

# Keith Hitchins: Honesty and the Writing of History

VASILE PUȘCAȘ



KEITH HITCHINS

## Vasile Pușcaș

Professor at the Faculty of History and Philosophy, Babeș-Bolyai University. Author, among others, of the books **România de la preaderare la postaderare** (Romania from pre-accession to post-accession) (2008) and **Teme europene** (European topics) (2008).

**T**HE FIRST book published by Keith Hitchins—*The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1780–1849* (1969)—has on the front cover a description of the topic approached by the author which begins as follows: “Long before Romania existed as a sovereign state, the Romanians struggled for national identity in Transylvania, an area of Eastern Europe of great ethnic and cultural diversity.”<sup>1</sup> Paraphrasing this introduction to the book, I could say that I met Professor Hitchins a few years before actually seeing him in person. This happened in the autumn of 1974, when I was starting my third year of studies at Babeș-Bolyai University. After a lecture on the modern history of Romania, taught by a professor that seemed to be more interested in dogmatic clichés than in actual science and with whom I started a historiographical dispute concerning the Romanian national movement in Transylvania in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, I asked Professor Pompiliu Teodor to be our “referee.” Professor Teodor told me to demonstrate my opinions only after I have become myself convinced of their validity. Thus, in order to better argue

the case to myself, he recommended a book written by an American historian, which I was to assess from the vantage point of the value system embraced by our historians. The book in question was Keith Hitchins's *Cultură și naționalitate în Transilvania* (Culture and nationality in Transylvania, 1972). I appreciated the clarity and the style of the argumentation in the three studies included in the volume in question, and especially their logic and rationality. I was particularly fascinated by the chapter on the Congress of Nationalities (1895).<sup>2</sup> Before me lay a clear presentation of the complex ethnic situation of the Habsburg Empire, discussed in a wider European and international context. At that time, the book in question not only helped me when it came to our seminar "disputations," but it also made me focus on the topic of Central Europe and of international relations in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

I got to meet Professor Hitchins in person in 1981. I had recently become an assistant professor of Contemporary Romanian History (Babeș-Bolyai University), and the same Professor Pompiliu Teodor introduced me to our American guest with the following words: "Keith, this lad is our assistant professor of contemporary history. He has read everything on contemporary history that he could find in Cluj, Bucharest and Jassy, and he keeps pestering me about the theory and the methodology of this discipline. How do you think we could help him?" This conversation was the beginning of a professional relationship with Professor Hitchins, who became a valued mentor, not only in the context of the American and European universities, but even in the Romanian academic circles. He taught me the discipline governed by the Muse Clio, and guided me in terms of the research methods to be used. He also told me that I must not squeeze an investigated topic into a pre-existing theory, but rather start by reading everything I can find on the subject in question, come to understand it in its full complexity and in the broadest possible context, operate a rational critique of the sources, and only then formulate my own point of view, including interpretations that take into account the social theories of the studied period and of the time of my readership.

Keith Hitchins has been present in Romanian historiography for more than five decades. After studying at Harvard University, in Paris, and in Vienna in the 1950s, in 1960–1962 we find him in Bucharest (with Academician Andrei Oțetea) and Cluj (with Academician David Prodan), as the first Fulbright fellow in Romania. On the same occasion he also worked with Petru Comarnescu, from whom he took the habit of analyzing culture and literature, as well as the Euro-Atlantic integrative imprint of the scientific and cultural dialogue.<sup>3</sup> As he has recently confessed, this period he spent in Romania not only helped him complete his doctoral thesis (on Bishop Andrei Șaguna),<sup>4</sup> but also to feel the substance of the "Europeanization" process in the Romanian space, which he understood as

the drive to come closer to the West, in terms of society and politics, and also of culture and mentalities.<sup>5</sup> It was in this context that he also approached the interwar period, in a logical attempt to follow the development of the national idea even after the political and state unification of Romania in 1918.

Despite the fact that he is one of the leading specialists in Romanian studies, little has been written about Professor Keith Hitchins, and there are very few interviews with him in the media. In 1997, the *Transylvanian Review* published a piece on the life and work of this historian of Central and Southeast Europe,<sup>6</sup> and in 2001 and 2006, Editura Enciclopedică (Bucharest), where Keith Hitchins published most of his Romanian books, compiled a bibliography of all of his texts.<sup>7</sup> On his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday, the *Vatra* magazine (Târgu-Mureș) (33, 424, July 2006) collected not only data on the historiographical activity of Keith Hitchins, but also a number of opinions, interviews, etc. with various cultural and scientific personalities from Romania and from several European and American universities. In the same context, the *Colloquia* review (Cluj-Napoca, 2008) published a presentation of historian Keith Hitchins. The qualities of this professor and scholar were praised and often evoked in the Romanian university and academic environment, especially after 1990. The universities of Cluj, Sibiu, Alba Iulia, Târgu-Mureș, Timișoara, Iași, and Constanța made him a Doctor Honoris Causa, and the Institutes of History of Cluj, Bucharest (Institute of Southeast European Studies) made him an honorary member. He is also an honorary member of the Romanian Academy (since 1991).

The high appreciation for his work in the field of Romanian studies is demonstrated by the many reviews to his writings published by prestigious publications from nearly all continents, and also by the fact that he was invited to manage the Romanian studies projects undertaken by various centers of historical research. Quite remarkable is his contribution to *Rumanian Studies* (Leiden, 1970–1986), both as an editor and as the author of studies, articles, and reviews. Also, as a member of the editorial board of the *Slavic Review* (1980–1991), he was among the most active American researchers who ensured that the topics pertaining to Romanian history are represented within area studies in the USA.<sup>8</sup> Keith Hitchins has also been a respected consultant for prestigious American institutions promoting area studies (we are mainly referring to the Central and Eastern European area) such as the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (1970–1979), the International Research and Exchanges Board (1972–1975), the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council (1982–1989), and the East European Selection Committee–American Council of Learned Societies (2008–2011). In the late 1980s he directed the project concerning the interwar history of Eastern Europe set up by the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe (1987–1989). In this fashion,

during the Cold War the American historian helped ensure scientific exchanges in which the ideological bias was reasonably limited and also encouraged a dialogue among the researchers, universities and institutes of history that also had an interest in Romanian studies. After 1990 we find the historian Keith Hitchins in the scientific and editorial boards of many Romanian historiographical institutions and publications. Starting with the mid-1990s, he has participated nearly every year in various conferences and historiographical events hosted by various Romanian academic centers.<sup>9</sup>

**I**N THE 1950s, when student Keith Hitchins made his debut in academic life, Harvard University was one of the most prestigious American centers of area studies, a field that saw a spectacular development after the World War II. As the main research topic when it came to Eastern Europe was Russia/the USSR, the young Hitchins also began by investigating this area. His professor, Robert Lee Wolff, suggested he should focus on Romanian history. With the support of the Ford Foundation, in 1955–1956 he studied in Paris and Vienna, becoming familiar with European history and with the area of Central Europe. It was in Paris that he met Professor Emil Turdeanu, who introduced the eager Harvard don to the study of the Romanian language and literature. Still, his systematic study of Romanian history only began in 1960–1962 when, as a Fulbright fellow, he investigated those Romanian archives and libraries that made him familiar with the national movement of the Romanians in Transylvania and the cultural and political personalities of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries that led it. Since then, historian Keith Hitchins has shown a thorough and dedicated interest in this historical topic. Furthermore, he has produced the most thorough and systematic approaches to the subject, as for more than five decades the American historian has carried out an in-depth investigation of certain events and personalities, institutions and trends, of short, medium and long chronological periods, he extended and compared his main topic to the immediate geographic area and also to the European and international context, and analyzed the cultural political phenomenon within the greater socio-economic process of societal evolution. In brief, we can say that historian Keith Hitchins has researched a total history, integrated in world history.

When a few young Cluj historians asked him why he had chosen to specialize in history, Professor Hitchins listed “interest and pleasure” as his main reasons.<sup>10</sup> By “interest” he meant knowing a society under all of its aspects: cultural, economic, social, political etc. Those familiar with Keith Hitchins are well aware of his veneration and love of what we call humankind. In a world divided by the Cold War or affected by the turmoil that followed the year 1989, the humanism of Professor Keith Hitchins was and remains an oasis in the desert. Undoubt-

edly, it stems from his own personality and from the education given to him by his family, as well as from the cultural and intellectual experiences he had after World War II. His desire to know everything there is to know about the social manifestations of the human individuals knows no bounds. Even today, the discovery of older books, of documents that speak of the actions and behaviors of various individuals and communities, usually of the deeds of outstanding individuals, stimulates him to embark upon new research projects and expand even further the horizon of human knowledge. We are almost tempted to say that Keith Hitchins is almost aristocratic in his intellectual approach to the chosen research topic, dedicating himself to it thoroughly and completely, without sparing any effort. As an outstanding intellectual, Keith Hitchins has always enjoyed the company of intellectuals from various historical periods, seeing in them the most dynamic agents of societal change. In his first book on the Romanian national movement in Transylvania (1969)—in the very first sentence, in fact—he ascribes this movement to the Romanian intellectuals who, using the “weapons” represented by the historical and linguistic treatises, by schools and churches, managed to lay the foundations of a national conscience and identity directed towards the support of certain Western-inspired political actions and programs.<sup>11</sup> Convincingly demonstrated and disseminated through studies published at Harvard, Oxford etc., Professor Hitchins’s opinions came in sharp contrast with the interpretations of those who saw in the Romanian space only the evidence of what was called “Eastern behavior” during the Cold War era. Extending his cultural-intellectual-political research to the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Hitchins even alluded to the resistance put up by the pro-European (pro-Western) Romanian intellectuals of that time, confronted with a variety of pan-Eastern and totalitarian ideologies that were rising manifestly imperial claims to the region.<sup>12</sup> Hitchins’s investigation of the “Romanian intellectual phenomenon,” not only in Transylvania, but in the entire Romanian space, is one of the most important contributions to Romanian studies in the Anglo-Saxon environment, during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and until today.

In his “Preface” to *Mit și realitate în istoriografia românească* (Myth and reality in Romanian historiography, 1997), Keith Hitchins confessed: “The modern history of Romania stirred my interest because of at least three elements: the evolution of the idea of nation, in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, especially in Transylvania; the rise of the organized workers’ movement, in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and its evolution under socialist and communist auspices, in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; and the great controversy regarding national identity and the road to progress among the Romanian intellectuals and politicians during the two decades of the interwar period.”<sup>13</sup> We must also add that the professor has contributed significantly to the participation of Romanian his-

toriography in the European and international historiographical dialogue, and to the modernization and development of historical writing in Romania. Before the year 1989, Professor Hitchins was a central role model for the young Romanian historians, alongside Academician David Prodan and a few other historians who, in various universities, research institutes, specialist or cultural publications, supported the professionalization of the study of history, in opposition to the politically “manufactured” historians and to the tendencies towards ideological bias in historiography. After 1990, he dynamically supported the attempts of Romanian historiography to regain its credibility and truly become part of world historiography. By saying that “Today, Romanian historiography is on a par with Western historiography, in terms of both methods and subjects,”<sup>14</sup> the historian from Urbana-Champaign indicated that the Europeanization of Romanian historiography was the fulfillment of a geocultural desideratum and that the country had demonstrated its potential for integration in the contemporary world historiography, which had an outstanding representative in Keith Hitchins himself.

It has often been said in Romanian historiographical criticism that the books *The Rumanians 1774–1866* and *Rumania 1866–1947*, published by Professor Hitchins in 1994 and 1996, are not only the best contemporary syntheses of modern Romanian history, but also a crowning achievement of his research in the field of Romanian history. Of course, the two books in question brought an essential contribution to the understanding of the main directions in the development of Romanian society over a period of nearly two centuries. Similarly, his studies on the development of the Romanian national movement are essential reading for anyone seeking to understand the issue of Romanian identity and the energies devoted to the modernization and the Europeanization of this cultural and historical space. In our opinion, not enough has been said about the role played by the historiographical work of Professor Hitchins in stimulating the interest in area studies, a field that originally led him to the investigation of Romanian history, at the time when he was still a student at Harvard. In a most brilliant and skilful fashion, Keith Hitchins managed to assimilate not only the history of Central Europe, which included the history of Transylvania and Romania, but also that of Southeast Europe, associated with the history of Wallachia and Moldavia, and then of modern Romania. The American historian, aware of the interdisciplinary nature of area studies, cultivated not only a comparative approach, but also turned towards the geopolitics and the geoculture of these two regions of Europe, in an organic association legitimized by the very facts of history. This historical reality can be seen not only in the studies devoted specifically to these two areas, but also in the pieces devoted to Romanian history. The most recent reference to this aspect can be found in Hitchins’s book about I. I. C.

Brătianu (2011), where the author describes in a logical and cogent fashion the manner in which the geopolitics and the geoculture of the two areas shaped the external and even the internal policy of Romania, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Starting from these area studies, Professor Keith Hitchins extended his field of interest towards other regions as well, such as Central Asia, the Middle East, or the Caucasus, performing comparative studies of their national and identity movements as well as of their cultural and intellectual structures. Thus, he found himself just one step away from investigations pertaining to the field of international relations and from remarkable pieces in which he explains the evolution of the modern international system, from the role of the Great Powers to the shifting balance of power.

For Keith Hitchins, Romanian studies means a systematic recourse to the European dimension. After more than fifty years of investigations devoted to the last three centuries of Romanian history, the historian is convinced that the modernity of Romania lay at the “crossroads between East and West.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, socially, economically, culturally, politically etc. there has been a constant vacillation between the two geopolitical and geocultural spaces, with manifest efforts on the part of the “pro-Europeans,” of those who advocated the Western model of development. Keith Hitchins believed that this category also included the Romanian intellectuals in Transylvania, starting even with the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and the local entrepreneurs, including those from the Romanian Principalities and then from Romania proper, who favored an expansion of the markets, industrialization and urbanization. In 1969, Hitchins wrote that even the Orthodoxy of the Romanians was essentially an expression of the Romanian spirit rather than a set of dogmas separating them from the Catholics and the Protestants in the West, and that it posed no obstacle to the assimilation of Western ideas, favoring the definition of the national identity in relation to a Western heritage precisely in order to highlight the differences in regard to the East.<sup>16</sup> In several studies and volumes, Keith Hitchins insisted on the intellectual, social and political debates in Romania involving the “pro-Europeans” and the “traditionalists,” and he systematically approached the process of Romanian modernization as driven by Western models and grounded in the adoption of Western cultural values. The attitude of the Romanian political leaders in regard to the structural changes demanded by the process of Europeanization has been suggestively presented by Hitchins in his latest book, devoted to the Brătianus and particularly to Ion C. Brătianu. This national epic, considered Hitchins, was abruptly ended after World War II, when the country became subordinated to Soviet Russia and was forced to adopt another model of development. In 2007, when Romania joined the European Union, Keith Hitchins once again argued that the communist episode could be seen as an “aberration that diverted Romania from the path of

Europeanization, which it had been following since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>17</sup> On the same occasion, with reference to the behavior of the Romanian historians after 1989, he argued that “the manner in which they understood to do their job” demonstrated that “European integration is the best way to ensure their own discipline and to better understand the national history.”<sup>18</sup>

Keith Hitchins is a professional historian in the sense defined by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre. Just like in the case of Paul Veyne, for Keith Hitchins the writing of history is an intellectual activity.<sup>19</sup> He is not one of those who constantly ask themselves whether historians are objective or subjective, seeking instead to be accurate and honest.<sup>20</sup> What does this mean? First of all, it means presenting all societal aspects in an unbiased fashion, and it also means explaining the meaning of the past so that contemporary readers could understand it. He began by researching the history of the Romanian national movement in Transylvania, a subject pertaining to the field of cultural and political history, but in the course of his work he specialized both horizontally and vertically. Thus, he also developed an interest in social, economic, institutional, biographic history etc., while expanding the topic to include the field of national identity and in fact the history of the entire Romanian space. Consequently, he published landmark studies devoted to the modernization and the Europeanization of the Romanians in the 18<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Keith Hitchins demonstrates that the role of the professional historian is to rewrite history not on account of changing circumstances, but rather in order to demonstrate the continuing development of human society as a process of constant change and transformation. According to Keith Hitchins, historians are meant to study human thought and actions, to identify and analyze the processes they generate and offer to the present and future human community, outlining the evolution of humankind and helping people understand “what they are, where they come from, and where they are going.”<sup>21</sup>

In *Le Temps de l'Histoire* (1986), Philippe Ariès argued that contemporary man has been “invaded by history” and criticized the professional historiographers, especially those from the “university” or “academic” environment, for writing only for specialists and not for a general readership. Ariès described professional historians as “technicians” who structure their discourse around “historical facts,” which involves “identifying the facts, the continuity of the identified facts, and explaining the facts in their succession.”<sup>22</sup> The French author demanded that historians “respond to the concerns of their contemporaries,” stop resorting only to a “specialist technique” and embrace a “manner of living in time.”<sup>23</sup> We shall not comment here on the statements made by Ariès, but we have to say that professional historians do not appropriate the fields of political science or of sociology, but merely draw on these disciplines, as well as on oth-

ers, within an interdisciplinary approach that, as demonstrated by Keith Hitchins himself, is so useful to a historian.<sup>24</sup> Conversely, the studies and the conclusions reached by professional historians can provide readers—including the specialists in political science, economy, sociology—with the certainty of operating with data unaffected by transient interests, and thus consolidate the factual-empirical foundation of social studies. Anyone familiar with the “research lab” of historian Keith Hitchins knows that he does not live in an “ivory tower” at his university, and that he is constantly interested in observing and finding out more about current issues, that he remains in constant dialogue with his students, with the public opinion, and with his colleagues and friends from all over the world. Interested in history as a field of human experience, at both individual and community level, the American professor brilliantly cultivated the historical biography, from his doctoral thesis on Bishop Andrei Țaguna to his latest book, on I. I. C. Brătianu. Furthermore, the manner in which Keith Hitchins presented his research, in books, studies, reviews, and also in many conferences and lectures, has been quite accessible to the general public, not being aimed exclusively at the academic or historiographical environment. Showing great care in structuring and in choosing the terms of the historiographical discourse, he would write and rewrite his own texts several times, until phrases become crystal clear and the style achieves utmost elegance and refinement.

The entire professional activity of Keith Hitchins was carried out in the university environment. He graduated from college at Schenectady (New York) in 1952, and from Harvard University in 1953, defending his doctoral thesis in 1964. From the very outset, he devised his profession as a historian in an organic relationship with the teaching of this discipline at the university. Thus, between 1958 and 1965 he was a tutor and assistant professor at Wake Forest University, a private university in North Carolina. At that time, the university in question was undergoing a process of adaptation to the new standards expected of American universities. From there, Keith Hitchins went to teach at Rice University (Houston, Texas), an institution established in 1912 and always oriented towards research and high quality education. Its school of humanities had a good history department and also promoted the study of foreign languages and the pursuit of cultural and area studies (incidentally, Professor Hitchins is a passionate student of foreign languages, being familiar with almost 20 of them, and also of world literature). After two years as an assistant professor at Rice University, in 1967 he went to work at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, as an associate professor. In 1969, he became a tenured professor in the History Department of this university.<sup>25</sup> He chose to remain at this university for more than four decades because here he could achieve the best balance between research and teaching. The university library held the third largest us

collection of documents and publications concerning Romanian history, after the Library of Congress and the library of Harvard University. Besides, the potential readership or public was greater here, as since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the Midwest had received many Romanian communities coming from Transylvania, as well as other ethnic groups from the former Habsburg Empire. Established as a university specializing in industrial and agricultural matters in the 1870s, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign nevertheless respected and carefully cultivated the study of history. In fact, the first president of the university was a historian who also specialized in economics and philosophy—John Milton Gregory (1868)—and the current president is also a historian, Professor Mike Hogan (he wrote the well-known monographs on the Anglo-American economic diplomacy after World War I, on the Marshall Plan and the reconstruction of Western Europe and, more recently, on the origins of the US security polity under Harry Truman).<sup>26</sup>

In the History Department of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, for decades on end Professor Keith Hitchins taught the history of nationalism, the history of Romania and of Central Europe, the history of the Habsburg Empire, the history of Southeast Europe, but also the history of Central Asia etc. His office in Gregory Hall (the building that hosts the History Department) is furnished with bookshelves (holding books that the professor uses in his research and teaching), a modest desk and a few chairs. The door is always open, and the professor thoroughly plans his hours of study and research and the hours reserved for tutoring. The courses taught at undergraduate level are not only adapted to the level of the students, but they are also aesthetically pleasing, delivered with passion and in a friendly manner. Professor Hitchins always invites his students to consider the social processes in their evolution and to research for themselves certain aspects and topics presented in a logical succession, so that the mind of the listener is always eager for novelty. In the framework of MA or doctoral programs he trained many specialists in the history of this area of Europe, including the history of Romania, who currently work in various American or European universities and who have been publishing valuable historiographical studies. The students of the major Romanian universities have received guidance and support from Professor Hitchins, both at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and at other American universities. In the past few decades he delivered a number of lectures and presentations at the universities of Cluj-Napoca, Timișoara, Târgu-Mureș, Iași, Alba Iulia, Constanța, etc., and many young Romanian historians have received from Professor Hitchins not only competent scientific guidance, but also warm and firm support in difficult moments. Professor Hitchins is a passionate and dedicated teacher and also a role model. I do not know whether he deliberately chose to be a role model,

but it must be said that his natural and easygoing attitude, his profoundly humanist qualities, his constant generosity and modesty inspire in us a certain scientific and intellectual behavior. He is eager to acquire knowledge, but only in order to give it back to his students and readers from all over the world. First and foremost, he is a person one could count on through thick and thin.

I myself had the opportunity of working under the guidance of Professor Hitchins. He directed me in the investigation of documentary sources important for the history of universities and education, for the history of Central Europe, of international relations, etc. With his customary generosity, he allowed me to borrow from his vast personal library (probably one of the most valuable private libraries in the US in what concerns this field) various interwar and postwar publications which I could not have dreamed of consulting in Romania before 1989. At the History Department of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Professor Hitchins introduced me to a number of leading American historians who guided me in my scientific and academic career: Joseph Love, who published some reputed studies on Mihail Manoilescu and the modernization of Romania; Paul Schroeder, a famous historian of international relations and European policies; Winton Solberg, who wrote the history of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a few well-known books on US history; Leonard Bates, a native of Montana thoroughly devoted to the history of American politics, the author of fundamental texts on American progressivism at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; or the passionate historians of Eastern Europe whom I met at the Center for Russian and East European Studies, Ralph Fisher and Marianna Tax Choldin, who were also directors of the aforementioned institute. In order to introduce me to the contemporary history of Southeast Europe, Professor Hitchins sent me to Professor Vucinich, at Stanford University (where I also had the possibility of consulting the Romanian diplomatic collections of the Institute on War and Peace) and to Professors Barbara and Charles Jelavich, at the University of Indiana. His guidance and recommendations also took me to the Library of Congress, in Washington, D.C., where Dr. David Kraus, director for European collections, led me to the titles and the historiographical fields that were the most relevant for my specialization.

**A**T THE age of 80, professor and historian Keith Hitchins is a universally respected intellectual, professional, and expert. The author of an impressive, original, and comprehensive historiographical work, he comes to demonstrate that in this period of turmoil and rapid changes the recourse to thorough rationality, to fairness and honesty can lay the foundations for a

scientific recovery of the past and consolidate our knowledge of the experiences of humankind. Driven by his profound humanism, Professor Hitchins has dedicated his energy, intelligence, and decades of work to the understanding of our greater calling as inhabitants of this Earth. For the historian and professor of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the cultural environment in which one lives and creates is the very essence of one's becoming, it is the hallmark of historical evolution. It is not by accident that Professor Hitchins's students and doctoral students from all over the world were told to study not only the intellectual and cultural context of the investigated period, but also to embrace a lofty cultural ideal and abide by certain rules of socio-cultural behavior that could provide a model to their contemporaries.



## Notes

1. Keith Hitchins, *The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1780–1849* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).
2. Keith Hitchins, *Cultură și naționalitate în Transilvania* (Cluj: Dacia, 1972), 73–93; see also id., *Conștiință națională și acțiune politică la românii din Transilvania, 1868–1918* (Cluj: Dacia, 1992), 22–168.
3. Remus Pricopie, Dorina Guțu, and Mihai Moșoiu, eds., *Fulbright Ripple Effect on International Education* (Bucharest: comunicare.ro, 2010), 51.
4. See Keith Hitchins, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Șaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846–1873* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977).
5. Keith Hitchins, *Ion I. C. Brătianu. Romania* (ser. Makers of the Modern World: The Peace Conferences of 1919–23 and Their Aftermath) (London: Haus Publishing, 2011), 39–40.
6. Vasile Pușcaș, “Keith Hitchins, Historian of the Central Southeastern European Area,” *Transylvanian Review* 6, 1 (Spring 1997): 99–130.
7. *Professor Keith Hitchins at Seventy* (Bucharest: Ed. Enciclopedică, 2001); *Professor Keith Hitchins at Seventy-Five* (Bucharest: Ed. Enciclopedică, 2006).
8. Ibid.
9. <http://www.history.illinois.edu/people/khitchins/>.
10. “Interview with Keith Hitchins,” initiated by Maria Crăciun, Ovidiu Ghitta, and Mária Lupescu Makó, *Colloquia* (Cluj-Napoca) 15 (2008): 159.
11. Hitchins, *The Rumanian National Movement*, VIII.
12. Keith Hitchins, *Rumania 1866–1947* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 292–334; see also id., *Conștiință națională și acțiune politică*, 22–168.
13. Keith Hitchins, *Mit și realitate în istoriografia românească* (Bucharest: Ed. Enciclopedică, 1997), 5.
14. “Interview with Keith Hitchins,” 167.

15. *Revista 22* (Bucharest) 18, 897 (15 May 2007) (<http://www.revista22.ro/ora-romaniei-376.html>, accessed on 29.07.2011).
16. Hitchens, *The Rumanian National Movement*, VIII–IX.
17. *Revista 22* (15 May 2007).
18. *Ibid.*
19. Paul Veyne, *Cum se scrie istoria*, trans. (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1999), 95; see also “Interview with Keith Hitchens,” 166.
20. “Interview with Keith Hitchens,” 166.
21. *Ibid.*, 159.
22. Philippe Ariès, *Timpul istoriei*, trans. (Bucharest: Meridiane, 1997), 238.
23. *Ibid.*, 262.
24. “Interview with Keith Hitchens,” 161.
25. <http://www.history.illinois.edu/people/khitchins/>. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign ranked 33<sup>rd</sup> among the top 200 universities in the world, and it was 21<sup>st</sup> in the Thomson Reuters rating of 2011 that measured the educational and scientific reputation of the top 100 universities in the world; cf. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings> (accessed on 18.08.2011).
26. <http://www.history.illinois.edu/>.

## **Abstract**

### Keith Hitchens: Honesty and the Writing of History

The present study is devoted to the personality and work of historian Keith Hitchens, one of the leading foreign specialists in Romanian studies, tracing the development of his interest in this field from the early stages in his career, at Harvard University in the 1950s, until the present day. Considerable attention is given to the vast body of work produced by the reputed historian on a variety of topics pertaining to Romanian history, and to the particular relevance and actuality of his approaches. Last but not least, we also learn about the influence he exerted and about the assistance he provided to several generations of Romanian historians.

## **Keywords**

Keith Hitchens, Romanian studies, historiography