

POLITICO-TERRITORIAL PROJECTS CONCERNING BUKOVINA AND THE ROMANIAN-POLISH BORDER IN THE CONTEXT OF DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATIONS DURING AND AFTER WORLD WAR I (1914-1920)

Cezar Ciorteanu

Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava

cezar_ciorteanu@yahoo.com

Rezumat: *Proiecte politico-teritoriale privind Bucovina și granița româno-polonă în contextul negocierilor diplomatice din timpul și după Primul Război Mondial (1914-1920).*

Articolul prezintă în mod succint problematica recunoașterii unirii Bucovinei cu Regatul Român din 15/28 noiembrie 1918 de către Conferința de Pace de la Paris (1919–1920). Eforturile delegației Regatului Român conduse de către Ion I. C. Brătianu, președinte al Consiliului de Miniștri, și, ulterior, de către Alexandru Vaida–Voevod, au fost orientate spre recunoașterea integrală a Bucovinei în frontierele sale istorice (până la Ceremuș, Nistru și Colacin), așa cum fusese votat de către Congresul General al Bucovinei întrunit la Cernăuți la 15/28 noiembrie 1918. Obținerea recunoașterii internaționale a unirii Bucovinei a fost legată strâns și de eforturile româno-polone de stabilire a unei frontiere comune, obiectiv atins cu ajutorul Înaltelor Puteri Aliate și Asociate, ținându-se cont de interesele și drepturile istorice ale României și Poloniei, de evoluția situației geopolitice în estul Europei, precum și de interesele Marilor Puteri.

Abstract: *The paper concisely presents the issue of the recognition of the November 15th/28th, 1918 union of Bukovina with the Romanian Kingdom by the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920). The efforts of the Romanian Kingdom's delegation led by Ion I. C. Bratianu, the president of the Ministers' Council, and subsequently by Alexandru Vaida Voivod were oriented towards the full recognition of Bukovina within its historical borders (reaching Ceremuș, Dniester and Colacin) as it has been voted by Bukovina's General Congress that met at Chernivtsi on November 15th/28th, 1918. The achievement of Bukovina's union international recognition was also closely related to the Romanian-Polish efforts to establish a common border, a goal achieved with the support of the Allied and Associated Powers, taking into account: Romania and Poland's interests and historical rights, the geopolitical situation evolution in Eastern Europe, as well as the Great Powers' interests.*

Résumé: *Projets politico-territoriales concernant la Bucovine et la frontière roumaino-polonaise dans le contexte des négociations diplomatiques pendant et après la Première Guerre Mondiale (1914-1920).*

L'article ci-joint présente de manière succincte la question de la reconnaissance de l'union de la Bucovine avec le Royaume Roumain de 15/28 novembre 1918 par la Conférence de Paix de Paris (1919-1920). On orienta les efforts de la délégation du Royaume Roumain dirigée par Ion I. C. Brătianu, le président du Conseil de Ministres, et, ultérieurement, par Alexandru Vaida-Voevod, vers la reconnaissance intégrale de la Bucovine dans ses frontières historiques (jusqu'à Ceremuș, Dniestr et Colacin), comme le Congrès Général de la Bucovine réuni à Tchernovtsy le 15/28 novembre 1918 vota. L'obtention de la reconnaissance internationale de l'union de la Bucovine fut étroitement liée des efforts roumaino-polonais d'établir une frontière commune, objectif réalisé à l'aide des Pouvoirs Alliés et Associés, tout en tenant compte des intérêts et des droits historiques de la Roumanie et de la Pologne, de l'évolution de la situation géopolitique à l'est de l'Europe, ainsi que des intérêts des Grandes Puissances.

Keywords: *boundary, diplomacy, Bukovina, Romanian Kingdom, Poland, Peace Conference.*

Introduction

In a world where many borders become fluid and many others tend to become separation walls between civilizations, the border issue is a very interesting and actual research topic. "The delimitation of political space through internationally recognized and regulated borders represents an essential condition in defining a state, regardless of its organization form. If at the beginning of the last century, worldwide, there still existed demarcations between states through the "areal type border", nowadays the contact between countries became a direct one, through "linear borders", boundaries with a specific and well-defined route based on adopted principles, assumed and applied by most of the world's countries"¹.

Boundaries can contribute to the promoting of cooperation, peace and stability in the region, representing, as in the case of Romania, a factor of development and stability in the region. In fact, as Viorica Moisuc, a consecrated historian in the field of international relations, notes: "In order for states to live peacefully next to each other, they need to exercise their sovereignty over a certain part of the globe. This space must be circumscribed by limits called boundaries. Defining them is both a right and an obligation of the states. It can

¹ Apud Vasile Grama, *Frontiera și sistemul teritorial frontalier oriental al UE. Studiu de geografie politică* (rezumatul tezei de doctorat) [The frontier and the EU Eastern frontier territorial system. A study of political geography (the doctoral thesis abstract)] Oradea, Facultatea de Geografie, Turism și Sport, coord. științific, prof. univ., dr., Ilieș Alexandru, 2011, p. 6.

not be imagined a state without clear demarcations that separate it from another neighbouring state. There is a very close relation between the boundary and the territory it delimits. The absence of clear boundaries subjects the state to permanent conflicts with its neighbours”². The phrase boundary was firstly used in 1893 by the American historian Frederick Jackson Turner, in the essay *The Significance of the Frontier in the American History* (Chicago, July 12th, 1893). The notion of boundary has the meaning of a territorial limit referring to the process of development of a culture, civilization, ideologies, religions, states and many others³. Rather than being interpreted in a strictly geographical manner, boundaries are mobile phenomena, representing some people's opportunity to verify their ability to preserve their own identity. The boundary motivates and maintains a complex variety of cultural, spiritual, political, and other processes understood in a broader sense as boundary processes⁴. For the Eastern and Central Oriental Europe boundaries, the situation is very complex, especially because of the mixed population areas. The relation between a state and an imposed community, usually by certain socio-political circumstances, is based on the parties' consent to the shaping of the respective geographical coordinates⁵. From a conservative perspective, the state boundary is the result of a need for protection and delimitation, marking the expansion of state's sovereignty. During the dismantling of the great European empires and the emergence of national states, when the Paris Peace Conference drew new boundaries between different regions of the Great Empires, thus being defined new national states, because of mistrust or incompetence vast buffer areas appeared between different sovereignties. These areas, future boundary areas and frontier areas, most often had a peripheral status in relation to the centre of power, becoming over time increasingly deficient from a demographic, economic, infrastructure and cultural perspective. Often, “the policy led by the centre aimed the structural weakening of these regions, through the absence of investment in communications and transportation means.”⁶

The frontier represents - as shown above - much more than a mere limit

2 Viorica Moisuc, *Istoria relațiilor internaționale – până la mijlocul secolului al XX-lea*, [The history of international relations - until the middle of the twentieth century] Ediția a III-a, București, Editura Fundației România de Mâine, 2007, p. 16–17.

3 Corduneanu Mirela-Lavinia, *Frontiera europeană. Caracteristici*, [European frontier. Characteristics] <http://ro.scribd.com/doc/203942558/Frontiera-Europeana>, p. 3, site accesat la 13 aprilie 2014.

4 *Ibidem*, p. 4.

5 Vezi și Nicolae Iorga, *Hotare și spații naționale. Conferințe de la Vălenii de Munte*, [National boundaries and spaces. Vălenii de Munte Conferences] 1938, p. 3– 4; 93.

6 Vasile Grama, *op. cit.*, p. 6; 17.

demarcating a state's territory, experts making a distinction between the concepts of boundary and frontier. "The boundaries represent a line that separate distinct regions; the boundary being a fix limit. The frontier can be represented by visible elements, but also by symbolic elements marking the transition from one stage to the other, from one category to another, from one age to another, and it may reflect ethnic, religious, or other appurtenance. The frontier implies different psychological, social and economic processes. The frontiers have a political importance, but also an economic, social and, especially a significance in terms of identity. Then we can talk about a frontier sociology, an economy or a psychology of the frontier"⁷.

In Bradley Parker's opinion, on the level structured boundaries, it is necessary to analyze boundaries from many perspectives: geographical, political, cultural and demographic.⁸ If in the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century boundaries overlapped ethnic regions/national states, nowadays there is the tendency to recreate multicultural or multinational regions.⁹ Back to the twentieth century, we must bear in mind the undeniable reality that the inter-war frontier established between the Romanian Kingdom and the Second Polish Republic maintained and contributed to the development of economic, military, cultural and religious relations among the two states, in a multicultural and multi-ethnic context represented by the Romanian, Ukrainian and Hebrew communities that lived on both sides of the boundary. Two worlds with different cultural, religious, economic and special ethno-national identities found and complemented each other through their common boundary, in a space characterized by elements specific to the Central European area. The complexity of the entire ethno-confessional situation, over which overlapped the geopolitical interests of interwar Europe imposed and retained a careful and thorough analysis of the Allied and Associated Powers.¹⁰

This study aims to analyze the issue of Bukovina's septentrional boundary,

7 Apud Dumitrașcu Veronica, *Studiu sociologic și geopolitic asupra frontierei estice a Uniunii Europene. Studiu de caz: Românii din nordul Bucovinei* (rezumatul tezei de doctorat), [Sociological and geopolitical study on the Eastern boundary of the European Union. Case Study: Romanians in Northern Bukovina (the doctoral thesis abstract)] Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Sociologie și Asistență Socială, coord. științific, prof. univ. dr., Ilie Bădescu, p. 2.

8 Vezi și Mircea Brie, Ioan Horga, *Europa: frontiere culturale interne sau areal cultural unitar* [Europe: internal cultural frontiers or unitary cultural area], în „Moldoscopie”, Chișinău, nr. 3/ (L), 2010, p. 123–143.

9 Corduneanu Mirela-Lavinia, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

10 For a comparison with Banat also see Adriana Babeți, *Banatul-un paradis între frontiere* [Banat - a paradise between boudaries], <http://www.memoriabanatului.ro/index.phppage=banat> (12 Aprilie, 2014).

in the context of the establishment of the Romanian-Polish border, but also based on the projects of sharing the province's territory between neighbouring states, according to various criteria. This research is based on the capitalization of primary sources discovered in the Central Historical National Archives and in the Diplomatic Archives (the Foreign Affairs Ministry) funds, as well as on collections of documents, studies and articles published by experts in the field. We are aware that during the research stages we have not exhausted the multitude of existing sources on Bukovina and/or the complex issue of the Romanian-Polish boundary.

Central Europe under the looking glass of the victorious powers

Before the surrender of the German Empire (through the Armistice of Compiègne, November 11th, 1918) and the end of World War I, the victorious powers debated and analyzed various projects for post-war Europe's reorganization¹¹. For the first time in the history of international relations, the justice of the force was intended to be replaced by the force of justice¹².

The United States, France, England and Italy (Japan being consulted exclusively on matters concerning the Far East) as the great allied and victorious powers, only on the last months of the year 1918, took into consideration the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, such a hypothesis not being approved until the end of the war, up to then still existed premises for the maintenance of the Austro-Hungarian Empire¹³. The initiation and promotion of the 14 points by Woodrow Wilson, the president of the U.S., led to a change in the vision of the Great Powers for the future of the multinational empires' component nations¹⁴. Presented to the American Congress by President Woodrow Wilson on January 18th, 1918, the 14 points created the premises of a profound remodelling of the geopolitics and of the ethno-state realities in Central and Eastern Europe¹⁵. In this program, the 10th point refers directly to the self-determination right of the peoples of Austria-Hungary¹⁶. This idea of President Wilson proved that the U.S., as well as its Entente partners, at the beginning of the 1918 had not decided yet to accept the imminent dissolution of

11 Ion Țurcanu, *Istoria relațiilor internaționale* [History of international relations], Chișinău, Editura Litera, 2005, p. 117.

12 Viorica Moisuc, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

13 Charles Zorgbibe, *Wilson. Un cruciat la Casa Albă* [Wilson. A crusader at the White House], București, Editura Fundației Titulescu, 2003, p. 229.

14 *Ibidem*, p. 233–234.

15 Viorica Moisuc, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

16 Ion Țurcanu, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy¹⁷. Without taking into consideration the profound wishes of the peoples that were under the dominion of the Court of Vienna, the Wilsonian perspective was based on the assumption that maintaining this great state in Central Europe could be an obstacle, on the one hand, for the Bolshevik Russia eventual expansion to the West, and on the other hand, for the Eastward German expansion. This 10th point represented the main topic of discussion at the 1918 Congress of Rome on the Austria-Hungary oppressed nationalities¹⁸. Wilson wished to convince the Paris Peace Conference to establish a “new world order based on mutual respect and cooperation among nations, in which all act in the general interest and are free to have their own lives under a common protection”¹⁹. “Some of Wilson's ideas, that were deeply democratic, were considered by its European allies as utopian and therefore difficult to put into practice. Shortly after the beginning of the Peace Conference, the American president got convinced that the European realities were more complicated than he initially considered and his solutions could not be applied in such a complex ethno-confessional space²⁰.”

The Big Four was the phrase used to designate Woodrow Wilson (the President of the U.S.), Georges Clemenceau (the prime minister of France), David Lloyd George (the prime Minister of England) and Vittorio Emanuele Orlando (the Prime Minister of Italy). They organized and coordinated the Paris Peace Conference proceedings and discussions, these resulting in a new Europe built on Versailles Treaty bases and principles.²¹ The committee of five foreign affairs ministers of the five allied states also had a significant role in the Peace Conference.

The establishment of the culprits for the deployment of World War I, the assessment of the war reparations' payments, the admitting of the new emergent states that resulted from the dissolution of the great empires and the application of the self-determination principle, the establishment of an institution that protects peace by preventing war, were the most important goals of the Paris

17 Jean Baptiste Duroselle, *Istoria relațiilor internaționale 1919–1947* [History of international relations 1919–1947], vol. I, traducere Anca Airinei, București, Editura Științelor Sociale și Politice, 2006, p. 19; 21–23.

18 Viorica Moisuc, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

19 Ion Țurcanu, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

20 *What Really Happened at Paris. The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918–1919, by American Delegations*, Edited by Edward Mandell House and Charles Seymour, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921, p. 14.

21 Dan Lazăr, *România și Iugoslavia în primul deceniu interbelic. Relații politico-diplomatice (1919–1929)* [Romania and Yugoslavia in the first decade of the interwar period. Politico-diplomatic relations (1919–1929)], Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2009, p. 23.

Peace Conference²². Meanwhile, it was added the establishment of a national minorities functional mechanism of protection, in accordance with the European standards in the field, by signing a minorities' treaty with the Central-Eastern and South-Eastern Europe states.

The Kingdom of Romania and the issue of future boundaries

Before presenting the actual issue of Bukovina and of the Romanian-Polish border in the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), we shall focus on the developments of the Romanian Kingdom's situation in relation with the analyzed events. During the period of neutrality (1914-1916), the Romanian Kingdom carried out numerous secret negotiations and discussions about its engagement into the war, either for the Central Powers (in 1883, a secret treaty of alliance was signed with the Austro-Hungarian Empire and King Carol I wished to respect the commitment) or for the Entente (towards which the majority of the public opinion and of the Romanian political class manifested positively, wishing the unification of Transylvania and of other Romanian provinces that were under Austro-Hungarian administration). A large number of Romanians were living outside Romania's boundaries (250,000 in Bukovina under Austrian administration, 2,500,000 in Transylvania, Banat, Crișana and Maramureș under Hungarian dominion, approximately one million in Bessarabia under Russian administration, and with another half a million scattered in Bulgaria, Serbia and Macedonia) and the Romanian state was too weak to help them without the support of a great power²³. Immediately after the beginning of the war, the German Empire had promised to award Romania with Bessarabia, Southern Bukovina (Suceava and Rădăuți counties) and to offer concessions for the Romanians in Transylvania, in exchange for its entering the war²⁴. On the other side, on September 18th/ October 1st 1914 a secret Russo-Romanian Convention was signed, in the form of an exchange of notes between Sergei Sazonov, the Russian Foreign Minister, and Constantin Diamandy, the Minister of the Romania

22 E. H. Carr, *Criza celor douăzeci de ani (1919–1939). O introducere în studiul relațiilor in-ternaționale* [The twenty years crisis (1919-1939). An introduction to the study of international relations], Iași, Editura Polirom, 2011, p. 30.

23 David Sherman Spector, *România și Conferința de Pace de la Paris. Diplomația lui Ion I. C. Brătianu* [Romania and the Paris Peace Conference. The diplomacy of Ion I. C. Brătianu], Iași, Institutul European, 1995, p. 12.

24 Ion Agrigoroaiei, Ovidiu-Ștefan Buruiiană, *România în relațiile internaționale din perioada 1914–1920 (Curs special de istorie contemporană a românilor)* [Romania in international relations during the period 1914-1920 (Special Course on Romanians' contemporary history)], Iași, 2013, p. 3.

Kingdom accredited in Petrograd²⁵. Through this document, the Russian Empire guaranteed Romania's territorial integrity and admitted its rights over the Austria-Hungary provinces inhabited by Romanians, remaining for Romania to occupy them when appropriate²⁶. As for Bukovina, the nationality principle was the basis for the delineation of territories between the two states²⁷. While the Austria-Hungarian Monarchy wished the expansion of Bukovina by including Northern Moldavia and Northern Bessarabia (the Hotin region), the Russian Empire wished to annex (at least) a part of the Austrian province relying on the slavish populations that lived in Bukovina²⁸.

The memorandum of Iancu Flondor (1915)

Given the open demands expressed by the Ukrainian National Democratic Party from Lvov for a part of Bukovina that was supposed to form together with Eastern Galicia a Ukrainian state, in 1915 Bukovina's leader, Iancu Flondor, sent to Ion I. C. Brătianu a *Memorandum regarding Bukovina's frontiers*, a very important document that had to be used by the Romanian delegation for the forthcoming Peace Conference²⁹. In this memorandum, Bukovina's political leader anticipated three essential elements in the determination of Bukovina's borders in the Peace Conference: **1. The nationalities' principle. 2. The future defence of the above mentioned principle. 3. Ensuring Bukovina's economic prosperity within its new boundaries.** Flondor noted that Bukovina's territory situated at the North of the Prut will be lost, but he considered that the rest of the province, especially the eastern territory located between Prut and Dniester rivers had to be seen "as an integral part of our claims"³⁰. Based on the ethnic reality of the Ruthenian majority of Western Bucovina (the Ruthenians mountains) Flondor suggested that "just in an extreme

²⁵ Titu Maiorescu, *România și războiul mondial. Însemnări zilnice inedite* [Romania and the World War. Unusual daily records], volum editat de Stelian Neagoe, București, Editura Machiavelli, 1999, p. 254.

²⁶ Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice* [Political notes], vol. I, 1897–1924, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Mihai Eminescu”, București, 1927, p. 243; 282; 184.

²⁷ *Interesele României în texte de drept internațional public* [Romania's interests in public international law texts], with an introductory study by Nicolae Dașcovici, Iași, Tipografia concesionară Alexandru Țerek, 1936, p. 82.

²⁸ Constantin Ungureanu, *Unirea Bucovinei cu România în 1918* [The 1918 union of Bukovina with Romania], în „Revista de Istorie a Moldovei”, Chișinău, nr. 1 (93)/2013, p. 31.

²⁹ Arhivele Naționale Istorice Centrale (în continuare ANIC) [The Central Historical National Archives (further referred to as ANIC)], fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 15, f. 2.

³⁰ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

case and as a last resort it would be more favourable to renounce to the Ruthenian mountains than the controversial territory between Prut and Dniester³¹ The data and analysis performed by Iancu Flondor on Bukovina's population statistics, especially on the ratio Romanian/Ukrainians are more valuable as it clearly prove that the 1910 Austrian census (as known this census was based on the conversation language of the counted persons) and did not correctly reflected the province's ethnic statistics, introducing a statistical table of the population that lived between Prut and Dniester, to Brusnitsa creek³². In the 48 localities (including the city of Chernivtsi) lived 183 930 people, of which 64 643 Romanian, 46.044 Ruthenian and 72.703 of other nationalities. The territory measured 109 473 hectares, out of which 50.413 hectares belonged to great landowners, the majority being Romanian (and some Polish and Armenian ethnic). Iancu Flondor insisted in his notes that "if the whole Bukovina can't be obtained, under no circumstance should the territory between Prut and Siret, with Chernivtsi city, be ceded. Prut's frontier as an efficient defence line of Southern Bukovina presents – in my opinion - a *sine qua non* condition. The entire left shore of Prut river along its course it is very wide and in many places susceptible to flooding, while the right bank, from Bukovina's current frontiers to the town of Zeleniv, has a relative height of two to five hundred meters, thus dominating completely the left shore in distances from seven to twenty kilometres. The new railway lines Novoselitsa – Chernivtsi, respectively Chernivtsi – Napolokivtsi – Vashkivtsi are under these circumstances absolutely impracticable for enemies, in the same situation being also the roads in the above mentioned valley. In addition, for the future, as for Bukovina's Northern and Western frontiers, almost certainly only defence is going to be taken into consideration. I conclude this chapter with the observation that – as Flondor noted – on the defence and ethnic strengthening of Bukovina's future frontiers, the undersigned will have to draw, in due time, a detailed program for the chosen ones. *Without Prut, as a border - warned Flondor - no agreement*"³³. The memorandum was sent to the Prime Minister Ionel Brătianu through the deputy Ioan Mavrocordat, but it came into the hands of Ottokar Czernin, being the basis of a high treason trial filed in 1916 by the Austrian authorities to Iancu Flondor in Lemberg (Lviv)³⁴.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 15, f. 3–4.

³³ *Ibidem*, f.12.

³⁴ *Ibidem*.



Figure 1. Bukovina's map with the delimitation of the Ukrainian majority regions
(Source: ANIC, Iancu Flondor fund, file 15)

Secret negotiations and projects for Bukovina's division

In June 1915, the discussions between the Romanian kingdom and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, led to three options of possible territorial concessions

in Bukovina³⁵. According to the first two options, the territory ceded by the Austrian coincided with the course of Suceava river, unto the border with the Suceava district. The last option accepted the river Siret as frontier unto the boundary with Vizhnitsa district. If either of the first two options were to be accepted, the Romanian villages on the right bank of Suceava would have been given to Romania, but those situated on the left bank would have remained as a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, thus separating Vicovul de Sus from Vicovul de Jos, Frătăuții Noi from Frătăuții Vechi, including the Hungarian colony Andreasfalva (Maneuti) from Hadikfalva (Dornești) and Istengetis (Tibeni) colonies. Finally, by resorting to the third option, it would have resulted in the loss of some Romanian villages (Ropcea, Iordănești, Carapciu, Prisăcăreni and Camenca) and of Storozhinets city³⁶. As mentioned before, not even Russia let aside some plans to share Bukovina: at the beginning of 1915, Lt. Gen. F. Vrebel, commander of the Russian troops that had occupied Bukovina in 1914, proposed the annexation of the entire province to the Russian Empire.³⁷ His initiative did not remain unsupported and a second annexation project of Bukovina drafted by D. N. Vergun, a Russian expert in Galicia and Bukovina issues being proposed, surprisingly, immediately after the signing of the Convention between Romania and Entente, in August 1916, about which we will discuss in the following lines. This project suggested the annexation to Russia only of a part of Bukovina, that necessarily had to include the city of Chernivtsi.³⁸

The Convention between the Romanian Kingdom and Entente (August 4th/17th, 1916)

After complex, long and of course secret negotiations, on August 4th/17th, 1916, it was signed in Bucharest *The alliance treaty between Romania*, on one hand, and *France, Great Britain, Russia and Italy*, on the other hand, as well as the *military convention*. The four states guaranteed Romania's territorial integrity, while Romania was obliged to declare war on Austria-Hungary and cease any

³⁵ Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, pp. 470, 475, 478.

³⁶ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

³⁷ *Condica tratatelor și a altor legăminte ale României 1354-1937* [The register of the treaties and of other covenants of Romania 1354-1937], drawn under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by F.C. Nano, Plenipotentiary Minister, former head of the Treaties' Division, București, 1938, doc. nr. 1161, *Schimb de note privind viitoarea frontieră ruso-română în Bucovina (Petrograd, 18 septembrie 1914)* [Exchange of notes for the future Russian-Romanian boundary in Bukovina (Petrograd, September 18th, 1914)], p.392.

³⁸ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

connections with the enemies of the Allies. There were recognized as Romanian the territories in Austria-Hungary foreseen and defined in a special article (Article IV)³⁹. The signatory states undertook not to conclude a separate or general peace, unless united and at the same time, Romania enjoying the same rights as its allies in the future peace conference. The Convention foresaw the mobilization of all the Romanian military forces for attacking Austria-Hungary no later than August 15th/28th, eight days after the beginning of the offensive in Thessaloniki.

The Russian army commits to initiate a vigorous offensive on the Austrian front in Bukovina, having to maintain at least the positions held at the signing of the Convention. The Russian fleet having to protect the Romanian sea coast and the banks of the Danube from any attempt of enemy attack. Russia undertakes to send to Dobrogea, at the time of the Romanian Army mobilization, two infantry divisions and a cavalry division to cooperate with the Romanian army. The four states committed to provide Romania with munitions and war material, on a minimum average of 300 tons per day, as well as other goods. Other stipulations on practical Russo-Romanian military cooperation were made. According to Article IV of the Convention, “the limits of the territories mentioned in the previous article are fixed as follows: The delineation line starts on Prut River at a point on the boundary between Romania and Russia, close to Novoselitsa and it will follow the river upstream unto Galicia's border, at the confluence of the rivers Prut and Cheremosh. Then it will follow the boundary of Galicia and Bukovina, and that of Galicia and Hungary unto Stog point (altitude 1655). From there it will follow the separation line between Tisa and Vitsa in order to reach Tisa in the village of Trebusha, near the place in which joins with Visa”⁴⁰. The Allied and Associated Powers (Entente) promised to comply to the commitments assumed by signing the Alliance Convention, recognizing Romania's right over the territories dominated by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (article IV)⁴¹. During the Crown Council of August 27th, 1916, Ion I. C. Brătianu stated that “by virtue of the rights won by entering the war, Romania will occupy the territory “unto Tisa, Banat, Crișana, the slavic part of Maramureș and Bukovina unto

³⁹ Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice [Political notes]*, vol. II, 1916–1917, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Mihai Eminescu”, București, 1927, p. 151.

⁴⁰ Bogdan Murgescu (coord.), *Istoria României în texte [The history of Romania in texts]*, București, Editura Corint, 2001, p. 272.

⁴¹ Also see Jean Marie Le Breton, *Europa Centrală și Orientală între 1917 și 1990 [Central and Eastern Europe between 1917 and 1990]*, with a foreword by Neagu Djuvara, București, Editura Cavallioti, 1996, p. 22.

Prut⁴². Sergei Sazonov⁴³, the chief of the Russian diplomacy, fiercely opposed to the renouncement of the entire Bukovina and Bessarabia in favour of the Romanian Kingdom,⁴⁴ but further event's development reconfigured the Russian options on Bukovina.⁴⁵ Military operations caused significant losses to Bukovina, many industrial enterprises were evacuated or destroyed, several railway lines were demolished, the greatest loss being recorded in the area between Prut and Dniester, where the most violent military confrontations took place.⁴⁶ Bukovina, including Chernivtsi city, was under Russian military occupation three times (September-October 1914, February 1915, June 1916 - July 1917)⁴⁷, every time human and material losses were caused.⁴⁸

Russia's pulling out of the war and the Ukrainian claims over Bukovina

Meanwhile, on November 13th/26th, 1917, the Soviet Russia proposed to the Central Powers negotiations for an armistice, which was signed in a short time at Brest-Litovsk, on November 22nd/December 5th, 1917. On January 27th/February 9th, 1918, Ukraine signed at Brest-Litovsk the peace treaty with the Central Powers, and along with this event, disappeared completely the French project of organizing a joint Romanian-Ukrainian resistance.⁴⁹ The Central Powers troops proceeded to occupy the Ukrainian territory, primarily in order to obtain food, that was very much needed. After the Bolshevik Russia

⁴² Cristina Țineghe, *Studiu introductiv* [Introductory study], în Cristina Țineghe (editor), *Dezmembrarea Maramureșului istoric: decizii politice, reacții și consemnări în mărturii contemporane (1919 -1923)*[The dismantling of historical Maramures: political decisions, reactions and recordings in contemporary testimony], București, 2009, p. 3.

⁴³ Alexandru Gabriel Filotti, *Frontierele românilor*[Romanian's frontier], II, Brăila, Editura Istros, 2007, p. 296.

⁴⁴ Cristina Țineghe, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁴⁵ Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice* [Political notes], vol. III, 1917-1918, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Mihai Eminescu”, București, 1927, p. 134.

⁴⁶ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁴⁷ Dumitru Preda, Vasile Alexandrescu, Costică Prodan, *În apărarea României Mari. Campania armatei române 1918-1919* [Defending Greater Romania. The campaign of the Romanian army 1918-1919] foreword by prof. univ. dr. Liviu Maior, București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1994, p. 81.

⁴⁸ Generalul Henry Berthelot, *Memorii și corespondență (1916-1919)* [Memoranda and correspondence (1916-1919)], *Introduction* by Glen E. Torrey, translation Mona Iosif, București, Editura Militară, 2012, p. 29.

⁴⁹ Horia Vladimir Rusu, *Tratatele de Pace ale României (1918-1920)* [Romania's Peace Treaties (1918-1920)], Rezumatul tezei de doctorat [The abstract of the doctoral thesis], Universitatea din București, Facultatea de Istorie, Școala Doctorală, coord. prof. univ. dr. Ion Bulei, p. 3.

broke the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, the German-Austrian troops entered deeply on Soviet territory.⁵⁰

At the beginning of 1918, the Rada from Kiev proclaimed Ukraine's independence issuing territorial claims on Galicia, Bukovina, Bessarabia and Maramureș, these latter three being ancient Romanian territories. The Austrian diplomacy approved of the union of the territories of Galicia and Bukovina in an autonomous Ukrainian state, but insisted on keeping its Eastern territories within the empire's boundaries.⁵¹ On February 18th/March 3rd, 1918, the Soviet government made peace with the Central Powers and the Soviet Russia ceded Finland, Poland, the Baltic countries and acknowledged Ukraine as independent, conditioned only by the presence of the German and Austro-Hungarian armies on its territory. This allowed the Central Powers to control the back of the Romanian front. Thus, Romania was surrounded with no possibility of receiving any outside help and with no possibility to withdraw in case of defeat⁵².

The Treaty of Bucharest and its effects on the Romanian Kingdom

On February 9th, 1918, Ukraine and Austria signed a secret treaty through with the Austrians, in exchange for a million tons of grain, committed to form a new Austrian province, that included Eastern Galicia and Bukovina. This agreement was never discussed in the Parliament from Vienna, due to the fierce opposition of the Polish deputies and to the situation from the battlefield. The events described briefly in the lines above, led to the total isolation of Romania, that had to engage in negotiations for the signing on April 24th/May 7th, 1918, of a peace treaty with the Central Powers⁵³. Practically, “after the ratification of the treaty, the state of war became an occupation state, by the maintenance of six divisions, as well as of the “necessary formations for the economic exploitation” and this without any limit, but as long as the occupant should consider it appropriate “!

The Romanian Army – the great majority – had to be demobilized and disarmed⁵⁴. Practically, Austria-Hungary received almost entirely the Carpathian Mountains chain (an area of 5,600 sq km), with significant soil and underground riches and of a great strategic significance. Also, Romania had to pay important

⁵⁰ Henry Berthelot, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*.

⁵² Ion Agrigoroaiei, Ovidiu Ștefan- Buruiană, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁵³ *Ibidem*; Dumitru Preda, Vasile Alexandrescu, Costică Prodan, *op. cit.*, p. 47– 48.

⁵⁴ R. W. Seton Watson, *O istorie a românilor din perioada romană până la înfăptuirea unității naționale* [A history of the Romanians from the Roman period to the achievement of national unity], Brăila, Editura Istros, 2009, p. 439.

amounts of money to Germany and Austria-Hungary, to renounce to any compensation on account of the damage caused on its territory etc.⁵⁵. The territory of Austrian Bukovina was going to be increased with a portion of the Hotin land, with an area of Hertsa region from Dorohoi land and with Dorna area of Romania. Through Article XI, the mountain border of Romania would be rectified considerably in favour of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In Southern Bukovina it was mentioned that the future frontier will pass, "2 km South of Păișeni, over the letter N in the word Păișeni, over the letter O from the word Moldova, over the letter I in the name Cornul Luncii, over the Eastern outskirts of Rotopănești village and over the Southern outskirts of Mihăiești and East of the town of Siret, the boundary would be drawn on the eastern outskirts of Talpa, on the Eastern edge of Călinești, point 396, 402 at ½ km from Dersca, over the point 189, 198, 332, 304, the shadoof fountain 1 km South-West of point 311, on the Eastern edge of Baranca, on the eastern edge of Filipăuți, point 251, up to Prut 1 km East of Lunca"⁵⁶. Basically, the application of the treaty would have determined a major entrance of an important mountainous area situated South of Vatra-Dornei, several villages adjacent to the cities of Suceava and Siret, a significant territory of the Hertsa region, including the localities of Mihăileni and Dorohoi, all in an Austro-Hungarian enlarged Bukovina⁵⁷.

In the context of the geopolitical changes determined by the peace treaties signed at Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, in the fall of 1918, the authorities planned the extension of Câmpulung, Gura Humorului and Siret districts, with the territories ceded by Romania, the establishment of a judicial district residing in Tsurenii, which included even the villages surrounding Hertsa. Another judicial district in Hotin had assigned the towns located in Northern Bessarabia that were planned to become a part of Bukovina⁵⁸

Attempts to reorganize the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the victory of the self-determination and nationalities' principles

On October 16th, 1918, Emperor Karl I of Habsburg released the proclamation *To my faithful Austrian people*, by proposing the reorganization of the Austro-Hungarian Empire on federative basis⁵⁹, in six independent states

⁵⁵ Ion Agrigoroaiei, Ovidiu Ștefan- Buruiană, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁵⁶ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 36-37.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 37.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁹ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 19, f. 57.

(Austrian, Hungarian, Czech, Polish, Yugoslav and Ukrainian)⁶⁰. In this plan Transylvania remained a part of Hungary, while it was not mentioned the kind of status Bukovina and the city of Trieste would have. However, it was stated that their people will be able to choose among the six countries mentioned above. Bukovina was represented in the Parliament of Vienna by six deputies. The Bukovinian deputy Constantin Isopescu-Grecul presented on February 21st, 1918, in the Chamber of Deputies of the Viennese Parliament Romania's position on Bukovina, that was considered to be a "genuine Romanian heritage"⁶¹. In response, the Ukrainian deputy Ilya Semak presented on March 6th, from the rostrum of the Deputies' Chamber, the Ukrainian demands (also) for the counties of Chernivtsi, Storozhinets and Siret, considered to be mainly of ethnic Ukrainians (previously the Ukrainian demands included the counties of Vizhnitsa, Vashkivtsi, Kitsmani and Zastavna)⁶². The Ukrainian deputy Nikolai Wasilko requested for the division of Bukovina between Romania and Ukraine⁶³, this proposal being rejected by the socialist deputy Gheorghe Grigorovici in the last meeting of October 22nd, 1918⁶⁴. A similar position was also expressed in his speech by Anton Keschmann, the German deputy, the representative of the 200,000 Germans in Bukovina and Galicia, which requested an equitable resolution of the national issue for his countrymen and rejected the alternative of dividing the province. Straucher Benno, the Hebrew deputy, declared that he represented the Jews of Eastern Galicia and Bukovina, and placed himself in opposition with Salo Weisselberg, former mayor of Chernivtsi.⁶⁵ Constantin Isopescu-Grecul stated that "he renounces any act of cession from Mister Wasilko and expects calmly the decision of the Peace Conference."⁶⁶ In the following period, the Ukrainians' claims grew significantly, in pursue of the annexation of the entire Bukovina to an Ukrainian state⁶⁷. Under these conditions, the reaction of the Romanians in Bukovina was immediate.

⁶⁰ Dumitru Preda, Vasile Alexandrescu, Costică Prodan, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

⁶¹ Ștefan Purici, *1918: Concepții privind viitorul Bucovinei* [Ideas regarding the future of Bukovina], in „Țara Fagilor” (Almanah cultural-literar al românilor nord-bucovineni alcătuit de Dumitru Covalciuc), Cernăuți-Târgu Mureș (XVIII), 2009, p. 46.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 19, f. 59.

⁶⁴ Ștefan Purici, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

⁶⁵ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 19, f. 59.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁷ For details also see David E. Murphy, *Enigma Barbarossa. Ce știa Stalin* [Enigma Barbarossa. What Stalin knew], traducere Mona Iosif, București, Editura Militară, 2013, p. 56 și urmt.



Figure 2. **The dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the emergence of new national states**

(Source: http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Austro-Ungaria#mediaviewer/FiC899ier:DestrC3A4marea_Austro-Ungariei.jpg)

On November 3rd, 1918, Austria-Hungary requested the signing of an armistice⁶⁸, and on November 11th the German Empire signed the Armistice of Compiègne. “The empire's collapse became fact. On October 28th, Czechoslovakia proclaimed its independence, on November 2nd, Hungary declared its independence (but without recognizing the liberation of Transylvania) on November 11th, Poland became an independent republic, on November 12th it was proclaimed the republic of Austria, on November 24th, the Central People's Voice proclaimed the formation of the Serbo-Croato-Slovenian state. The union of Bukovina (November 15th/28th) and of Transylvania (November 18th / December 1st) with the Kingdom of Romania

⁶⁸ United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919. The Paris Peace Conference* (infra: FRUS), Volume II, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1919, p. 175, <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/FRUS.FRUS1919Paris02> (27 March, 2014), p.178–179.

led to the achievement of Greater Romania⁶⁹.

The union of Bukovina with the Romanian Kingdom (November 15th/28th, 1918) and the national minorities' attitude

Due to the crushing defeat suffered by the Central Powers in the war, the Marghiloman government was forced to resign on October 24th/November 6th, 1918. It was formed a government led by General Constantin Coandă, that had as main objective “the mobilization of the army and Romania's joining the war again, with the Allies. The chambers elected in 1918 were dissolved and all the measures of the previous government were declared null and void (including, therefore, the Treaty of Bucharest)”⁷⁰.

Because of the instauration of an anarchy state in Bukovina, Iancu Flondor asked, through Zotta, the support of the Romanian army⁷¹. On November 6th, 1918, the troops of Division VIII led by General James Zadik installed in the frontier locality of Burdujeni, advancing by order of Alexander Marghiloman unto Chernivtsi.⁷² In the order sent to General James Zadik it was stated that “he together with all the border guards and gendarmes on duty at Bukovina's frontier should occupy without delay the localities of Ițcani and Suceava, and then gradually the entire province, including Chernivtsi”⁷³. In this important mission a great role was played by the border guards of Dorohoi, Botoșani and Suceava counties⁷⁴. The detachments that aimed at releasing Bukovina were highly suggestive renamed “Dragoș” (former “Dorohoi”), “Alexandru cel Bun” (former “Botoșani”) and “Suceava” (former “Fălticeni”)⁷⁵.

On November 11th, 1918, at 9 am the Romanian troops entered the great city of Chernivtsi⁷⁶. Because of the information that suggested an attack of the Ukrainian troops, the General Headquarters of the Romanian Army ordered on November 12th, the pacification of the entire province in the shortest time possible. Starting with November 19th the military operations were extended North of the course of Prut river unto the town of Shipenits, having recognition missions to the Mahala-Sadagura-Kitsmani-Orshivtsi line. The displacement of

⁶⁹ Ion Agrigoroaiei, Ovidiu Ștefan- Buruiană, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 41.

⁷¹ Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice* [Political notes], vol. IV, 1918–1919, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Mihai Eminescu”, București, 1927, p. 114.

⁷² Ion Bulei, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

⁷³ Dumitru Preda, Vasile Alexandrescu, Costică Prodan, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁶ Alexandru Marghiloman, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

the Romanian troops had the following configuration: the Suceava detachment had most subunits in Șipeniț, with patrols oriented towards Stara Lashkivka and Orshivtsi, a guard post at the bridge over Prut River on the road Kitsmani – Hlinitza, as well as other checkpoints on the Western border of Bukovina to Snyatin; The “Alexandru cel Bun” detachment, was North of the city of Chernivtsi near the post across Prut of the road Sadagura - Chernivtsi, with recognition missions sent to the Mahala – Novoselitsa region; The detachment “Dragoș” stationed in Chernivtsi (on November 19th arrived from Iasi, by rail, the “Stefan cel Mare” 13th Infantry Regiment. On November 21st, the Romanian Military Headquarters decided the completion of the military operations between Prut and Dniester, by dividing into three sectors and assigning for each one a reinforced infantry regiment: Regiment 13 in Zastavna region, Regiment 25 (in course of transportation from Vaslui) in Kitsmani and Vashkivtsi and Regiment 37 in Chernivtsi. The action was finalized on November 28th, when on the old Northern and Western Bukovina's frontier between Cheremosh and Dniester it was fixed a border guard station post. In total, Division VIII had 261 officers and 7542 troops (2316 horses and 417 carriages)⁷⁷. On November 28th, 1918, it started the progressive replacement of the Imperial Gendarmerie with the Romanian gendarmes, this process being completed in 1921⁷⁸.

On November 15th/28th, 1918, the General Congress of Bukovina unanimously decided the unconditional union with the Romanian Kingdom⁷⁹, at the event being also present the members of the Polish National Council, led by Stanislaw Kwiatkowski, and of the German Council, led by Professor Alois Lebouton, alongside 13 representatives from five Ukrainian villages (Ridkivtsi, Toporivtsi, Velykyi Kuchuriv and Ivankivtsi and one of Storonets-Putila)⁸⁰. The Jews (although they were invited) chose not to participate in the Congress, awaiting the decision of the Peace Conference⁸¹, while Armenians and lipovan Russians expressed their adhesion to Bukovina's union with Romania, during

⁷⁷ Dumitru Preda, Vasile Alexandrescu, Costică Prodan, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁷⁸ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 14, f. 34–35; Ilie Nuțu, *Jandarmeria din Bucovina (noiembrie 1918–mai 1919)* [The gendarmerie in Bukovina (November 1918–May 1919)] in Mihai Iacobescu (coordinator), *Istorie și educație. In Honorem Mihai Lazăr* [History and Education. In Honorem Mihai Lazăr], Iași, Editura Junimea, 2012, p. 300; 303–306.

⁷⁹ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 19, f. 45; 47–48; f. 109.

⁸⁰ Constantin Ungureanu, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁸¹ Ileana Maria Ratcu, *Teodor Bălan (1885–1972) istoric și arhivist al Bucovinei* [Teodor Balan (1885–1972) historian and archivist of Bukovina], Târgoviște, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2013, p. 44.

1919. The national minorities from the Romanian Kingdom, particularly those from the former historical Bukovina, organized themselves in various organizations and political parties, thus getting actively involved in public life, often in alliance with the Romanian political parties, expressing their opinions in public meetings, in the media or from the parliamentary rostrum⁸².

On November 1st, 1918, the Ukrainian National Council formally took over the power from Lviv, Stanislav and Tarnopol. On November 13th, 1918, this Council has proclaimed the Western-Ukrainian People's Republic that should have also included, beside Eastern Galicia and the Subcarpathian Ukraine, a part of Bukovina. As president of the Lviv Ukrainian National Council, on November 26th, 1918, Evgheni Petrushevich, addressed President Woodrow Wilson through a telegram, asking him to intervene so as to prevent the integral occupation of Galicia and Bukovina by the Polish and Romanian troops. Bukovina - states Petrushevich - having a Ukrainian majority in the North and North-West, had been annexed by the Romanian troops that were acting on behalf of King Ferdinand⁸³.

The leaders of the Bukovinian Ukrainians did not recognized Bukovina's union with Romania and did not take part in the first parliamentary elections held in 1919⁸⁴. Subsequently, they reappraised their attitude and took advantage of the democratic framework offered by the 1923 Constitution and elected representatives that defended their interests in the Parliament of Great Romania⁸⁵. Constantly, the diaspora collaborated closely with the Bukovinian Ukrainians maintaining and supplying a revisionist speech on the issue of the borders of historical Bukovina. A Report of the Security Service of Bukovina mentioned the following: "The Ukrainians compactly established in the Northern part of Bukovina and Bessarabia and in the North-West of Transylvania, are following the left political current, represented by Petrushevich, which is in Russia and who considers that with the support of the Soviet Russia it will be accomplished a unified Ukrainian state, that will comprise Transcarpathian Russia, Eastern Galicia, Bukovina and Bessarabia.

⁸² Alexandru Marghiloman, *Note politice* [Political notes], vol. V, 1920–1924, Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Mihai Eminescu”, București, 1927, p. 47.

⁸³ *FRUS*, II, p. 195–196.

⁸⁴ Frédéric Beaumont, *La frontière roumano-ukrainienne et le poids réel de la question des minorités*, în *Cybergeo : European Journal of Geography*, Espace, Société, Territoire, article 303, mis en ligne le 23 février 2005, modifié le 22 juin 2007. URL: <http://cybergeo.revues.org/3230> (29 Mart, 2014).

⁸⁵ Victoria Camelia Cotos, *Populația Bucovinei în perioada interbelică* [The population of Bukovina in the interwar period], *Foreword by prof. univ. dr. Ioan Agrigoroaiei, General index by dr. Alexandrina Ioniță*, Iași, Casa Editorială Demiurg, 2009, p. 67.

This policy of the Bukovina's Ukrainian party is also inspired and supported by the Ukrainian committees, so-called national, residing in Vienna, Prague, Uzhgorod or Moscow. Thus, all the attention of the leaders is directed not only on all matters of general policy of our country, but also on all special issues that could be exploited in order to keep continuously awake the Ukrainian national consciousness. These issues are: the agrarian matter, the Ruthenian language in church, the introduction of the new calendar and especially schools with their national teaching language and the affiliation of the Ukrainian population in Bukovina to different governing political parties is done only for the interest they seek, namely to achieve these goals that are highlighted on every opportunity and which is a conversation subject not only for the masses of Ukrainian populations, but also for intellectuals, as they all gather in their cultural, economic, sports, student etc. societies”⁸⁶

The issue of Bukovina at the Paris Peace Conference

In 1918, Romania has considerably increased its territorial area (295 047 sq km) and its population (approximately 19 million inhabitants, of which 29.1% belonged to national minorities), fact that required the development of a national policy for defending the boundaries by entering into alliances with the neighbouring states interested in maintaining the regional *status quo*. Once accomplished the union of Bukovina with the Romanian Kingdom through the democratically expressed decision of the General Congress of Bukovina (November 15th/28th, 1918, Chernivtsi) it appeared the issue of the diplomatic recognition of this act, alongside those of the representative assemblies of Chişinău and Alba Iulia (March 27th/April 9th, 1918 and November 18th/December 1st 1918) that founded Greater Romania. This recognition was accomplished in the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920) as a result of the discussions and debates that lasted about a year.

In the speech he will give in the first Parliament of Great Romania, on December 16th, 1919, Ion I. C. Brătianu will reveal the difficulties arisen when he asked for precise and definitive explanations concerning the Romanian state boundaries and what were, not only in theory, but applied on the geographical map, the rights that the allies will recognize and ensure to be granted to us if victory would be theirs. Do not believe that the admission of these conditions was so simple and could be obtained quickly.” Russia wanted to obtain Northern Bukovina and also Russia, “wished obstinately that we do not receive the entire

⁸⁶ ANIC fond *Direcția Generală a Poliției* (în continuare se va cita *DGP*) [The General Directorate of Police (further will be cited *DGP*)], file 74/1927, f. 80.

Banat". Following long and thorough discussions attended by representatives of the allied governments it was finally recognized Romania's right over Cernivtsi and the entire Banat, unto Tisza and unto the Danube."⁸⁷ On this subject, Cristina Țineghe, writes: "In presenting Romania's claims at the Paris Peace Conference, Ion I. C. Brătianu relied only partially on the 1916 secret treaty. Invoking the historical and ethnic rights and relying on the self-determination right, Brătianu will subsequently require entire Bukovina, as well as Bessarabia, both being territories that were not subject to the political convention signed with Allies"⁸⁸ Brătianu had in front of the "*Big Four*" a firm and inflexible attitude in matters concerning the Romanian Kingdom's boundaries' configuration or the protection of national minorities' rights⁸⁹. For this purpose, on the list of the Romanian delegation were included specialists such as Nicu Flondor⁹⁰ (expert on financial and economic issues of Bukovina)⁹¹, Archip Roșca⁹² and Alexandru Vitencu (competent in ethnic and geographical issues).⁹³

Bukovina's representation at this conference was not up to the expectations because, Iancu Flondor, the responsible for the Union with the Romanian Kingdom was not even included in the Romanian delegation, due to tense relations between him and Ion I. C Brătianu⁹⁴. Thus, article 3 of the Resolution adopted by Bukovina's Constituent Assembly on October 27th, 1918, on Bukovinians representation at the Peace Conference, was ignored. The mission of the Romanian delegation present at the Paris Peace Conference, based on the secret treaty signed with the Allies on August 4th, 1916, and on the Union with Bessarabia, Bukovina and Transylvania, was not an easy one: after the Buftea-Bucharest (April 24th, 1918) ⁹⁵ peace agreement; in some circles of the allies existed the belief that "the treaty signed by the Ion I. C Brătianu government in 1916 lost its actuality."⁹⁶ Romania was about to be

⁸⁷ Ion Agrigoroaie, Ovidiu Ștefan- Buruiană, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁸⁸ Cristina Țineghe, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁸⁹ Alexandru Murad Mironov, *Vremea încercărilor. Relațiile româno-sovietice 1930–1940* [The time for experimenting. The Romanian-Soviet relations 1930–1940], București, Institutul pentru Studiul Totalitarismului, 2013, p. 47 *passim*.

⁹⁰ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 56, f. 4.

⁹¹ *FRUS*, III, p. 48.

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 49.

⁹³ ANIC file 73/1919 – 1920, f.1.

⁹⁴ *Idem*, file 32/1919, f. 63.

⁹⁵ Ion Bulei, *op. cit.*, p. 56;66.

⁹⁶ V. Fl. Dobrinescu, *România în fața Congresului Păcii* [Romania in front of the Peace Congress], in Gh. Buzatu, Horia Dumitrescu (coord.), *România Mare în ecuația păcii și războiului (1919–1947). Aspecte și controverse* [Great Romania in the equation of

informed on this and “in a discreet manner, only Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, Italy's Foreign Affairs Minister recognized that Romania signed the peace with the Central Powers being forced by the extremely difficult circumstances.⁹⁷” This situation amplified Romania's delegation assignment in Paris, more than just the ways in which they had to carry out the discussions and negotiations. Defending Romania's territorial rights based on the ethnic and historical principle, Brătianu stated that the Romanian state could not include all Romanians without endangering its fundamental interests. In the memorandum presented on the February 1st, 1919 Conference meeting, Brătianu stated that the Romanian government in establishing its territorial claims sacrificed legitimate aspirations in order to achieve sustainable peace in the world. Asking for the great Romanian unity, the hundreds of thousands of Romanians across the Dniester, the Romanians settled on the other side of the Danube and the Romanian villages from the Hungarian plain, this unity “could have easily disregarded the foreign elements set within Romania's natural borders, between the Danube, Tisza and Dniester.” It could be established “an artificial and scattered state” with a difficult economical development and “a geographical constitution that would have been a source of countless and endless conflicts with the neighbours, with whom it wants to live always in mutual trust, in respect of the rights and in good relations of peace.”

This does not mean that Romania could abandon the Romanians settled outside its borders. It has to help them live respecting the perfect equality treatment with the other inhabitants of the States on whose territory they live, as it will ensure the equality of all heterogeneous populations established on its own territory. “But Romania does not require the Romanian unification of all these populations settled across the Danube, Dniester and Tisza, not even of those that are separated only by a water stream. Romania only requires all the neighbouring countries to prove the same consideration and to make the same sacrifices in the interest of peace, of peoples' development and of Europe's economic progress.”⁹⁸ Regarding Bukovina, Brătianu invoked the provisions of the Convention signed with Entente in 1916, stating that the territory was

peace and war (1919-1947). Aspects and controversy], Iași, Casa Editorială Demiurg, 2009, p. 93–99.

⁹⁷ Viorel Screciu, *Documente americane privind situația Banatului în prima jumătate a anului 1919* [American documents on the situation of Banat in the first half of the year 1919], în „Banatica”, Muzeul de Istorie Caraș Severin, II, 13/1995, p. 375.

⁹⁸ Ion Agrigoroaiei, Ovidiu Ștefan- Buruiană, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

ripped from Moldova by Austria, in 1775.⁹⁹

**The Romanian-Polish boundary:
diplomatic efforts and mutual support of Romania and Poland
in favour of obtaining common boundaries**

An important role in the recognition of the Bukovina's d boundaries was played by the mutual support between the delegations of the Romanian Kingdom and the Second Polish Republic. The problem itself was not necessarily new, taking into consideration the historical tradition of neighbourhood and good cooperation between Moldova and Poland, brought into question during the contacts between the two delegations and set into direct connection with the military operations of the Romanian army in Pokutia, these anticipating the resuming of the bilateral diplomatic relations and mutual support against Bolshevism. In a 1918 specific context, the joint Romanian-Polish contacts were resumed and supported on the boundary issue and subsequently on signing a defensive alliance treaty against a possible Soviet attack¹⁰⁰. Romania and Poland supported each other in obtaining a common border, the discussions on this respect being started during 1918 through the diplomatic missions from London and Paris¹⁰¹. On November 11th, 1918, Poland proclaimed its independence focusing trenchant and quickly to resolve its many territorial issues, by obtaining the Romania's cooperation at the Peace Conference¹⁰².

On January 2nd, 1919 Ion I. C. Brătianu communicates to the Polish and Czechoslovak governments about the intention of establishing solid political and economic relations, inclusively the establishment of a solid boundary¹⁰³. Brătianu insisted on the emergency application on the ground of a Romanian-Polish junction plan on the Munkacs alignment (from Subcarpathian Ruthenia to Pocutia")¹⁰⁴. The Romanian Army - as shown above - entered Pocutia to

⁹⁹ Victor Aelenei, *Retrospectivă istorică a istoriei grănicerilor români și a Poliției de Frontieră Române* [Historical Retrospective of the history of Romanian border guards and of the Romanian Border Police], București, Editura Pro Transilvania, 2001, p. 133.

¹⁰⁰ *FRUS*, II, p. 741.

¹⁰¹ Aurel Neagu, Victor Aelenei, *Istoria frontierei României* [History of the Romanian border], vol. I, București, Editura Pro Transilvania, 2003, p. 189.

¹⁰² Mihaela Bărbieru, *Relații militare româno-iugoslave în perioada interbelică (1919-1939)* [Romanian-Yugoslav military relations in the interwar period (1919-1939)], Craiova, Editura Aius, 2011, p. 131-132.

¹⁰³ Florin Anghel, *Construirea sistemului „Cordon sanitare”. Relații româno-polone 1919-1926* [Building the "cordon sanitaire". The Romanian-Polish Relations 1919-1926.], Cluj Napoca, Editura Neremia Napocae, 2003, p. 53.

¹⁰⁴ Aurel Neagu, Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

liquidate and eliminate the danger of Bolshevism, the South-East corner of Galicia being returned to the Second Polish Republic (and) with the military and diplomatic support of Romania¹⁰⁵. On February 1st, 1919, Brătianu argued for the rights of the Romanian Kingdom over the entire Bukovina, demanding the Supreme Council that “the river Dniester to become the natural boundary of Romania in Bukovina and Bessarabia”, thus changing the provision included in the Convention signed with Entente on August 4th/17th, 1916, by which, due to the pressure exerted by the Russian Empire, the boundary of the Romanian Kingdom was fixed on Prut river¹⁰⁶. The advocacy of the Romanian Prime Minister comprised historical, economic, demographic and ethnographic arguments, relying on the democratic decision of the Bukovina's General Congress from November 15th/28th, 1918¹⁰⁷. For Bukovina, the document in question required that the border line should pass from Vișeuul Maramureș “to Cârlibaba, where the border crosses in Bukovina and goes onto the mountains of Moldovița, Vicov, Siret, Storozhinets, Chernivtsi, and returns in a semicircle to Rădăuți, and then goes towards the city of Siret, Hliboka, Boian and Novoselitsa”¹⁰⁸

On the issue of Bukovina, the American delegation established since January 21st, 1919, a consistent documentation, comprising the ethnic and territorial boundaries of the province that would be returned to the Romanian Kingdom¹⁰⁹. The commission discussed initially the issue of Bukovina without the participation of any Romanian delegate. The result was “the drawing by the Americans of a memorandum presented at the Commission meeting of February 8th, 1919, that proposed the dividing of Bukovina in two main ethnic regions, separated by a border line that passed a mile away to the North-West of Chernivtsi, city that remained Romanian”¹¹⁰.

¹⁰⁵ *Condica tratatelor și a altor legăminte ale României 1354–1937* [The register of the treaties and of other covenants of Romania 1354–1937], doc. nr. 983, p. 283.

¹⁰⁶ Romulus Seișanu, *Principiul naționalităților. Originile, evoluția și elementele constitutive ale naționalității. Tratatetele de pace de la Versailles, Saint-Germain, Trianon, Neuilly-Sur-Seine, Sévres, Laussane* [The principle of nationalities. The origins, evolution and constitutive elements of nationality. The peace treaties of Versailles, Saint-Germain, Trianon, Neuilly-Sur-Seine, Sevres, Lausanne], București, Editura Albatros, 1996, p. 367.

¹⁰⁷ *FRUS, The council of ten: minutes of meetings January 12 to February 14, 1919*, III, p. 847.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁹ Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

¹¹⁰ Radu Economu, *Unirea Bucovinei cu România. 1918* [The 1918 union of Bukovina with Romania.], București, Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1994, p. 98.

The alignment of the border itself raised discontent and protests in Ukraine, that sent several memoranda to the Peace Conference. In March 1919, Grigori Sydorenko, a member of the *Directorate* led by Simeon Petliura¹¹¹ requested that in setting Bukovina's boundaries to be taken into account Ukraine's demands on the above mentioned area, that was inhabited in majority by Ukrainian population. Two months later, in May 1919, the demands of Grigori Sydorenko narrowed down to an area located in the Cheremosh valley (the Northwest of Bukovina). The Ukrainians did not have their own delegation in Paris, the requests and memoranda drawn by them and strongly supported by the Ukrainian diaspora from the United States and Canada were analyzed by the specialized members of the Peace Conference¹¹². Alexandru Vaida Voivod wrote on August 25th, 1919, "Sidorenco, Petliura's man, is working on creating the independent Ukraine. Pichon told Sidorenco that he wants and believes that it would be in the best interest of France to create an independent Ukraine, but it should also seek to develop close relations with Romania".¹¹³

The proposal of the American delegation presented by Charles Seymour¹¹⁴, raised numerous objections from the French and British delegates, who supported the granting of the entire Bukovina to the Romanian Kingdom. In the February 22nd, 1919 Commission meeting, Ionel Brătianu protested in regard to the American proposal¹¹⁵. Unable to reach an agreement after several meetings, the Commission decided on March 5th, 1919, to submit the issue of establishing Bukovina's borders to the analysis of a subcommittee, where it had been appointed Charles Seymour as representative of America¹¹⁶. The conclusions were presented to the Border demarcation Commission, that on April 6th, 1919, presented to the Supreme Council the ethnic boundary recommended by the American delegation¹¹⁷. This, having as starting point the irrelevant results of the

¹¹¹ ANIC fond *Iancu Flondor*, file 32/1919, f. 63.

¹¹² Daniel Hrenciuc, *Bucovina și problema minorităților naționale în dezbaterile Conferinței de Pace de la Paris (1919–1920)* [Bukovina and the issue of national minorities in the debate of the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920)], în „Țara Fagilor” , (XIX), 2010, p. 86.

¹¹³ Alexandru Vaida Voivod, *Scrisori de la Conferința de Pace. Paris-Versailles 1919–1920* [Letters from the Peace Conference. Paris-Versailles 1919-1920], edition cared for, study and notes by Mircea Vaida Voivod, București, Editura Multi Press International, 2003, p. 318.

¹¹⁴ Ion Stanciu, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

¹¹⁵ *FRUS*, III, p. 848;851.

¹¹⁶ Daniel Hrenciuc, *Provocările vecinătății: Ucrainenii bucovineni în Regatul României Mari (1918–1940)* [The challenges of vicinity. The Bukovinian Ukrainians in the Greater Romanian Kingdom (1918-1940)], Iași, Editura Tipo Moldova, 2010, p. 26.

¹¹⁷ Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

1910 census, considered in the report, incorrectly, that Romania would receive a territory inhabited by 85. 000 Ukrainians and 300 Romanians¹¹⁸. In the document, it was mentioned that it is to the advantage of the Ruthenians in Bukovina to be associated with the Romanians for the economic cooperation and being of the same religion¹¹⁹.

The difficulties of the diplomatic confrontations were amplified by the fact that on May 2nd, 1919, the govern of the Socialist Republic of the Ukrainian Soviets, through the People's Commissars President, Cristian Rakovsky, sent from Kiev an "ultimatum to the Romanian government urging the immediate evacuation of Romanian troops from Bukovina, he argued that the Socialist Ukraine is united with Bukovina through a solidarity bond uniting the working masses of all countries, through the ethnographic relatedness of its population with a considerable part of Ukrainian population"¹²⁰. On May 27th, 1919, Ion I. C. Brătianu sent a protest letter to Philippe Berthelot, in which he announced that he will not sign the treaty with Austria if Dniester will not be admitted as Bukovina's boundary¹²¹. The Romanian delegation oriented towards the establishing of a common Romanian-Polish border, fact directly related to the recognition of Bukovina as a Romanian territory by the Allied and Associated Powers, objective comprised in the memorandum sent by the Romanian delegation to the Peace Conference¹²², from January 21st, 1919.

Report no. 1 of April 16th, 1919 of the Commission on Romania's boundary contained a detailed description of the proposed boundaries and a map of the border line between Romania and Bukovina. Cernivsti was left to Romania but Horodenka, Snyatin and Kolomeea remained outside the boundaries of the Romanian state¹²³. The Commission was concerned with the correct establishment of the ethno-national relations in Bukovina, taking into account the number of the Ukrainians from Northern Bukovina, evoking the natural connection of the province with Romania and taking into consideration the common religion of Ukrainians and Romanians. In the document, it was also

¹¹⁸ David Sherman Spector, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

¹¹⁹ Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

¹²⁰ *Organizarea Conferinței de Pace de la Paris și poziția României în problema Bucovinei* [The organization of the Paris Peace Conference and Romania's position on the issue of Bukovina], p. 4.

¹²¹ AMAE, fond 71/1914, vol. 90, f.14–15. *Raport nr. 1945, de la Legația României din Londra, decembrie 1918* [Report no. 1945 from the Romanian delegation in London, December 1918].

¹²² *Idem*, fond *Convenții* 13/1, vol. 1, f. 1.

¹²³ Florea Șapcă, 1919: *Diplomația americană și problema Bucovinei* [The American diplomacy and the issue of Bukovina], în „Țara Fagilor”, XVIII/2009, p. 55.

admitted the modification of the historical boundaries of Bukovina according to the economic and ethnic needs, as follows:

a) In the North, it was succeeded the obtaining from the railway junction that connects the two cities of Galicia, Kolomeea and Zalishchyky.

b) In the West, it was detached from Bukovina the Cheremosh Basin, a region that presented economic interests for Galicia. These corrections that took from the area of Bukovina annexed to Romania the territories inhabited by about 85,000 Ukrainian and 300 Romanian gave Romanians a relative majority in the portion that was assigned to them”¹²⁴.

In any version, the setting of a border line that would respect the ethnic criteria in Bukovina would have placed outside the borders large ethnic groups. Such a border line – calculated by the American experts - would have passed from the North-East to the South-West through the centre of Bukovina, crossing four of the five counties and leaving untouched only a single county: Suceava county¹²⁵. The Commission's report was approved by the Central Territorial Committee on April 9th, 1919. On May 23rd, 1919, the Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers approved Bukovina's boundaries without having solved, this issue in accordance with the Romanian Kingdom delegation's requests. On June 21st, 1919, it was approved the configuration of Bukovina's boundaries by the Council of the Four¹²⁶. Noteworthy is the position of the Italian delegation (G. de Martino, Luigi Vannutelli Rey) which argued that Romania should receive the entire Bukovina since it was promised this when it signed the 1916 Alliance Convention. There existed some opinions pertaining to experts that supported the concession of some Ukrainian parts of Bukovina to an Ukrainian state, or even to Poland.¹²⁷

On July 1st, 1919, the Supreme Council decided to inform Romania on the decisions made. On July 9th, 1919, Alexandru Vaida Voivod wrote, “Yesterday we were also handed the dimensioning of Bukovina's boudaries. The strip we received reaches only partially the territory promised in the Treaty, instead we were left parts that have been conceded to us. The land assigned to the Polish is the poorest region of Bukovina, inhabited by hutsuls and up to 80% are in other communes of very poor Jew. The forests are almost all exploited by Gotz. The mining taxes don't exist there. Poland will have to support within her boundaries

¹²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

¹²⁵ *Documente străine despre Basarabia și Bucovina 1918–1944* [Foreign documents on Bessarabia and Bukovina 1918-1944] Selection of documents and the introductory study by Valeriu Florin Dobrinescu și Ion Pătroi, București, Editura Vreamea, 2003, p. 98.

¹²⁶ Ion Stanciu, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

¹²⁷ Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

an autonomous Galician Ukraine, the same for the Czechoslovaks in North Eastern Hungary. Therefore, the concession is actually a gain.¹²⁸

The issue of Bukovina was resumed in the discussions had on the 22nd and 25th of July, 1919 by the Committee for Romanian and Yugoslav Affairs with the participation of U.S. experts (A. C. Coolidge and D. W. Johnson)¹²⁹. The American's opinion was influenced by the positions of France, Italy and England that supported the establishment of a joint Romanian-Polish border¹³⁰. The political leaders of Bukovina supported the negotiations with the Polish side for the correct establishment of a demarcation line between the boundary of Bukovina and Galicia, respecting the alignment *Dniester-Kolachin-Cheremosh*. This setting of the border should take into consideration aspects of "economic nature, strategic, military, and of course local particularities."¹³¹ Subsequent negotiations on the subject were held by the Committee for the studying of Polish territorial issues, led by Jules Cambon in May-June 1919¹³². The result was the establishment of the Romanian-Polish border line by the Allied and Associated Powers delegates in the July 2nd, 1919 meeting¹³³. Alexandru Vitencu and Nicu Flondor have submitted their point of view through a memorandum sent to the Romanian delegation that was at the Peace Conference (July 4th, 1919). The text of the Memorandum required for the railway route Chernivtsi-Zalishchyky to pass entirely on Romanian territory, along with the line Nepolokivtsi-Vizhnitsa that ensured the connection with Chernivtsi, as "the valley of Cheremosh has its natural economic opening in Chernivtsi". At the same time, it was necessary to study carefully the requests of inhabitants of the Romanian villages from across the Dniester, freeholder's villages that following their annexation to Galicia would be in danger of becoming slavich¹³⁴

The only border adjustments accepted referred strictly to Storozhinets area, the authors of the Memorandum (Alexandru Vitencu and Nicu Flondor) obviously wrongly considered that it does not imply too much ethnic and

¹²⁸ Alexandru Vaida Voevod, *op. cit.*, p. 234–235.

¹²⁹ Florea Șapcă, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹³⁰ Ion Stanciu, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

¹³¹ Ion Nistor, *op. cit.*, p. 39–40.

¹³² Centrul de Studii și Păstrare a Arhivelor Militare Istorice „General Radu Rosetti” (în continuare C.S.P.A.M.I), fond *Divizia 8 Infanterie*, dosar nr. 3, f. 37.

¹³³ Daniel Hrenciuc, *Bucovina și problema minorităților naționale în dezbaterile Conferinței de Pace de la Paris (1919–1920)* [Bukovina and the issue of national minorities in the debate of the Paris Peace Conference (1919–1920)], p. 92.

¹³⁴ AMAE, fond 71/1914, vol. 58, f. 86. *Memoriul semnat de Nicu Flondor și Alexandru Vitencu către delegația română la Conferința de Pace de la Paris* [The memorandum signed by Nicu Flondor and Alexandru Vitencu for the Romanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference], July 4th, 1919.

geographic loss¹³⁵. Fromageot acknowledged that “Romania has the right to demand for the entire Bukovina”, explaining however that the Allied and Associated Powers will absorb some of the (Romanian) authority over Bukovina, if “the Romanian delegation does not sign the treaty with Austria.”¹³⁶

The possibility of conceding certain bordering localities to the Polish State determined a series of protests addressed to the Supreme Council by the freeholders' and small boyars' Society, respectively the inhabitants of Stăneștii de Jos¹³⁷. To clarify this situation, the Commission for Romania's territorial issues assigned two special meetings - July 22nd and 25th, 1919 - destined to the analysis of Bukovina's borders. The new American representative in the Commission, Archibald Coolidge, noting that the area of Bukovina that had an Ukrainian majority had not been claimed by Poland¹³⁸, he proposed, based on economic reasons, that the Cheremosh basin should be given to Romania, issue accepted by the other delegations.¹³⁹ Galicia remained with only a small area of the Northwestern Bukovina, including the rail junction Kolomeea-Zalishchyky¹⁴⁰. The proposal was addressed to the Supreme Council on July 30th, 1919. It decided, based on the suggestion of André Tardieu, to accept the Commission's for territorial issues new version, following that Romania should be notified only after it had signed the Peace Treaty with Austria¹⁴¹.

On July 31st, 1919, at Lvov, it was signed the Romanian - Polish Convention concerning the evacuation of Pokutia and the establishing of the demarcation line between the two states. In Article 2 of the document it was stated that “the line that separates the Romanian Army and the Polish Army will consist of the Bukovina's historical boundary, from Babin, on the Dniester, onto Yablunitsa on the White Cheremosh. The village of Serafyntsi being a part of the territory that will be reoccupied by the Polish army. The Romanian-Polish Convention stated that the demarcation line followed exactly the route suggested by the Peace Conference delegates, noting that the village of Yablunitsa was mentioned as

¹³⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹³⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹³⁷ Ion I. Nistor, *Problema ucraineană în lumina istoriei* [The Ukrainian issue in the light of history], edition coordinated by Ștefan Purici and foreword by Gheorghe Buzatu, Rădăuți, Editura Septentrion, 1997, p. 213.

¹³⁸ Ion Stanciu, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

¹³⁹ Daniel Hrenciuc, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

¹⁴⁰ Vezi și Ludmila Rotari, *Mișcarea subversivă din Basarabia în anii 1918-1924* [The subversive movement in Bessarabia during 1918-1924], București, Editura Enciclopedică, 2002, p. 54.

¹⁴¹ Daniel Hrenciuc, *Cu ochii la Răsărit: Relațiile româno-polone în perioada interbelică (1919-1939)* [Staring towards the East: the Romanian-Polish relations in the interwar period (1919-1939)], Iași, Editura Tipo Moldova, 2012, p. 82 passim.

part of the Romanian state.”¹⁴² Article 59 of the Peace Treaty with Austria (September 10th, 1919) stated on the issue of Bukovina that “Austria renounces in favour of Romania all rights and titles over the part of the former Duchy of Bukovina beyond Bukovina's boundaries, as will be fixed subsequently by the Allied and Associated powers.”¹⁴³ Article 60 of the same treaty specified that Romania accepted that the Allied and Associated Powers will protect the interests of the inhabitants of Romania which differ in race, language or religion from the majority of the population”¹⁴⁴

Austria was reduced to an area 84,000 square kilometres and a population of 6.7 million inhabitants, of which a quarter lived in Vienna.¹⁴⁵ Completing the treaty of Saint German en Laye with Austria through the introduction of *The minorities treaty* discontented Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Serbia.¹⁴⁶ The Supreme Council communicated to Romania the route of the Romanian-Polish border line only on December 18th, 1919, but it discontented Romania because it let outside its borders Babin, Luca, Prylypche, Zvenyachyn and Khreshchatyk communes, that were attributed to Poland.¹⁴⁷ For this reason, between the two countries took place subsequently, at a politico-diplomatic level, extensive discussions and negotiations for an exchange of territories. The document was presented by Georges Clemenceau on December 22nd, 1919, by this being acknowledged officially the appurtenance of Bukovina to Romania: “According to the decision taken by the Supreme Council of the Allied and Associated Powers on the 18th of the month, I have the honour to announce that Romania's boundary with Eastern Galicia, in Bukovina, from the Dniester to the

¹⁴² Aurel Neagu, Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

¹⁴³ *Relațiile internaționale reflectate în dezbaterile Parlamentului României 1862 – 2010* [The international relations reflected in the Romanian Parliament 1862 - 2010], București, Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale, volumul I, Adunarea Deputaților, work drawn up under the care of Stelian Neagoe, 2010, p. 213– 214.

¹⁴⁴ Aurel Neagu, Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p. 195; George Sofronie, *Principiul naționalităților în Tratatetele de Pace din 1919–1920, Studiu introductiv* [The principle of nationalities in the Peace Treaties of 1919-1920, Introductory study,], coordinated by Constantin Schifirneț, București, Editura Albatros, 1999, p. 59.

¹⁴⁵ Gh. Buzatu, Marusia Cârstea, *Europa în balanța forțelor 1919–1939* [Europe in the balance of forces 1919-1939], vol. I, Iași, Editura Tipo Moldova, 2010, p. 24; also see *Condica tratatelor și a altor legăminte ale României 1354–1937* [The register of the treaties and of other covenants of Romania 1354-1937], *Protocol între România și Austria asupra bunurilor salvate din Bucovina (Viena, 26 iulie 1924)* [Protocol between România and Austria on the goods saved from Bukovina (Viena, July 26th, 1924)], dc. 392, p. 83.

¹⁴⁶ Gh. Buzatu, Marusia Cârstea, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁴⁷ Aurel Neagu, Victor Aelenei, *op. cit.*, p.102.

former boundary between Hungary and Galicia has been fixed as follows: “a line that leaves Dniester's thalweg unto a point located approximately 2 km downstream of Zalishchyky. From there towards the South-West to the meeting point of the administrative line between Galicia and Bukovina, with the boundary between Horodenka and Snyatyn districts at approx. 11 km South-East of Horodenka, a demarcation line on the field that passes through the 317, 312 and 239 altitudes.

From there towards the South-West, the former administrative line between Galicia and Bukovina to the junction point with the former boundary between Hungary and Galicia¹⁴⁸. In adopting this route, the Supreme Council maintained Bukovina - which was recognized as Romanian - with its historic territory integrity, except a slight correction, which was considered necessary so as not to cut the rail connection between the cities of Galicia, Horodenka and Zalishchyky”¹⁴⁹.

The inhabitants of neighbouring villages like Stăneștii de Jos have addressed a memorandum to the French Prime minister Georges Clemenceau, in which they protested against their integration into the territorial frameworks of Second Polish Republic¹⁵⁰, the document of the residents of that commune argued fiercely by the Romanian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference was eventually successful. Other localities like Babin, Luca, Prylypche, Zvenyachyn and Khreshchatyk would have, according to the Treaty of Sevres, to become part of the Polish state¹⁵¹. This problem was solved through mutual understanding between Romania and Poland, based on the Mixed Commission Protocol signed at Bucharest on January 26th, 1926¹⁵². The final establishment of the Romanian-Polish boundary was fixed by the provisions of the Sevres frontier's Treaty of August 10th, 1920, signed by Romania on the one hand and on the other by the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Poland and Czechoslovakia alongside the Allied and Associated Powers¹⁵³. On behalf of Romania, the Treaty of Sevres was

¹⁴⁸ *Interesele României în texte de drept internațional public* [Romania's interests in public international law texts], p. 29.

¹⁴⁹ Grigore Stamate, *Frontiera de stat a României* [Romania's state frontier], București, Editura Militară, 1997, *Anexa I*, p. 292-312.

¹⁵⁰ Ion I. Nistor, *Unirea Bucovinei cu România* [Bukovina's union with Romania], București, Editura Bucovina - I. E. Torouțiu, 1940, p. 40-44.

¹⁵¹ *Relațiile internaționale reflectate în dezbaterile Parlamentului României 1862- 2010* [The international relations reflected in the debates from the Romanian Parliament 1862 - 2010], p. 214.

¹⁵² Ion I. Nistor, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹⁵³ Daniela Nica, *România și politica securității colective. Pactul Briand-Kellog* [Romania and the collective security policy. The Briand-Kellog Pact], Târgoviște, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2012, p. 63.

signed by Nicolae Titulescu and Dimitrie Ghica and as specified in the Preamble, was meant “to ensure the sovereignty of Romania, Poland, of the State of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and of Czechoslovakia over the recognized territories”¹⁵⁴

Mainly, the Romanian-Polish border was the one established by the Lviv Convention in July 1919. The exact determination of the common border line was performed only on January 26th, 1928 (when the idea of mutual territories' exchange was renounced) by a mixed Romanian-Polish Commission formed after the Treaty of Lausanne. In 1928 the Romanian Kingdom and the Second Polish Republic agreed to fix the boundary between them, the historical Bukovina's border before its annexation and Eastern Galicia¹⁵⁵.” The Governments of the Romanian Kingdom and of the Second Polish Republic accepted the conclusions of the mixed Commission in the fifth plenary session, making this known by notification of identical diplomatic notes exchanged at Warsaw on October 10th, 1928¹⁵⁶. The last meeting of the Romanian-Polish mixed Commission took place on November 17th, 1935 in Bucharest, for taking note of the technical subcommittee activity of in the field frontier's demarcation, collected in nine volumes of documentation¹⁵⁷. The mixed Commission established in Article 2 of the Protocol that the border between the two states, which will start from the Stog edge, altitude 1605, and having as final point the confluence of Zbrucz River with the Dniester, is heading towards the former border between Galicia and Bukovina. The boundary thus established was the final one. On November 17th, 1935, in Bucharest, it was signed a Convention for the protection, conservation and recognition of the boundary stones and of other signs serving to indicate the border line. The international recognition of Bukovina had a diplomatic and politic complex route, starting with the Peace Treaty with Austria and ending with the protocol of the Romanian-Polish mixed

¹⁵⁴ Daniel Hrenciuc, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

¹⁵⁵ *Interesele României în texte de drept internațional public* [Romania's interests in public international law texts], p. 28.

¹⁵⁶ *Condica tratatelor și a altor legăminte ale României 1354–1937* [The register of the treaties and of other covenants of Romania 1354–1937], doc. nr. 990, p. 285. “Poland made statements regarding: a - the polish transit on the Horodenka-Babin-Ștepanivka-Zalishchyky rail line; b - the grazing of cattle on both sides of the border; c - the transit on the Kolomeea-Deleatyn-Yasynia line and on the Hryniava-Copilaș road; the Polish renunciation to the litigious land located south of the Munceluș creek”, *ibid*, doc. No. 992, p 286. Agreement made through exchange of notes for the establishment of the boundaries with Poland.

¹⁵⁷ *Interesele României în texte de drept internațional public*, p. 637– 674. *Reglementarea definitivă a graniței dintre România și Polonia. Protocolul final de delimitare al comisunii mixte de la 17 mai 1935, semnat la București.*

Commission of November 17th, 1935¹⁵⁸. The boundaries of the Romanian Kingdom were naturally reported in their majority to the boundaries of medieval Moldavia, as established in specific treaties¹⁵⁹. The Romanian-Polish border for which defensive strategies were built in the interwar period, could not resist subsequent geopolitical developments, because of the implementation of the provisions of the secret additional protocol annexed to the German-Soviet non-aggression pact known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, concluded on August 23rd, 1939¹⁶⁰.

On September 1st, 1939, the German troops invaded Poland and on September 17th the Red Army occupied 52% of the remaining Polish territory, taking control of the Eastern regions and reaching the Romanian boundary. In the interwar period, the security of Romania's Northern boundary relied on the common interest with that of the Second Polish Republic against a possible Soviet attack. The appurtenance of Bessarabia to Romania also prevented the direct contact of Bukovina with the Soviet Union in the North-East. The occupation of Galicia by the Soviet Union changed the entire regional geopolitics, Bukovina's defence becoming vulnerable, because "the upper parts of the rivers Prut and Dniester, as well as the northward part of the main rail that crossed from North to South, were occupied by the red Army"¹⁶¹. The Northern part of Bukovina to which was added Hertsa region and all of Bessarabia were ceded by the Romanian Kingdom to the Soviet Union as a result of the ultimatum addressed to the Romanian royal government on June 26th, 1940¹⁶². Subsequently, between 1941-1944 the territories ceded by the Romanian Kingdom to the Soviet Union were reclaimed by the Romanian army, but on February 10th, 1947, in the Horologe Hall at the Quai de d'Orsay in Paris the Great Powers acknowledge their return to the USSR by signing a treaty with Romania¹⁶³. The Prut boundary between Romania and nowadays Ukraine (previously the USSR) was established by the Paris Peace Treaty of February 10th, 1947 in the following terms: "*The Soviet-Romanian border is thus fixed in accordance with the Soviet-Romanian Agreement of June 28th, 1940*". (Article 1,

¹⁵⁸ Daniel Hrenciuc, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

¹⁵⁹ Gheorghe I. Brătianu, *La Moldavie et ses frontieres historique*, București, Editura Semne, 1995, p. 12, 95.

¹⁶⁰ Gh. Buzatu, *România sub imperiul haosului 1939-1945* [Romania under the rule of chaos 1939-1945], București, Editura Rao, 2007, p. 61.

¹⁶¹ *Documente străine despre Basarabia și Bucovina 1918-1944* [Foreign documents on Bessarabia and Bukovina 1918-1944], p. 108.

¹⁶² David E. Murphy, *op. cit.*, p. 57 și urm.

¹⁶³ Ion Agrigoroaei, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

Part I) ¹⁶⁴. Through this action mode, dominated by the right of the force and by international arrangements foreign to the spirit of Versailles, the Northern part of Bukovina and the Romanian-Polish boundary were lost.

Conclusions

The diplomatic recognition of the Bukovina's union with the Romanian Kingdom and of the Romanian-Polish boundary was conducted in the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), the efforts of Ionel I. C. Brătianu and Alexandru Vaida-Voivod, as well as of other representatives, including from the society of Bukovina, led by Iancu Flondor and Ion Nistor, were successful. The presentation of the historical ethnographic, economic, geopolitical arguments before the committees of the Peace Conference meant the capitalization and analysis of Romania's rights over Bukovina, an ancient Romanian territory whose ethno-confessional configuration modified radically during the 144 years of Austrian administration. The Romanian Kingdom by signing the Minorities' Treaty (December 9th, 1919) assumed European responsibilities in the protection of the rights of the national minorities that live on its territory. The national minorities from the former historical Bukovina were active in the political, social, cultural and religious fields in the Romanian Kingdom, from the Ukrainians existing some revisionist projects, but which have remained in theory, these being under Romanian authorities' strict control. Having an advantageous position from a geopolitical point of view, Bukovina was at the beginning of World War I - as briefly developed in this article - the subject of secret negotiations between the Romanian Kingdom, the Russian Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, each of these powers wanting to take or to maintain control over it, at least partially. Russia didn't agree, in any version, the returning of the entire Bukovina to Romania, while Austria recognized democratically the appurtenance of the province to the Romanian state by signing the Saint German en Laye Peace Treaty (September 9th, 1919). In Paris, the Romanian Kingdom's delegation argued and supported with great determination Romania's right over the entire Bukovina, any other version being considered as unacceptable and therefore contrary to the historical, ethnic, geographic and geopolitical realities. Given the historical legitimacy of the right over Bukovina, confirmed in the spirit of the Wilsonian ideas by the principles of self-determination and of nationalities, the Romanian Kingdom managed, benefiting (also) from the performance of valuable political leaders, to gain recognition of the act of the representative council on November 15th/28th, 1918. The setting of the boundary of the

¹⁶⁴ Viorica Moisuc, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

Romanian Kingdom with the second Polish Republic was imposed primarily by geopolitical considerations, the two states supporting each other, as previously shown, before the Allied and Associated Powers gathered at the Peace Conference.

The evolution of the politico-diplomatic and military context after 1918, imposed and shaped the Romanian-Polish closeness, the two countries (Romania and Poland) being directly interested in preserving the regional *status quo* against the revisionist danger represented by Soviet Russia (from 1922, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Unfortunately, being in reality profoundly vulnerable the Versailles system was strongly and irreversibly affected by the secret understandings of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (August 23rd, 1939), on which relied the subsequent aggression of Germany and the USSR on Poland and Romania. In this context, Romania and Poland lost violently and brutally, what it had been obtained naturally and democratically in the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920). This paper, based on the capitalization of studies and primary documents, urges to knowing and revalorizing an important chapter in the history of Romania, namely Bukovina's and the Romanian-Polish border recognition in the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920).