The Voice of Bucovina], n.d. [1928], pp. 1-28. Other contributions included studies on the Church by V. Șesan, D. Marmeliuc on political life and the press, and Romulus Cândea on post-secondary education. Earlier, he had published Din zilele Unirii; Cugetul Românesc, [From the days of the Union; Romanian Conscience], vol. 1 (1922), pp. 116-124.

131 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 17 (1928), nr. 7-12, pp. 179-185.


136 Ceausu, Tabel cronologic [Chronology Table] 1993, p. 17, points out that between 1927 and 1933, Nistor was the PNL chief in Bucovina and a leader of the opposition in the Parliament. This doubtless added a political sub-text to his historical work.
explicative,”

dealing with forts used by an ill-fated Polish attempt to conquer Bucovina in the 17th century, and “Un român iscoadă la 1683 în tabără regelui Sobieski la Viena,”

about an ill-fated Romanian spy; “Un process politic la Cernăuți în 1878,”

on the Arboreasa trials of the 1870s; “Răpirea Bucovinei după Sulzer,”

which made accessible materials from Sulzer's unpublished history; and a booklet on Mănăstirea Moldoviței. Cu ocaziunea aniversării de 400 de ani dela înființarea ei.

His wartime activities had expanded his scope beyond Bucovina and Moldova, while strengthening a perceived link between historical scholarship and national interests. It was, Vasile Grecu pointed out, a situation in which Nistor not only wrote history but made it as well.

His educational efforts in Chișinău in 1918 had been part and parcel of his political efforts. This work — such as his 1918 pamphlet, Drepturile noastre asupra Hotinului, and a 1919 article on “Populația Basarabiei (1812-1918),”

that presented the Romanian demographic case in its negotiations dealing with Basarabia — was utilized in Paris and subsequent negotiations.

His experiences in Basarabia led in 1923 to perhaps his longest lasting work or synthesis, Istoria Basarabiei. Scriere de popularizare,

a book that went through


139 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 20 (1931), nr. 1-4, pp. 3-27. For further discussion, see Nistor, Istoria Bucovinei [The History of Bucovina], 1991, pp. 229 ff.

140 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 21 (1932), nr. 7-12, pp. 169-176.

141 Cernăuți: “Glasul Bucovinei” [Cernovcy: “The Voice of Bucovina”], 1933, 15 pp. His interest in Bucovinian monasteries was also manifest in Mănăstirile din Bucovina [The Monasteries of Bucovina], “Junimea Literară”, Vol. 20 (1931), nr. 5-8, pp. 113-119; and Aniversarea de 400 de ani de la întemeierea mănăstirii Humorului [The anniversary of 400 years since the foundation of Humor's Monastery.] “Calendarul Glasul Bucovinei” [The Voice of Bucovina’s Calendar], vol. 12 (1931), pp. 61-64.

142 Grecu, Nistor ca istoric, [Nistor as a historian], 1937, p. 45. On this approach—summarized by Mihail Kogăniceanu's lapidary phrase “Today we not only write history, but make the history of our country as well” — see Al. Zub, A scrie și a face istorie (istoriografia română postpașoptistă) [To write and make history (Romanian forthy-eighthers history), Iași, Junimea Editure, 1981. This was a principal tenet of Romanian historiographical militantism.

143 Michelson, Nistor and the Development of Romanian Historiography, 2010, pp. 77-78.

144 Arhiva Pentru Știință și Reformă Socială, [The Archive for Science and Social Reform], Vol. 1 (1919), nr. 2-3, pp. 299-311.

four editions by 1924. This was the first volume in a series of popularizations of Romanian history projected by the newly-founded I. C. Brătianu Foundation and was a direct outcome of his 1918 lectures at the Universitatea Populară in Chişinău. (His connection with the Foundation was, of course, opened up by his political support of the PNL). The Brătianu Foundation initiative had been born in 1922 out of discussions between Sextil Puşcariu and Vintilă Brătianu which resulted in the creation of a series of Romanian cultural works designed for the general public. Puşcariu assumed direction of the language-literature-folklore-ethnography side, while recruiting his old friend to direct the historical-geographic works.146 This began a long association between Nistor and the Brătianu Foundation, which subsequently published others of his writings.147

Nistor later related that because of the great interest aroused by his 1918 lectures at the Universitatea Populare Moldovenesti and at teachers workshops in Chişinău, he had spent considerable time in the archives gathering materials (how many people giving lectures of a popular nature – in the middle of a war no less – would prepare by doing original archival work? This was typical of Ion Nistor’s work ethic and method.) The contemporary materials were gathered on the spot, reading newspapers, attending meetings, and discussing with leaders of the day.148 The Istoria Basarabiei was composed of two parts: 1) the first dealt with Basarabia (that is, Moldova between the Prut and the Nistru) prior to its seizure by the Russians in 1812 (pp. 3-241); 2) the second was a history of Basarabia under Russian domination through the Union of 1918 (pp. 245-436). The focus of the first part was to rebut Russian claims concerning this area and the Romanian-speaking people who lived there (such as the argument that there was a difference between Romanians and “Moldovans”). The focus of the second part was on Tsarist efforts to russify the region and the Romanian national struggle which ensued, leading up to the re-unification of Basarabia with the Regat in 1918. The book is made more accessible by an extensive table of contents and index, as well as over 80 illustrations and maps.

Apart from his focus on Bucovina and Basarabia, Ion Nistor also published in this era a number of papers dealing with the Romanian principalities and Romanian history generally. These included a commemorative lecture on the 400th anniversary of the death of “Neagoe Basarab,”149 praising his cultural contributions; “Pomenirea

---

146 Puşcariu to Nistor, 9 January 1922, in Olaru, Sextil Puşcariu. Scrisori, [Sextil Puşcariu. Letters], 1994, pp. 133-135. The letter contains considerable detail about Puşcariu’s plans for the series, including proposed authors. Needless to say, the Foundation also paid its collaborators well.

147 Nistor later published Vintilă Brătianu şi Bucovina, [Vintilă Brătianu and Bucovina], “Junimea Literară”, vol. 19 (1930), nr.. 9-12, pp. 460-466.


149 “Calendarul Glasul Bucovinei”, [“The Calendar of Voice Bucovina”], vol. 3 (1922), pp. 19-29.
which commended Cantemir as the first to do real historical work and argued that his foreign policy was based on the idea of an Orthodox crusade in the Balkans which would further the national unity of the Romanians, not opportunism; “Luca Arbore Hatmanul. La 400 de ani de la moartea lui,”151 “Solia lui Luca Cârjă,”152; “Grigori Vodă Ghica. La aniversarea de 150 de ani de la moartea sa,”153 a history of the prince and of the origins of the Ghica family, and a discussion of his tragic end defending Bucovina in the 1770s; “Rostul politic şi social al bisericii în trecut şi în prezent”154 was a discussion of the role of the Romanian Orthodox in the past of all three Romanian lands as a spiritual and material pillar of Romanian society and how communist propaganda was undermining the ancient faith and social organization of Romania as well as Romanian national consciousness needed to be counteracted; “Drumurile noastre în ultima sută de ani”155 a return of sorts to his pre-war economic studies, tracing the subject from the 1830s, and arguing for a uniform regime for roads; and “Bisericele şi școala greco-română din Viena”156 whose purpose was to present the Romanian side in an on-going dispute over canonical jurisdiction in Vienna. In 1932-1933, Nistor devoted considerable effort to the commemoration of Alexandru cel Bun: Alexandru cel Bun. Cu ocazia aniversării de 500 de ani de la moartea,157 Locul lui Alexandru cel Bun în istoria civilizației creștine,158 and “Prăznuirea lui Alexandru cel Bun.”159 According to Vasile Grecu, Nistor lauds the role of Alexandru cel Bun as a defender of Christianity (comparing him with Ferdinand of Castile and Ivan the Great of Russia) and as organizer of the Church in Moldova. Nistor gets high marks for making Alexandru cel Bun accessible to a broader public while maintaining high scholarly standards.160

A popularization of another kind was his 1933 Rück- und Ausblick in die

151 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 13 (1924), nr. 7-8, pp. 297-309.
152 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 14 (1925), nr. 5-7, pp. 129-140.
154 Biserica și Probleme sociale: Conferințe [The Church and the Social Problems: Conferences], Bucharest, 1933, pp. 167-190, discussed by Grecu, Nistor ca istoric, [Nistor as a historian], 1937, p. 47.
159 “Calendarul Glasul Bucovinei”, vol. 19 (1933), pp. 35-41.
160 Grecu, Nistor ca istoric, 1937, pp. 36, 46.
This was a lecture he delivered at the University of Berlin to Ernst Gamillscheg's Romanist seminar, designed in the first instance to counteract Hungarian theories of Romanian genesis and continuity (or, rather, discontinuity) while making contemporary Romanian scholarship known in German scholarly circles. Nistor argued that there was “a parallelism in the historical development of the three Romanian Principalities” and that the Union of 1918 had opened up the possibility of future greatness for the Romanians now that almost all of them were in a single national state.  

Romania's friendship with Czechoslovakia was one constant in this era. As a consequence, Ion Nistor's work included a couple of pieces dealing their relations: “Cehoslovacii și Românii,” which began with Cyril and Methodius and covered cultural influences on Romanian culture, including the introduction of Church Slavonic in the Romanian church and the Hussites' translation of the Bible into Romanian for the first time, and concluding with their parallel struggle against denationalization under the Habsburg Monarchy; and “Vizita lui profesorului Masaryk la Iași” an event that overlapped with Nistor's wartime service.

Ion Nistor made contributions to the history of the Romanian 19th century outside of Bucovina and Basarabia as well. These included a short discussion of “La 10 mai” “Decorarea lui Avram Iancu și a camarazilor săi,” with documents from the Austrian archives; and the first volume of an edition of the correspondence of Ion C. Brătianu, edited by Ion Nistor, Vol. I: 1859-1883.

Surprisingly, Nistor did not write much of a substantial nature regarding Romanian historiography. There were some comments in his 1924 Academy commemoration of Dimitrie Cantemir. He wrote two brief pieces on Dimitrie Onciul: “În amintirea lui Dimitrie Onciul,” and “Dimitrie Onciul. La zece ani dela moartea...”  

---


162 Summarized by Grecu, Nistor ca istoric, 1937, p. 36.

163 “Codrul Cosminului”, vol. 6 (1930), pp. 261-342. This was also published as a short book: Cernăuţi: “Glasul Bucovinei”, 1930, iv + 80 pp.

164 In Iuliu Maniu et al., T. G. Masaryk, președintele republicii cehoslovace [T.G. Masaryik, the president of the Czekoslovakian republic], Bucharest, Adevărul [The Truth], 1930, pp. 35-45.

165 “Junimea Literară”, vol. 18 (1929), nr. 5-8, pp. 117-122.


167 Bucharest: Imprimeriile Independența, 1933 [Bucharest: The Independence Printers, 1933]. Four more volumes were to follow in 1934-1935. These were published by the Ion C. Brătianu Foundation.

These pieces praised his mentor's critical method and rejection of the Romantic approach to history, at the same time characterizing Onciul's work as coming from a patriot's heart: "national history needs to find an echo in our soul and in the state of political and cultural development in which we find ourselves, needs to provide the weapons for defending our rights over the land in which we work."\textsuperscript{169}

In 1929, Nistor gave a lecture on "Opera istorică a lui A. D. Xenopol,"\textsuperscript{170} another of his mentors. The pathbreaking nature of Xenopol's \textit{Istoria Românilor din Dacia Traiană}, which Nistor called "the Book of the Nation," was that it legitimated the Romanians' place in the Danubian-Carpathian region. His writings "gave the Romanian people an act of proprietorship over the land in which they lived."\textsuperscript{172}

The final historian to be treated by Ion Nistor was yet another mentor (and now contemporary), N. Iorga. In 1931, Iorga turned 60. Coincidentally, he was also the Prime Minister of Romania at the time. Nistor published three pieces on Iorga, in addition to his contribution to the Iorga festschrift, \textit{Închinare lui Nicolae Iorga} (1931), dealing with Sobieski's Bucovinian campaigns. These were \textit{Douăzeci şi opt ani în slujba unităţii culturale}, \textit{Nicolae Iorga ca istoric}, and \textit{Opera istorică a d-lui Nicolae Iorga}.

Nistor identified Iorga's mission as having been "to follow the development of the Romanian people on all possible paths of investigation and with all possible scholarly means," a mission for which he was uniquely equipped. As a result, Iorga was able "to resurrect the past from the remains of the life which was...[thereby] illuminating the most obscure epochs..."\textsuperscript{176} Iorga's vast oeuvre included unexcelled source discovery and editing, analytical studies which left no era of Romanian history untouched, and monumental works of synthesis that emerged from his vast knowledge, his "unmatched powers of penetrating thought," and literary skill.\textsuperscript{177} This made Iorga the "true apostle" of Romanian unity, "one of the determining factors of the knitting together of our national unification." Now as Prime Minister, Iorga was called to not only write history but also to make history.\textsuperscript{178}
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IV. CONCLUSION – In the later part of 1933, Ion Nistor would once more ascend to the highest levels of political and cultural power. With the opening of the 1933-1934 academic year in October, he was chosen as rector of the University of Cernăuți, a position he would hold until the end in 1940. In November of 1933, the Partidul Național Liberal was called to take the reins of government under the Prime Ministership of Ion Duca. Ion Nistor was a member of the new cabinet. In the fifteen years which had passed since the creation of Greater Romania, Ion Nistor had burnished and extended an already impressive resume: influential politician and multiple times cabinet member with a special responsibility for the integration of Bucovina into the new Romanian state, university reformer and leader, prolific scholar and shining light of the Romanian Academy, editor and cultural mover and shaker, and for more than two decades a favorite son of his home province of Bucovina.

The future, however, was not as bright as it had been ten years earlier, since the world was already lurching into the Era of Tyrannies. In January 1933, Hitler had come to power in Germany, the promising age of the League of Nations was about to end, and revisionism looked set to reopen questions thought that had been thought resolved in 1918. Wasted, ineffective, and neglected efforts of the 1920s would come back to haunt Ion Nistor and the Romanian establishment. Soon the world would be plunged into another, even more deadly and debasing world war and militant Romanian scholars would again be summoned to the scholarly barricades. But that remains for the final chapter of our story.

V. END NOTE – There were a couple of possibly apocryphal works by Ion Nistor that I encountered: Lămuriri istorice la deslegarea problemei agrare din Basarabia;179 [Historical Explanations to Unraveling Basarabien’s Agrarian Question] and Pentru Consolidarea României Mari.180 [For the Consolidation of Great Romania]


180 Cernăuți: “Glasul Bucovinei”, 1920, listed in Publicațiile interzise până la 1 mai 1948 [Forbidden Publications until 1 May 1948], Bucharest, Ministry of Art and Information, 1948), p. 303. This may be the same as Discurs mesajul tronului [The Speech as message of the throne], Cernăuți, Glasul Bucovinei, 1920, 32 pp.