

Adrian Marino – Contributions to the Research on Censorship in Romania*

Ionuț COSTEA

Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Keywords: history of intellectual life, history of ideas and ideologies, Romanian culture, liberalism, censorship, Marino Adrian

Abstract: The article discusses the contributions of literary critic and expert of intellectual history Adrian Marino to the research on censorship in Romania in two major registers. In the first one, the author observes, on the one hand, a remodelling of Adrian Marino's intellectual biography in the second half of the last decade of the 20th century, by concluding a research project dedicated to the idea of literature and starting a new one on the evolution of the ideas of freedom and censorship in Romanian culture. On the other hand, he emphasizes the theoretical and methodological perspective based on which the new research project is articulated, a history of ideas engaged in the context of a broader cultural program regarding the reconstruction of modern, European and creative Romanian culture which was a necessary step for the formation and strengthening of civil society and democracy after the fall of communism in 1989. In the second register Marino's biographical incidence with censorship is studied. Imprisoned and being in house arrest in the years of communism (in the 50s), Marino was subject to a series of censorship practices: using a pseudonym, writing chapters of annulled books, passages excluded from articles and books, books within publishing programs postponed *sine die*, etc. Moreover, Adrian Marino was not relieved of these practices even after the fall of communism. His contribution to the international encyclopedia of censorship published in 2001, the summarizing article on Romania, suffered a series of editorial interventions without the author's "blessing" (e.g. shortening the text, reorganizing the chapters, or introducing different passages). The present study is based on a number of primary sources (correspondence, memoirs, interviews with A. Marino) and on a rich literature on the topic.

E-mail: costea78@yahoo.co.uk

*

* In the present article, I also use previously published research results and articles on Adrian Marino's work. See: Ionuț Costea, "Adrian Marino și cercetarea Iluminismului Românesc" (Adrian Marino and the Research on Romanian Enlightenment), in *Istoria culturii. Cultura istoriei* (The History of Culture. The Culture of History) (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2010), 523–539; idem, "Adrian Marino and his Research on Romanian Enlightenment," in *Transylvanian Review* (in press); idem, "Adrian Marino și ideea de libertate: O reparație și o revanșă necesare" (Adrian Marino and the Idea of Freedom: A Necessary Repair and Revenge), in *Studii de știință și cultură* (Studies on Science and Culture) (in press).

Adrian Marino was the dedicated author of some works fundamental to the Romanian culture, several summarizing works, a dictionary of literary ideas and an exceptionally important intellectual apparatus. His work and his contributions regarding the history of censorship in Romania constitute a part of the same register, even though they were only partially realized in a synthesis. The beginnings of the research on this topic were embedded in the context of the creation of an international encyclopaedia of censorship, within which Adrian Marino got the role of presenting a general view of Romania and that of writing a case study with references to the literary history of the second half of the 19th century, including the lawsuit filed against B. P. Hașdeu in 1873. Carried out on the level of a “historical sketch,” in a Romanian and an English version, then completed by a contribution related to the beginnings of the affirmation of the idea of freedom and censorship in the Romanian culture up to the 19th century, the approach of this topic was the last major project undertaken by the author. What are the theoretical and methodological landmarks invoked by Marino in relation to such problems? What kind of biographic context of his is this project circumscribed in? Through which means and in which circumstances do these contributions to the history of censorship in Romania appear and get stated? To what extent did the editing of his texts cause formal or content-related modifications in the meaning of his writings and in the significance of the problem? The research of Adrian Marino’s works on censorship presented here was guided by these very questions. The documentary sources standing at the basis of the research were memoirs, journalistic writings, interviews with Marino, correspondence related to the works on censorship in Romania and the manuscripts of these works.

Looking at Marino’s bibliography, we can observe the “obsession” of erudition and encyclopaedism as well as that of systematization and hermeneutical analysis which sends the intellectual exploration to the depths of the texts, literary structures and cultural trends, to the genesis and circulation of ideas in the area inhabited by Romanians (“we certainly know, as Marino wrote, that the history of Romanian culture and ideology, in its actual state of development, is in an absolute need of also being built by such – so far poorly cultivated – investigations and methods in depth”).¹ Despite the incapacitations of the political system, the “marginalization” and disloyalties of some of his colleagues, his persevering continuous efforts were followed by the convergence of the national culture as an authentic, original dimension supported by a strong and active self-consciousness, pride and prestige in the field of European and universal culture. Romania’s cultural presence in Europe was fundamentally important, however, the assertion of this tendency should not have occurred under any conditions. Of course, imposing this perspective was motivated by the man of culture Adrian Marino’s attitude, a critical, active and seditious attitude (against the rigid, conformist structures of the

¹ Adrian Marino, *Libertate și cenzură în România. Începuturi* (Freedom and Censorship in Romania. The Beginnings) (Iași: Polirom, 2005), 12.

establishment – see his estrangement from George Călinescu,¹ his dialogues with Sorin Antohi, his memoirs,² and the polemics regarding his CNSAS “file”³).

In fact, the assumption of this condition of “seditionary spirit” is rooted in his strong belief about the civilizing and civic purpose of the man of culture, convergent aspects of Romanian civilization. His interventions after 1989 mark a series of concerns, studies, articles, books, which all illustrate his placement on the opposition’s side. From there, his voice was heard not only driven by narcissism, as some would think, but it was dominated by constructive ideas and values related to the birth and consolidation of democracy in post-communist Romania. For Marino, cultural activity was no longer a free act, devoid of social and civic meanings. On the contrary, in the spirit of the humanist tradition recycled by the ideology of the revolution of 1848 (*pașoptism*), culture was required to develop and strengthen authentic values in a moral, ethical, civic horizon, in favour of a harmonious and dynamic society.



Șerban Savu, *The Old Roof*, 2009, 162 x 200 cm, oil on canvas

In these circumstances and anchored to such an outcome were his obstinate preoccupations circumscribed in the last years of his life, dedicated to creating a

¹ Idem, *Viața unui om singur* (The Life of a Lonely Man) (Iași: Polirom, 2010), 46–55.

² Adrian Marino, *Al treilea discurs. Cultură, ideologie și politică în România. Adrian Marino în dialog cu Sorin Antohi* (The Third Discourse. Culture, Ideology and Politics in Romania. Adrian Marino’s Dialogue with Sorin Antohi) (Iași: Polirom, 2001).

³ Simona Maria Pop, *Adrian Marino. Obsesia trecutului* (Adrian Marino. The Obsession of the Past) (Alba Iulia: Gens Latina, 2010).

monograph on the evolution of the idea of freedom in Romania. As a man of systematic projects, characterized by consistence in their implementation, Adrian Marino was entirely devoted to the research and the creation of the different versions of the monograph about freedom and censorship in Romania. Based on his liberal options and beliefs, the project seems even more attractive and exciting within the circumstances of a “new liberation” from the ideological restrictions imposed by the single-party state, the cult of personality, and the dominance of the red bourgeoisie and “cultural nomenclature”. Political activism led him to define a cultural and civic programme that would restore the authentic values and build the democratic regime, a modern and European Romanian civilization in the spirit of the programme called *neopașoptism* (new revolutionary ideology).¹

Uncomfortable, controversial, odd, antisocial – as self-characterized in his memoirs – and led by a hypercritical spirit, Adrian Marino had the role of a “milestone” in the consciousness of the intellectual, cultural and civic life of the country. With such a destiny and sensibility, even after he passed away, he continued to provoke and create discontent and press scandals. Uncompromising with himself and others regarding the act of creation, without allowing for intellectual compromises, no matter how minor and ordinary they might seem, he experienced the stance of the marginalized with an acute awareness, in prison and in house arrest imposed by the communist regime, with the disloyalties of his friends and fellow critics and intellectual personalities, the disloyalties of the province where he lived, Cluj, and the disloyalties coming from the national circles, far too monopolistic and dominant in his view. The present article is not meant to directly concentrate on these aspects – even though they constitute the background of one of Marino’s intellectual, cultural and civic projects – but rather on the way he built his arguments and constructed his project and on its value in determining his intellectual identity.

In the most general terms, this project can be identified as what he called *For a liberal culture*. It began with some articles and studies dedicated to the affirmation of the ideas of freedom and censorship in the Romanian culture. It tended towards a synthesis on censorship, at first realized through some articles in *The Sphere of Politics*,² a contribution to the international encyclopaedia of censorship, a British project, published in the year 2001,³ and a Romanian version edited in Craiova in the year 2000.⁴ The project is summarized in a posthumous contribution published in Iași (Polirom, 2005),⁵ which brings together the pages of the first part of the synthesis dedicated to the

¹ Adrian Marino, “Pentru neopașoptism” (For a new revolutionary ideology), in *Al treilea discurs* (The Third Discourse), 145–163; Idem, “Actualitatea ideologiei culturale pașoptiste” (The Actuality of the Cultural Ideology of Revolutionism), in *Al treilea discurs* (The Third Discourse), 164–178.

² Idem, “Cenzura în România. Schiță istorică” (Censorship in Romania. A Historical Sketch), in *Sfera politicii* (The Sphere of Politics) V/49 (1997): 49–56; V/50 (1997): 52–53; V/51 (1997): 48–52; V/52 (1997): 58–60; V/53 (1997): 54–56; V/54 (1997): 53–56.

³ Idem, “Romania,” in *Censorship. A World Encyclopedia*, ed. Derek Jones, vol. III. (London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2001), 2042–2048.

⁴ Idem, *Cenzura în România. Schiță istorică introductivă* (Censorship in Romania. An Introductory Historical Sketch) (Craiova: Aius, 2000).

⁵ Idem, *Libertate și cenzură în România*.

Romanian concept of freedom, which was presented by the author himself as follows: “In principle, it would have three major parts: *The beginnings*, *The moment of 1848 and the consolidation of the liberal ideology* and *The confrontation of liberalism and the totalitarianism of right-wing and left-wing politics*. This way, the research would be brought up to date, to the present.”¹ The writings published in Romanian in 1997 and 2000 show a common morphology, identified, on the one hand, by their reprinting without almost no major structural, content-related or problematization-related intervention. The collaboration to the international encyclopaedia of censorship led to the creation of the first text about the history of censorship in Romania, a writing that appeared in its 1997 version, when, in June, Marino had to send it to the editors in London. Based on careful comparison, this version coincides with the one published in the same year as a series of six articles in *The Sphere of Politics*. On the other hand, the text published in 2001 in the third volume of the international encyclopaedia, as a result of editorial interventions, has a number of distinctive characteristics (regarding structure, content and extent) which will be discussed in detail below.

Initiated in 1997, the research on censorship led Adrian Marino towards the elaboration of a large project in which censorship was interpreted as the reversal of the manifestations of freedom in the Romanian society. The idea of censorship, in its relation to the fight for the affirmation of fundamental rights, opened a new perspective for studying the history of ideas and ideologies and of studying the Romanian version of liberalism.

The project that aimed at studying the concepts of freedom and censorship in the Romanian area began at an advanced age of over 75, and it galvanized Marino’s intellectual preoccupations and powers, giving it a particularly important value in his intellectual biography, even though he would not be able to complete it. Actively and methodically engaged in post-communist Romanian public, civic and political life, Adrian Marino almost organically assimilated the project dedicated to the Romanian concept of freedom, undergoing a homogeneous and inherent fusion with the efforts to build a cultural and civic life in Romania that would be consonant with the European one, a cultural and civic sphere based on the respect of human rights and democratic values, in order to “build a *new* culture and a new ‘country.’”²

Adrian Marino’s cultural and civic engagement in defining liberal ideology became dominant in the last decade of the 20th century. On the one hand, it was the final part of a cycle subsumed by the completion of some projects through the revision of some previous works and, on the other hand, it was the beginning of a new one, an evaluation and an affirmation of a new direction. His delimitation from his “old” preoccupations was consistent; there are a series of afterwords and epilogues that emphasize the metamorphosis of his intellectual identity, enabled by the circumstances of the release from the totalitarian restrictions. Publishing the sixth volume of *The Biography of the Idea of Literature* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000) can also be considered “the end of a road.” “By finishing this *Biography* I said ‘goodbye’ to this type of studies. And in general to studies of literary criticism. I was obliged to turn to this direction by the

¹ Ibid., 7.

² Idem, Epilogue in *Biografia ideii de literatură* (The Biography of the Idea of Literature), VI. (re-edited version) (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 2006), 235.

censorship and the ideological constraints of the communist regime. My real preoccupation – to avoid the ambitious term ‘vocation’ – is located in the direction of the ideas and the ideology itself. In a way, I am a deviated author, not to say prohibited by the circumstances from my real intellectual identity: that of critic of ideas and ideologist. This identity could freely manifest itself only after 1989. Only the volumes published after this time are representative – at least on the level of intentions – to my really essential preoccupations. I do not deny any of my previous volumes, but I intend to create, until... the end, only reviews, articles, studies and volumes written in the field of the criticism of ideas and ideology itself.”¹ The topic of this turn of his intellectual identity returned obsessively in the discourse of his memoirs, as well, together with his militant vocation of the same illuminist-revolutionist origin in view of defining the new Romanian culture and civil society in the spirit of democratic ideas: “But the ideological works waiting for me will be something much more. Much, much more. They will offer something essential, in addition. And they will be ‘offered,’ above all, to me myself. They will finally show my real intellectual identity. I hope that my age will permit, at least, this satisfaction. Maybe I deserve it...”²

To Marino, the new revolutionary ideology (*neopașoptism*) was “actuality, vitality and a constructive, profoundly reforming spirit,” as it was “the fundamental solution for a real modernization and Europeanization of Romania.”³ Its vision was dynamic and adaptable. It re-actualized the spirit, the major ideas and the enthusiasm of Enlightenment and revolutionary ideology (*pașoptism*), which placed into the centre of attention the beginnings (“The revolutionary ideology of 1848 represents for Romanians a symbolic moment of ‘absolute’ beginning”⁴), universality, generalization and originality (“Romanian culture has its own rhythm and sense of development”⁵), “the ideal of originality and authenticity,”⁶ (“Neither ‘superiority,’ nor ‘inferiority,’ but only ‘differentiation.’ As much as it is possible...”⁷). Revolutionary ideology was perceived as a tradition to graft “a new reality and historical evolution,” as an act of rebuilding what “would translate this aspiration into a new language”⁸ in quasi-identical socio-political contexts: “In the last century, after a Phanariot regime and the Russian occupation. In the actual one, after a totalitarian communist regime of the same Eastern imperialistic origin, which snatched us and isolated us from the great ‘family of European peoples.’”⁹ The program defined by Marino was articulated in the light of some prior intellectuals, such as Ștefan Zeletin or Eugen Lovinescu, however, the critic of ideas also felt close to some younger compatriots’ initiatives, like those of Alina Mungiu or Sorin Antohi and Stelian Tănase.

¹ Ibid., 240.

² Ibid., 235.

³ Ibid., 240.

⁴ Idem, *Viața unui om singur*, 245.

⁵ Idem, *Pentru neopașoptism*, 145.

⁶ Ibid., 147.

⁷ Idem, *Biografia ideii de literatură*, 235.

⁸ Ibid., 236.

⁹ Idem, *Viața unui om singur*, 288.

In Marino's vision, a "new culture" has to be critical, based on syntheses and encyclopaedic spirit: "The Romanian culture is in a vital need for works of reference, syntheses, encyclopaedias, books of 'European standards,' which would complete and, this way, absorb the culture of fragments and inconsistent journalism, primarily preoccupied with immediate actualities, unfortunately still predominant,"¹ "The Romanian culture is in an acute need for works of reference, for librarian work, for syntheses and erudition, for serious instruments of work. Created with... *cards*. Indeed, with *cards*."² "But only by strictly actual *chronicles*, occasional fragments and improvisations intended as *essayistic*, by dilettant, prolific and redundant critical polygraphy, by talk-shows, we cannot build a culture. However, Romanian culture is needed to be – primarily – built. Through basic, essential works (dictionaries, encyclopedias, histories of all kinds, etc.), which are, unfortunately, absent so far."³

Breaking away from literary theory and criticism, and disappointed with the Romanian literary life, with the overly careerist attitude of intellectuals, his behaviour became "militant and confrontational,"⁴ in order to consolidate a *different* kind of Romania which he would prefer to be dominated by a *liberal culture*, animated by a rational and critical spirit. In 1999, when he was writing his memoirs, he set the genesis of his new project – which was to become "an overwhelming obsession" in the last years of his life – in terms of a *fortunate accident* that occurred on the basis of a profound ideological catharsis and a professional and intellectual orientation: "A *fortunate accident* occurred in the spring and summer of the year 1997, which gave an even more powerful impulse to these tendencies. An unpredictable phone call from Andrei Pippidi got me involved in the London adventure of *Censorship: An International Encyclopedia*, for which I wrote the Romanian *item*. It was very interesting, even exciting. Almost two months of intensive documentation and being at the library day by day brought me back into the – once frequented, then abandoned – world of historical sources of Romanian ideology. I got into contact with authentic, first-hand documents again. With a totally ignored incipient tradition. With a world of forgotten ideas, which were mine as well. A phone call rarely more inspired, more welcome, more stimulating. Because I quickly realized that I *could* and that I *should* write an entire book about *Censorship and freedom in Romania*, which I will undoubtedly dedicate to Andrei Pippidi. The first and the last such dedication of my life. Because such a topic reaches the most sensible sphere of my ideological orientation: the reaction against censorship and totalitarian restrictions. Immediately after sending the reduced English version, I began to collect new cards, sources for this project. I will be devoted to this topic as soon as Life is finished and definitively put through."⁵

Marino captured the scope of his new project: hard documentation, return to the authentic sources, highlighting the incipient tradition of Romanian ideological discourse, finding some common ideas in the light of which he designed his program of rebuilding the national culture and society in the postcommunist age. These topics dominate the

¹ Idem, *Pentru neopașoptism*, 145.

² Ibid., 149.

³ Idem, *Viața unui om singur*, 287.

⁴ Idem, *Biografia ideii de literatură*, 234.

⁵ Ibid., 234.

author's discourse in the last years of his life, in the period of the retrospective analysis of the life of "a lonely man."

Every time he had the opportunity to be in public, he insisted to define the cultural and civic program within which the Romanian society should evolve. Noting a recent editorial appearance at that time (1995), signed by Sorin Antohi, he re-iterated the main ideas which, in his opinion, should guide Romanian cultural life. *A new history of ideas* calls for "a new style in the actual and traditional Romanian way."¹

His interest in the history of ideas regained from the tradition of Enlightenment–revolutionism–liberalism could not circumvent the moment of genesis of the Romanian liberal ideology: "Romanian ideology, as long as it existed, was born under the sign of Enlightenment and liberalism."² The study "integrated and integral" to Romanian Enlightenment³ proves an encyclopedic concept exhibited in a double register, that of the dictionary of the powerful ideas of Enlightenment (progress, scientific progress, equality, peace, revolution, etc.), on the one hand, and that of the historical approach of the problems (illumination, preserving the language, the "discovery" of Europe), on the other hand. The history of ideas was practiced as a synthesis through fragments in terms of Friedrich Schlegel exposed in the dialogue with Sorin Antohi by Marino himself: "a fragment must be like a microcosmos that includes a whole system, a whole vision, a pattern, a projection of a future construction, condensed into a reduced formula."⁴ In affinity with the encyclopedism, Europeanism and creativism of the generation of Enlightenment–revolutionism, Marino considered it to be an orientation that "remains to this day... a Pole-star" – "We are, keeping all proportions, in the tradition of enthusiastic revolutionists, that of the people at the *beginning of trips* in all directions, that of cultural *pioneers*. The precursors are the people of encyclopedist Enlightenment" and "we are now reclaiming ourselves from this double illustrious cultural and... ideological descendance."⁵

The history of ideas and ideology also gives intimate resorts to Marino, as the ideas have "a critical and visionary, disruptive and explosive function and, at the same time, the function of organization on new bases."⁶ Another motivation for the adherence to these formulas resulted from the foundations of the Romanian ideology: "Romanian ideology, as long as it existed, was born under the sign of Enlightenment and liberalism."⁷

¹ Florina Iliș, Studiu introductiv (Introductory Study), in *Viața, opera și activitatea lui Adrian Marino. Cercetare bibliografică și de referință* (The Life, Works and Activity of Adrian Marino. A bibliographical and referential research) (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2010), LXII–LXVI; Florina Iliș, "Adrian Marino. De la ideea europeană la ideea de libertate" (Adrian Marino. From the European Idea to the Idea of Freedom), in *Istoria culturii. Cultura istoriei* (The History of Culture. The Culture of History) (Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut, 2010), 540–551; Simona Maria Pop, *Vârstele devenirii* (The Ages of Becoming) (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 2010), 218–264.

² Marino, *Viața unui om singur*, 484, 507.

³ Idem, O nouă istorie a ideilor (A New History of Ideas), in *Politică și cultură. Pentru o nouă cultură română* (Politics and Culture. For a New Romanian Culture) (Iași: Polirom, 1996), 248.

⁴ Idem, *Viața unui om singur*, 249.

⁵ Costea, *Adrian Marino și cercetarea Iluminismului Românesc*, 523–539.

⁶ Marino, *Viața unui om singur*, 295.

⁷ Idem, *Biografia ideii de literatură*, 234.

Opting for the history of ideas is justified by Marino in his work referring to the ideas of freedom and censorship in Romania. The book opens with two programmatic texts. The first one, bearing the title Preface (*programatic preface*), gives arguments for the opportunity, the necessity, the urgency of the research and the knowledge of the Romanian political ideology measured through the prism of the antithetical pair freedom – restriction/censorship: “The Romanian example fully demonstrates that the idea of freedom is inseparable from the idea of restriction, respectively censorship.” A book “that has not been written yet” is recommended as a *claim* (“this way, Romanian culture begins to get Europeanized, to exceed its popular and religious traditions”), a *replica* (for those contesting the tradition of liberal ideology, foreigners and Romanians), a *refutation* (addressed to the right-wing and left-wing ideologies), *necessity* (reading the primary sources and defining the liberal ideological tradition of Romania, fighting the idea of “cultural colonization”) and a *return* to the “native soil” (the transfer of intellectual identity from the adherence to the alternative culture to a “new culture,” focused on the study of ideology).¹

The second text, *The History of Ideas*,² is a methodological manifest which is meant to define the horizon of the work from the point of view of the proposed approach and the sources that are at the basis of the work. Adrian Marino defined his approach of the history of political ideas through the consent to the concept that had dominated his study, the highlighting of the Romanian and international precedents, those of synchrony or discrepancy, those of adherence to a horizon of knowledge and a methodology of research. The history of ideas not only appeal to Arthur O. Lovejoy’s concept which is directly disclosed by Marino, but it operates – in the spirit of an observation made by Paul Cornea – a direction oriented towards a “unifying comparatism,” represented in the writings of Cassirer and Paul Hazard.³

His claims were directed this time towards the history of Romanian political ideas, as it was practiced by Vlad Georgescu, whose book about the political ideas of Enlightenment in the principalities marked an era. Vlad Georgescu opted for a theorization of these endeavours in a work to which Marino also refers,⁴ a synthesis of Romanian political ideas between the years 1369 and 1878.⁵ The conceptualization of the history of ideas determined the historian exiled to München to propose a Romanian vocabulary of the discipline, codifying what is known in the history of ideas as “unit-ideas” with the term of politograms, while the history of these politograms was named politography in the sense of “the history of a certain concept, gone through the range of scholars who expressed it.”⁶ As a matter of fact, Adrian Marino discovered in Vlad Georgescu’s expressions a research direction and a method that had already been used by him in his studies from 1963–1966, and to which he remained consistent through the entire work dedicated to the analysis of Romanian Enlightenment.

¹ Idem, *Al treilea discurs*, 116.

² Ibid., 54.

³ Idem, *Libertate și cenzură în România*, 7–10.

⁴ Ibid., 11–16.

⁵ Vlad Georgescu, *Istoria ideilor politice românești (1369–1878)* (The History of Political Ideas in Romania) (München, 1987).

⁶ Marino, *Libertate și cenzură în România*, 9.

While some of these contributions preceeded him, with others he was in synchrony. Even though he did not become a theorist of the history of ideas, he expressed his methodological option for the history of ideas and ideology as many times as he could in the social and cultural media, in his dialogues, and he postulated such a discourse as late as in his last book published in his lifetime. The history of ideas allowed him to capture “the Romanian political ideology from all provinces as one unite,” “the unity of implicit and explicit meanings of these ideas,” their versatility, the description of the physiognomy of “the Romanian ideological tradition.”¹ The approach illustrated by him led him towards two axiological closures regarding “existence, beginnings, continuity and the development of a real Romanian ideological tradition:” the presence of ideas recover a qualitative dimension, while frequency and distribution is not as important as their significance and, under an ideological magnifier, the hierarchy of values is regenerated, the criteria which order the field of ideology and those which order the field of aesthetics are different, the political and national idea dominates at the expense of the literary and aesthetic idea. This way, Marino proposed a new reading to literary history beyond the autonomy of aesthetics, also expressing cultural, ideological, political, social values. This change in the cultural order is not only internally produced, but also on the level of synchronization with European culture: “through its ideological content... we were undoubtedly effectively European, modern and superior with high standards.”²

His attention paid to the research of the history of ideas and ideology can be seen as approaching the history of censorship in Romania as an unusual topic, developed by the author for the first time in the Romanian culture and literature. Marino claims, fully deserved, with pride the primacy of his research as “the first synthetical sketch, although brief, but complete regarding the essential moments of the history of censorship in Romania.”³ The author’s polemical spirit is commonly noted, and it can also be met in the preface of the above-quoted work, referring to taking the step of opening the way to the research on censorship: “It is a notable detail, as all works on the topic of Romanian censorship, published after mine, casually... ignore it.”⁴

Marino’s writings on the history of censorship in Romania assimilate the main characteristics of his work, while the novelty of the research has already been illustrated above. It is emphasized repeatedly and obsessively as the publishing of the encyclopedia of censorship gets postponed⁵ or other author’s works got published without any reference to his writings already published, beginning from 1997.⁶ This latter fact

¹ Ibid., 12–13.

² Ibid., 14–16; 16: “A new hierarchy is established, which ‘rehabilitates’ a culture and a literature so far considered minor, in fact unknown.”

³ Marino, *Cenzura în România*, 9.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ BCU Cluj-Napoca, Fond Marino, Ds. 436, leaf 32: “will be published ... in 1998” or at leaf 10: “we hope to have published by early summer 1998;” leaf 15: “The publishers hope to have the book out by early summer 2000;” leaf 17: “We want to publish the book in September 2001.”

⁶ Idem, *Cenzura în România*, 9–10. Același lucru îl sublinia și în fraza de deschidere din textul manuscrisului trimis la Londra în 1997: „Până acum n-a fost publicată nicio cercetare istorică de sinteză despre cenzura din România.” Cf. BCU Cluj-Napoca, Fond Marino, Ds. aflat în prelucrare, textul se intitulează *Censorship in Romania. A Historical Survey*, 45f, vezi f. 1. Aceași chestiune este ilustrată și în memoriile publicate postum. A. Marino, *Viața*, p. 214: „Adevărul este că nu există încă o istorie completă a cenzurii în România (doar contribuții fragmentare) și a

contributed to his decision to reprint in a separate volume the series from *The Sphere of Politics*, at Craiova, in the year 2000. The European character of the placement of this research was also programatically argued for: it was not only a Romanian problem, but a general one, with Romanian particularities which, however, did not “essentially” differ from the problems of “the European censorship of the era,”¹ and “such a history can only be written in a European, ideological and comparative framework.”² Simultaneously, the writing is based on “critical, analytical, liberal, antidogmatic thinking without myths and prejudices.”³ Last but not least, the work expresses an intellectual solidarity affirmed in the Romanian culture from the turn of the millennium: “We are much more confident, at least in the legitimacy – or even in the success – of such a ‘resistance,’ when we observe that quite many contemporary Romanian spirits think, write and act in the same sense.”⁴ The history of censorship also had a dimension of experienced history in the author’s work, resulting in a history in incidence with his own biography: “Me myself, let us say, a totally general case, as actor and spectator of this era, went through every situation described above: fully prohibited and void of ‘the right of signature’ for two decades (*The Life of Alexandru Macedonski*, editorially announced in 1946, published in 1965), with massacred texts (e.g. the article *Decadentism* from the *Dictionary of Literary Ideas* I, 1973), with fully eliminated chapters (*The Autonomy of Literature*), taken out of *The Hermeneutics of the Idea of Literature* (1987), reintroduced only in the Italian version (*Teoria della letteratura*, 1994), a “stopped” preface to a volume of comparative Romanian–Hungarian literature, edited only in 1993, etc. Nothing more than Simple bibliographical documentary information.”⁵

Adrian Marino’s contribution included both a summarizing article (Romania, pp. 2042–2048) and a case study (B.P. Hașdeu, *Duduca Mamuca: From the memories of a student*, p. 1031). The moment was described by the author: “I wrote for the same *International Encyclopedia of censorship* a small *item* about Hașdeu’s trial from 1873... and I tried – to Derek Jones’s request, with whom I engaged in an assiduous correspondence – to find other Romanian collaborators, as well.”⁶

The synthesis realized by Marino is part of the intellectual program defined by the author, of a discourse about the history of Romanian ideology beginning with the opening towards the affirmation of the citizen’s rights, the declaration and printing of unrestricted thinking. The delayed steps against censorship gave an opportunity for the ideologist to see this process in the mirror, to recognize the way of enforcing the restrictions of the state and its institutions, and how the Romanian society defines a civic program for free manifestation of public opinion and civil society. The historical political science excursus by Marino defines not only a diachronic component, but a co-ordinate of political geography as well. Thus the author insists on Muntenia, Moldova and Transylvania as separate political units, talking about Romania only after 1920. The

trebuie s-o schițez, într-un timp record, cam în două luni, printr-un obositor efort zilnic, de documentare la BCU Cluj.”

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., 12.

³ Ibid., 14.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Idem, *Cenzura în România*, 80. See also: *Vatra* 6–7 (2003): 191.

⁶ Marino, *Viața unui om singur*, 214.

confessional character of the beginnings of censorship was clearly underlined, but the laicization of this phenomenon as well, with the affirmation of the modern state, it defined its authority and institutions more consistently. The religious origins of censorship together with the phenomenon of its laicization and with the affirmation of the modern states introduce Marino into a problematic evolved in European and international cultural context. Romania is a European country, it is a part of contemporary world, its cultural evolution was not isolated, autarchic. In Adrian Marino's vision, Romania is placed in vortex of events and international currents, which marked its evolution: liberal and democratic thinking, national idea, right-wing and left-wing totalitarianism (monarchy, national legionary state, communist regime).

Integrated within a generous theoretical and methodological frame, novel for Romanian historical research, unusual from the point of view of the public for which it was addressed, Marino's contribution to the history of censorship in Romania presents a series of differences between texts in English and Romanian, printed first in column in the magazine *The Sphere of politics* (1997) and as a separate volume by the "Aius" publishing house from Craiova (2000). The differences are not only of formal nature, motivated by the space allocated for the part or the series from the Romanian political science magazine. The editor of the encyclopedia interfered with Marino's text by adding a series of problematic phrases from the point of view of the veracity of the historical information and considerable for the conception that projected Romania's image. In this case we can talk about an editorial "stopping" that is obvious after the comparison of the text in English with the one printed in Romanian, where the excerpt is missing. On the other hand, a phrasing catches our attention: "For clarity, this part discusses the history of censorship before 1920 in a separate section. The censorship of Hungarian literature from 'Greater Romania' is one of the next parts."¹ In the editions in Romanian, Marino operated with a chronological and geographical segmentation in the organization of the chapters and subchapters of the historiographical text, criteria followed with accuracy for the 18th and 19th centuries. For the last chapter, the one dedicated to the 20th century, the author set a thematic criterion, talking in one section about the totalitarian censorship (fascist-Antonescian, communist) and about the relation between writers and the communist censorship. The year 1920 does not appear as a "threshold" anywhere in Adrian Marino's approach. Similar to the manuscript translated into English, which was probably sent for the London editor, there is nothing that could imply the year 1920 as a boundary between two ages. I consider that this delimitation operation is the editor's. This is affirmed even by the sentence which ends the quoted passage referring to the censorship of the Hungarian literature in Romania. The year 1920 is a basis for the debate, which is important in my opinion as well, about the state of minorities in the successional counties. But having all the attention on the Hungarian minority from Transylvania without underlining the historic context in which the events happened, and outlining an ambiguous background persecution due to Romanian nationalism, draws our attention to a propagandistic goal and a militantism of which the critical intellectual spirit should stay neutral. The symbolic significance of Trianon is well known and I do not wish for a controversy regarding these pages.

The editorial completions introduce at the same time a series of inadequate historical facts and contradictions to Marino's text. For example, the Battle of Mohács is

¹ Adrian Marino, *Romania*, in *Censorship*, 2042.

marked with the date of 1529 in the first passage, yet on the next page the date is 1526. Could it be just a printing mistake or an error made by the proofreader? If we analyze further historical data provided by the passage, we realize that we are much more likely faced with ignorance. After the end of the First World War Transylvania was not the sole territory that was added to Romania, as this passage informs the reader. Parts of Basarabia, Banat and Bucovina were also added. Transylvania did not become a sovereign principality right after the Battle of Mohács but it was only the beginning of a process that took decades to complete. 1526 generated a current that will lead to a Principality, one under the sovereignty of the High Porte. The confessional presentation of the population is also problematic. It refers to Transylvania as a place where the Roman-Catholics and the Unitarians represent the majority while the Protestants are the minority. Of course, the Orthodox population represented the vast majority while the Roman-Catholics were far less than the Protestant population. All of these statements are contradicted by Adrian Marino's text.

The usage of the syntagm "Greater Romania" in the English translation is – if not susceptible and with some significance in the semantic horizon implied by the editors – contradictory with Adrian Marino's complete civic and intellectual intercession. First of all, the author does not use it in the texts published in Romanian, and I could not identify it in the English manuscript either. Introducing these key words, syntagms and references to international treaties, the editors of the encyclopedia try to orient "with premeditation" the meanings of the text written by Adrian Marino. The practice of placing this under the scientific authority of Adrian Marino had the role to prevent an immediate and unpleasant reply from the Romanian academic groups.

The editorial organization of the text dedicated to the history of censorship written by Adrian Marino and published as a synthetic part about Romania in the encyclopedia of censorship has produced a resematization of the historiographical discourse of the Romanian author from the perspective of some propagandistic and commercial-advertising motivations. In this discourse Transylvania became a problematic topic of history, while the geographic-political reality of Romania was far more complex and nuanced than that, and only the extremist political parties simplified it directly and roughly. As a result of the editorial interventions, the text has a certain hostile attitude against the peace treaties after the First World War, mainly against Trianon, Romania being a country gratified for its participation in the First World War and seen by the one who interfered with Marino's text as gaining Transylvania as a reward.¹ Introducing a passage that mentions Vlad the Impaler, a passage that is missing from the Romanian and English versions sent by the author is trying to establish a stereotype of the vampire under which the image of Romania and that of the Romanians is disseminated in the eyes of the Western Societies.

All these interventions may seem benevolent and we may wonder why the author did not react, what were the reasons why he accepted the publication of the text "decorated" by the editors with all these passages? The lack of any reference to these aspects in the memoirs may seem surprising. Much more so, if we take into consideration the highly laudatory and enthusiastic references to a new research project,

¹ Ibid, 2045: "The Romanian state was rewarded for its World War I activities by the incorporation of Transylvania in 1920."

dedicated to the study of freedom and censorship in the Romanian society. Enthusiasm is reflected in the dialogue with Sorin Antohi, and it can be found everywhere on the pages of the memoirs. But we must not forget that the text of the memoirs was written in 1999. It contains a set of references to the collaboration with Derek Jones, which are important for what happened. Instead, the dialogue between Marino and the publishers of the encyclopedia (“with whom I had a correspondence which ended assiduously”) shows a large number of issues related to the length of the text. Initially, the original text was five times longer, it had various explanations regarding different events, titles mentioned in the text: “Recently (January 4, 1999), Derek Jones informs me that he finished ‘editing’ my essay. He used some abbreviations, of course I do not ‘mind.’ However, for a first English language ‘introduction’ to the subject, even an abbreviated version can be very useful.”¹ In January 1999,² Derek Jones assured the author that he will receive the text in printable version, nevertheless it seems that Marino received the text two years later.³ After reading the text, in May 2001 Marino reacts. It seems that his professional impression and conviction about the publisher suddenly changed. If in the memoirs he talks about the editor as “a true professional” interested in a variety of “technical, attentionate, careful” details, the tone becomes polite but also stern and accusatory. From the correspondence of Marino with the publishers results the observation of inconsistencies, the direct and severe but always polite tone of the author. The fact that he drew the attention to the “additions” is a convincing confession, even without explicitly highlighting their significance, although from the formulation of the letter we can conclude an obvious irritation. In a sketch of a letter dated May 12, 2001 Marino wrote: “Thus there have been added some new materials without my permission. It happens that these additions are useful, but I think, in principle these kinds of things should be discussed with me. I agree with the idea that an editor should make suggestions, but I think that with substantial interventions made without asking me constitutes an act of censorship.”⁴ The author’s observation is more incisive and determines a paradoxical situation: “a contribution about censorship, published in an international encyclopedia of censorship ... was censored.”⁵ Unfortunately we do not know the answer of the publishers. Instead, the testimony is the printed text, as it is underlined by Marino, a text that was censored.

With a few exceptions, the reviewers of the encyclopedia in the Romanian cultural environment did not notice the historical inaccuracies and the terminological and conceptual contradictions in the text signed by Marino. In general, the Romanian intellectual environment showed a superficial and conformist reception. Some parts can nevertheless be distinguished. The *Vatra* magazine presented the encyclopedia and

¹ Ibid., *Viața unui om singur*, 214.

² BCU Cluj-Napoca, Fond Marino, Ds. 436, leaf 12; see leaf 13 as well, the letter from January 12, 1999 in which Marino was ensured that he will receive the manuscript for proofreading. The editor confessed that he made a few modifications both in abbreviating the text and the clarification of the proofreader who is not familiar with the Romanian cultural and historical realities: “I am very pleased with the result and I hope that in both cases you are pleased, too.”

³ Ibid., leaf 17, letter from May 3, 2001.

⁴ Ibid., leaf 2 and 3.

⁵ Ibid., leaf 3.

Marino's text more like a concise one, but in which the author, a "high-value specialist" "manages to present a history of censorship in the Romanian States and in Romania in a very balanced and an extremely well-documented fashion."¹ As opposed to this, Ștefan Borbely² draws the reader's attention with some bibliographical and methodological suggestions, but does not notice the unbalance of the text referring to the relationship between form and content, as well as the historical inaccuracies.

The censoring (the interventions that were carried out without the consent of the author, as one can find out about from the above mentioned correspondence) of the text sent by Marino, by the editors reveals a procedure that developed in more registers. In the first place, we can speak about the censoring through the abridgement of the text. In the initial description of the encyclopedia and of the types of parts it encompasses, their structure and dimensions, the editors mentioned on the level of a chapter dedicated to a country a number of words between 1000 and 10000.³ The text sent by Marino translated into English, despite of what the editors had communicated, was longer. In a letter dated to the beginning of July, we find out that this text included 15000 words, although at a previous moment the author and the editors decided that the part dedicated to Romania to include only 3000 words. Finally Derek Jones asked him to reduce the text to 5000 words.⁴ It is possible that the editors faced with this situation decided that the only way to abridge the text was to reduce the number of examples, to cut out passages contextualizing the evolution of censorship on the different levels of the Romanian society and the elimination of censoring processes, as it is the case of the simplification of the typology of censorship in the communist era. In the initial text, Marino identified eight cases of manifestation of censorship in Romania in the communist era, while the printed text reduced it to only six.⁵

Another case in which Marino's text was censored is its restructuring. From the organization of the text based on geographical, chronological and problematizing criteria, especially for the communist period, the editors of the encyclopedia of censorship introduced a major delimitation establishing two distinctive parts, separated

¹ Vatra 6–7 (2003): 191. The author of this mark signed N.S. ignores the previous texts published by Marino on this topic. He introduces an observation that has no foundation at all: One single regret: it is a shame that the author did not have access to the brochure that included the banned books, a list compiled in 1848." Both in the bibliography of the encyclopedia and in the series in *Sfera Politicii* or in the volume printed in Craiova in 2000, Marino was familiar with the above mentioned lists.

² Ștefan Borbely, *Enciclopedia mondială a cenzurii* (The International Encyclopedia of Censorship), 13. The review written by Monica Gheț includes criticism as well regarding the lack of parts referring to censorship in the communist Romania, see the case of Gheorghe Ursu. Cf. Monica Gheț, in *Caietele Echinox* IV (2002): 217–218.

³ Fond Marino, leaf 33: "Countries (1000-10.000 words): history of censorship in the context of national history and culture, media censored, evolution of institutions of censorship, treatment of foreign media, current position and future trends, further reading. (Headnotes listing population, literacy statistics, radio and TV ownership, etc., will be prepared separately.) A sample entry will be sent out with the assignment."

⁴ Ibid., leaf 5–6. See Marino, *Viața unui om singur*, 214. "A study resulted in the English version, of 45 pages (way over the required 5000 words)..."

⁵ Marino, *Cenzura în România*, 70–79; *Censorship*, 2047.

by the year 1920. Surely, deciding upon this chronological order can be argued for if we think of a criterion referring to the organization of the state, the administrative integration of the provinces joined to the Old Kingdom after the Great War. But the law of administrative union appeared only after 1925 and the *expressis verbis* linking of the Trianon Treaty to the year 1920 and the definition of a fissure in the evolution of the Romanian state destabilizes the relevance of the invoked criterion. Not only the joining of Transylvania changed the political geography of Romania at the end of the war, a part of Banat, Bucovina and Bessarabia were in the same situation. Looking at it from another perspective, Trianon is an international sanctioning of a situation in fact intervened as a result of the plebeian expression illustrated by the National Meeting at Alba Iulia and of the treaties of the political elites from Transylvania and Hungary. Emphasizing the year 1920¹ and giving it importance through attaching Trianon introduces a very simple and restrictive key to reading, with obvious rewords in the area of propaganda. This appears in the conditions in which Marino's text does not make any reference to the year 1920.

Thirdly, censorship was applied through the introduction of passages and fragments that cannot be found either in the Romanian version, nor the English translation sent by Adrian Marino in 1997: the fragment with which the chapter starts, p. 2042; the fragment on Vlad the Impaler, p. 2043 as well as the fragment at the beginning of the section entitled "Romania since 1920," p. 2045. We have already discussed these passages, nevertheless we remind of the propagandistic–advertising significance they imply, stressing that these addenda were not convened by the author.

The synthetic presentation of Romania in the encyclopedia of censorship can be included in a Western cultural stereotype in the era of the Cold War and perpetuated *tale quale* by the work coordinated by Derek Jones, after 1990. From the problematic perspective, this stereotype stresses two fundamental directions in describing censorship: on the religious level (through the chapter signed by Janice Broun) and in the register of state – minority relations (George Gomori,² the author of the article *The Hungarian Literature in Romania*). The articles of synthesis are completed with a presentation of the case studies which relate certain episodes in which censorship was manifested, episodes detached from the literary life of Romania from the end of the 19th century up until the years of the communist regime.

The presentation of the history of censorship in Romania is integrated in Marino's case in the research of the history of ideas and ideologies, a domain illustrated by a series of contributions from the years of the communist regime dedicated to the Enlightenment, a monograph that has not yet been published as an autonomous volume,

¹ Ibid., 1042.

² See Ștefan Borbely's standpoint, "Enciclopedia mondială a cenzurii. Schiță pentru delicii parțiale" (The International Encyclopedia of Censorship. A Sketch for Partial Delights), in *Observator cultural* 151 (2003): 13: "In Gomori's text the assertion of contractual infidelity remains not founded with arguments, the sketch of the evolution of the Hungarian culture in Transylvania in the period 1919–1940 remaining rather banal." The same opinion in *Vatra* 6–7 (2003): 191: "The performance of other authors is debatable who participate in the reconstitution of a complete image of Romania, the one from the religious perspective, and the other from the point of view of the Hungarian ethnic group."

dissipated in the articles of social, cultural, scientific magazines and thematic volumes or in the proceedings of colloquia and international congresses, altering the publishing in the Romanian language with translations in world languages. The issue has been taken over in the decades of Romanian democracy in an effort to define civil society and liberal ideologies of founding modernism in a new spirit of revolution, through the edification of “the third discourse,” which means “neither frightened by the Western World, nor stuck and arrested in our specificity.” Unfortunately the text published in the 2001 international encyclopedia of censorship is, in turn, an example of censorship, a paradox using Adrian Marino’s words. It is a type of censorship that is not characterized by the proximity of the religious or lay power, of the civil society (morality), but by a militant and propagandistic perspective, typical of a decentralized society, attached to an “interpretative community” that has not been freed by certain reflexes of modernity.

Translated by Boglárka Németh

Appendix 1

5 Oct 98

Dear Derek Jones,

Thank you for the letter about
your new address, sent by your assistant
Deborah J. Jones (your wife or your daughter?
Excuse me my... misinterpretation). Please, let me
know some information:

1) When the Encyclopedia shall be ^{finally}
published? How long is the delay?

2) My contribution shall be published
with some ~~short~~ ^{short} introductions or
entirely?

3) What is the ^{probably} price and if the
contributors (like me) have the possibility
to ^{buy all} ~~buy~~ ~~the~~ four volumes with a
discount of author (contributors)?

Thank you for your ^{kind} ~~answers~~ ^{answers}.

Best
~~kind~~ regards,

4) How I must proceed in this case?

12 May 2001

Mr. Editor

— Oxford

Dear Mr. K.,

I understand that time is of the essence and I mailed
the proofs by return mail.

Also, some new material was added without
my permission. It so happens that the additions
are helpful, but I still think that, on principle,
I should have been consulted. I agree with
the idea of an editor making suggestions but I
feel that ~~unapproved~~ ^{added} editorial interventions
constitute an act of censorship.

Appendix 2

Passages introduced by the editor into Adrian Marino's text written for *Censorship. A World Encyclopedia*, III, London, Chicago, 2001.

1. Page 2042: *By the treaty of Trianon (1920), the territory of Romania (mostly formed by union of Moldavia and Walachia in 1861) was extended to include Transylvania, which had been at first an independent principality after the battle of Mohacs (1529). The newly extended country was now home to peoples with different religious allegiances and cultural traditions: the populations of Moldavia and Wallachia were mostly Orthodox Christians; those of Transylvania were mostly Roman Catholic and Uniate, but there was also Protestant minority. For clarity, this entry will discuss the history of censorship before 1920 in separate section. The censorship of Hungarian literature in "Greater Romania" is covered in a further entry below.*
2. Page 2043: *These two chieftainships, which foreshadowed the future Romanian state, emerged in the 14th century, forming what was later known as the Regat, the Romanian kingdom. Moldavia also included Bassarabia and Bukovina. Among the chieftains, perhaps the most notorious was Vlad III of Wallachia, otherwise known as Vlad the Impaler, or "Dracula" (1431–76), a byword for cruelty and mass terror, who paid tribute to the Ottoman Turks soon after they had captured Constantinople in 1453. Die geschichte Dracole Waide, published in 1488, is the "classical" account of religious fanaticism.*
3. Page 2045: *Romania since 1920//The Romanian state was rewarded for its World War I activities by the incorporation of Transylvania in 1920. It lost most of this territory during World War II, because Germany regarded its commitment as lukewarm. After the war, Bassarabia became Moldova, a Soviet Republic, which has voted to refuse overtures to rejoin Romania since the fall of communism. Much of Transylvania was returned in 1945.*

Appendix 3

CENSORSHIP IN ROMANIA. A HISTORICAL SURVEY

Adrian Marino

Up till now, no synthetic historical survey of censorship in Romania has been published. However, the existing documentation enables a broad outline of the stages of censorship in the Romanian countries from its beginning down to a period very close to the present day.

1. The first censorship formula corresponds to the general situation in Europe at the time. It is religious, and basically it displays two major chapters. The Counter Reformation in the Catholic countries brings the *Index librorum prohibitorum* (1559, with its subsequent additions and changes), which is fully operative. It is also applied in Transylvania. Recent research has demonstrated that the library of the Cluj Jesuit College (1579) was strictly controlled. It had a compartment of “heretical”, banned books, and a secret store, where only the professors had limited access. The college is closed down, after many tribulations, in 1606, by Transylvania's Reformed prince, Sigismund Báthory. The library is dispersed. The *Index* loses efficiency in the areas of Reformed religions (Lutheran, Calvinist, Unitarian), including this area.

In the Orthodox countries (in the Romanian case: Moldavia and Wallachia), religious censorship is based upon a Slavonic index (Moscow, 1646). It is the Orthodox variety of the prototype: *Decretum Gelasianum: de libri recipiendi et non recipiendi* (432), which had several Slavonic-Byzantine versions. The only Romanian translation, preserved in manuscript, dates from 1667-1669. It was made by Staico the Grammarian “from the Slavonic language”, being titled: *Cărpile ceale mincinoase, pre care nu Be cade a le pinea si a le citl drept credinciosii Hrlstiani* (The Untruthful Books, which Christian Believers Ought not to Keep and Read). The discriminatory, restrictive spirit of the Orthodox, as well as of the Catholic hierarchy is to be noted. The circulation of religious books was not free. In the *Pravila de la Govora* (The Govora Code of Laws) (1640) there is a statement: “Not to be given in laical hands”. It follows that reading was selective and prohibitive. An implicit but very precise censorship was imposed in the seventeenth century, especially by a body of polemic literature in Slavonic, Greek and Romanian, directed against the Catholic, but also the Calvinist and Protestant, doctrine and proselytism.

2. During the enlightened absolutism, in the eighteenth century, censorship in the Romanian countries enters a new stage. It displays a centralized, laicized, and, above all, a bureaucratized form. In Transylvania, the effects of Joseph II's reforms are felt, which—among other things—lead to a radical reform of censorship itself. Before 1740 only the monopoly of religious censorship exists in the Hapsburg Empire. After this—in the spirit of the Enlightenment—, precise steps for centralization and laicization are taken. A *Zenzur-Hofkommission* is established. A more permeable and flexible *Catalogus librorum prohibitorum* is composed. The climax of this reorganization is the 1781 decree: *Grund-Regen zur Bestimmung einer ordentlichen künftigen Bücher Censur*. These “underlying regulations” are much more liberal, they reduce the number of banned titles from 5,000 to 900, which represents—given the period in question—a real progress.

Four categories were still banned: 1 “pornographic literature”; 2. works with a “superstitious” content; 3. antichristian (that is, “protestant”) writings; 4. “politically dangerous works”. The rigour (*reviaio vlsitatis librorum*) was moderate; in the first two years only about two or three books were banned per year.

The new instructions start being applied, in Transylvania, as early as June 1787, by a *Comissio Regio Librorum Censoria*. Censorship operated at different steps of hierarchy: Vienna, Budapest, Sibiu, under the direct authority of the Transylvanian government. The Commission, consisting of the Catholic bishop and a team of assessors, was mainly concerned with the circulation of the works by the French writers

of the Enlightenment: Montesquieu, Voltaire, etc. It is in this spirit that the Batthyaneum library in Alba Iulia is attentively purged: 16 titles, 26 volumes figure in a *Catalogus librorum prohibitorum*. This is the first list of “banned publications” known on Romanian territory. By 1781, 38 titles are signaled.

The notion itself of “censorship” enters the language of the representatives of the Transylvanian Enlightenment. In 1791, Gh. Șincai, for instance, would have liked to engage in polemics with the Transylvanian Saxon scholar I. C. Eder, who had attacked *Supplex Libellus Valachorum*. But “no-one here will dare print it without the censorship of the government” (*sine gubernii censura*). The first rumours about the existence of a very dangerous Romanian “samizdat” also date from this period. It is July 1794, soon after the outbreak of the French Revolution, a time of strict vigilance. Gherasim Adamovici, the Orthodox bishop of Sibiu, is said to have received (illegally, it can be concluded) some copies of a “Wallachian newspaper printed by someone named Paul Iorgovici in Vienna”.

It could spread “the dangerous ideas of freedom promoted by the French” and would threaten to “overthrow the public order”. This is the reason why Gh. Banffy, governor of Transylvania, demands that the authorities in Vienna adopt drastic measures. However, it is not known whether this newspaper indeed appeared.

At the same time, the censorship by Catholic or Uniate Church (“Greek-Catholic” Church) authorities was operative. Its well-known formulas were *admittitur*, *imprimatur*, in case of approval, or *erga achedam*, in case of rejection. Their competence ranged over all religious and didactic publications, which was not without difficulties, however, especially for the members of the Uniate Church in Blaj. The censorship at *Typographia Hungaricae Budae* was meant to stop the publication of whatever might “harm” the Catholics. Besides, the censors in Blaj were Hungarian. In Buda, the Romanian language censors were appointed with great difficulty, only on the recommendation by the Uniate Bishop of Oradea. The Uniate printing office also came up against the economic censorship exercised by the monopoly of the Vienna printer and editor Kurbock. There are complaints against him. The Uniates also condemn the works “infected by heresies” of the Calvinist Church. Steps are taken that Orthodox publications in Moldavia or Wallachia do not enter Transylvania. A 1725 synod, a 1746 Imperial decree which was extended in 1768 to the Church publications in Russia are a token of the same restrictive mentality. At the end of the eighteenth century, the different Churches in Transylvania censor one another on a reciprocal basis, in spite of the Josephine reforms and the spirit of the Edict of Tolerance in 1783.

3. The new spirit of enlightened despotism has, however, a beneficial effect in Wallachia. The Church monopoly on censorship is lifted. The system of double censorship is still maintained, but the Metropolitan bishop's censorship is subordinated—for the first time—to civil authorities. Being obviously inspired by Joseph II's reform, prince or hospodar M. Șuțu signs, on 25 July, 1784, a *Pitacu către prea sfinția sa Părintele Mitropolit pentru Tipografi*, a nu se mai tipări de acum înainte nimica până a nu înștiința Măriei sale întâiu (Ordinance to His Holiness the Metropolitan Bishop for Printers, that nothing be printed from now on before notifying His Highness first). The progress is considerable. The same policy is continued also by hospodar Alexandru Moruzi. He is willing, in 1795, to liberalize book imports from Transylvania almost completely. School textbooks, “geography, physics, philosophy and

others of this kind are free". Restrictions continue only for books about...the Turks and "journals".

This does not mean that the liberalization of book trade is easily accepted by the Church. The latter wishes to maintain its traditional double monopoly: on book production and trade, as well as on the control of the purity of faith. A Wallachian charter from the hospodar or ruler from 1749 consolidates the monopoly of printing: "Without the will and blessing of the Metropolitan Bishop books could not be printed". Another one, from 1765, extends this monopoly to the circulation, including the right to ban imports: "We ourselves have decided that it is no longer necessary to bring such books from other printers to the diocese of the Metropolitan Bishop."

With regard to the "protection" of the Christian Orthodox faith, at the end of the eighteenth century there exists a fairly large amount of texts (as a rule translations preserved in manuscripts, from Slavonic and Greek) that anathematize and "curse" "heretical" and Catholic books. Radical measures are also contemplated: "...possessors of such books should expose them in order that all be gathered together and burned in the fire, lest those who read them should be led astray". The precious indication was given by the Patriarch in Constantinople. It was also retained by a Western observer that was passing through Moldavia at the time (Jean-Louis Carra). The latter deplores the impossibility to import French books as a result of religious intolerance directed against those who "would dare to read the works written by Catholics, and especially by Voltaire".

4. The nineteenth century is decisive in all respects for the theory and practice of censorship in the Romanian countries, as well as for the grandeur and decadence of these ideas, so important and topical in Europe. After a period of unprecedented improvement and intensification—a direct effect of foreign occupation in Moldavia and Wallachia—censorship experiences a syncope in the year 1848, before it is reintroduced, and later on suppressed and abolished—for a long period—by the 1866 Constitution. Its forms of organization, operation, and methods can be seen live through a rich, often savoury, documentation. Otherwise, censorship belongs to the political, ideological and cultural mentality of the whole century. Its coupling with such ideas as "research", "thinking", "literature", "expression" is constant and deep.

In Transylvania the spirit of organization and control, distinctly superiour to the one in the Principalities at that time, continues to operate through the Printing Office of the University of Buda. It has (in 1825) "royal censors in all the languages". The Romanian censor is extremely vigilant; in a text (1845) he erases, for instance, a sentence that speaks of

... "the honest office of censorship". But even before, as a result of some highly emphatic official communications, neither I. Piuariu Molnar's project (*Walachische Zeitung fur der Landmann*, 1793), nor T. Racoce's (1817) *înștiințare pentru gazetele românești* {Notice for Romanian Journals) had got the approval. Publicity of this kind was strictly prohibited. Ecclesiastical censorship continues to be operative, both in the Uniate Church (in Transylvania) and the Orthodox Church (in Wallachia). In the former case, the believers are warned through a *PSstorlceascS datorie* (Priestly Duty) to be on their guard against "lies and devilish deceptions". In the latter case, the books printed in Blaj are "full of the (wicked) intentions of the Westerners".

The way in which this censorship was practiced reveals extremely severe and intolerant inclinations and methods. The first to operate is the tendency of the censorship of all times and from everywhere: “the law” of progressive aggravation, from the centre towards the periphery, of increased vigilance, directly proportional to the distance from the power and decision center. Protests and great zeal are recorded: “The inhabitants of Buda know little about Transylvania and they care little about it, they allow the publication of such things that for Transylvanians are the venom of rebellion”. In a different circumstance, it is requested that all the books about Transylvania be censored in Hungary first, as an additional precaution.

*In some punctual, well known cases, drastic measures are taken: banning as a whole, in part, or confiscation. The champion of repression is the Uniate Bishop Ioan Bob, and the first victim seems to be Samuil Micu Klein, as early as the end of the preceding century. His translation of *Istoria ecclesiastica* (Ecclesiastical History) by Fleury is banned, since it “would cause a great uproar among our scholars because of the marginal notes”. Earlier, in 1790, the same bishop asked the government to confiscate, pure and simple, the translation of the Bible by the same Samuel Micu. The translator, however, being cautious, did not...submit the manuscript. So, there was nothing for the “government” to confiscate. The circumstance is not devoid of irony: in 1804, Samuel Micu, after many hesitations and delays, is he himself appointed censor, thereby being in a position to effectively censor others (Ștefan Crisan Korosi).*

*A constant “client” of censorship is Gh. Sincai, “the censor of books” or censor et corector *llbrorum valachorum* (1804-1808), at the same Printing Office of the University of Buda. He became well acquainted with the situation as early 1780, when he wanted to append a dialogue to his grammar (*Elements langue Daco-Romanae sive valachicae*): “but the censorship of the Emperor's Court in Vienna did not allow me to”, he declares in *Hronlca Romanilor* {*The Chronicle of Romanians*). The *Hronlca* is also a document of self censorship or, to use a modern expression in a new context, “precensorship”. Sincai sometimes hesitates to carry out his plans “the way I would like to”, since he fears censorship. It stands to reason that he cannot escape it. Approved initially in 1812 in an original abridged version, the *Hronlca* is “severely attacked” and even confiscated by the censor bishop Joseph Martonfi, at the request of *Commissio Librorum Revisoria* (1813-1814), the abilitated institution. It is “inept, ridiculous, full of false opinions, of bizarre conjectures”, “dangerous to public opinion”. The resolution, however, which became famous, legendary—*opus igne, author patibulo dignus*—is apocryphal, invented probably by Al. Papiu-Ilarian. It cannot be found in the Latin text of the rejection report.*

*Petru Maior also finds himself in the not at all enviable ambiguous situation of “censored-censor”. Appointed “censor and corrector” in 1808, after S. Micu Klein's death, he clashes with the same I. Bob, a difficult bishop, to say the least. The latter requests the removal of material from four pages, “which disturb public order”, from *Istoria pentru începutul Romanilor in Dacia* (*The History of the Beginning of Romanians in Dacia*) (1812), printed “with I do not know whose approval”. The solution? The pages in question should be torn out carefully and meticulously. *Istoria Bisericii Românilor* (*The History of the Church of Romanians*) (1813) is censored, at I. Bob's request, along the same expeditious lines. There is suspicion of some personal allusions. Printing is stopped at p. 392. An entire official investigation is underway.*

“The text must be erased pure and simple”. Finally the problem is referred to the arbitration and decision of another Uniate bishop, S. Vulcan. The latter, more lenient, decides that “this work thus cleansed and improved” may be put into circulation again. But he urges the author to apologize, which Petru Maior, quite humiliated, accepts. The servitudes of the profession are, however, ruthless. In 1819, using the word censura itself, he bans, in his turn, a Lexicon...by V. Colosi. D. Tichindeal, in a different context, had been denounced, too, and interrogated, for “another dangerous book”. The free critical spirit of Romanian culture can manifest itself only by way of allusions, interpolations in some translations, references to foreign sources, tolerated within certain limits. The typical example: the footnotes in Tiganiada (The Gipsy Epic) by I. Budai Deleanu.

5. While in Transylvania censorship continues to be abusive, bureaucratic and strictly centralized, in the Romanian countries it goes through enormous and decisive changes in the nineteenth century: from the most unrelenting and intransigent rigour to liberalization and, finally, complete abolition. The historical context, internal and external, is very different, with an essential specific note: the development of private enterprise in the sphere of printing, publishing and circulation of books and periodicals. The event is of paramount importance, first of all because it breaks the monopoly of the Church in the domain of printed publications and censorship.

In the “enlightened” spirit of M. Sufcu's ordinance of 1784, hospodar Ioan Caragea (Wallachia), on 3 November, 1817, grants Doctor C. Caragea the privilege to set up a new printing office (Chrisovul tipografiei de aici din București,... “Charter for the Printing Office here in Bucharest,...”). It is the first laical printing office on Romanian territory. The charter has interesting clauses: the control of church publications continues to be “under the blessing of the Metropolitan Bishop”, a privilege that dates from “Mihai Racoviță”. But the didactic and laical books, as well as “philology, that is writings that have to do with love for learning”, “should first be censored by the Hospodar's First Counsellor”. “Journals” are not allowed, nor can any new printing office be established for as long as twenty years. These obvious monopolistic tendencies are seconded, however, by relaxation and clear delimitation of competence. An indisputable progress.

Soon, the catastrophic moment will come. It occurs during the Russian occupation, a direct consequence of the Russian-Turkish war (1828-1829), concluded with the peace treaty of Adrianople and the Organic Regulations (1831-1832) in both principalities. It is the first official recognition and efficient, drastic, organization of censorship in a despotic-czarist spirit. Its appearance gives rise to a double surprise: of the occupation power, which is stupefied to see that this basic institution does not yet exist in Wallachia and Moldavia, and of the local authorities, whose rejoinder in 1829 is dignified—“la presse avait été de tout temps libre en Moldavie et qu'elle n'était soumise à d'autre restriction qu'à celle du respect de la religion et de la moralité”. The trauma caused by the new measures is deep, their effect is historical, indeed. The conception is formed now that censorship is not only a natural attribute and instrument, but also indispensable to political power.

A number of measures and aspects become typical, exemplary and traditional for the new mentality and work strategy. It is characterized, first of all, by bureaucracy and centralization. The Comisia de priveghere asupra cărților de cetit (The Commission for

the Surveillance of Books) is established. It operates on the basis of “the laws of censorship”, which approves, controls, bans or confiscates, as is necessary, any type of publication. Vigilance is extended from the capitals to the provinces, not without resistance (in 1832) offered by some printers in Oltenia. Some procedures will become famous: the removal and alteration of titles, words, sentences or of whole passages, banning as a whole, the making of black lists (“catalogues”), the emergence of “informers” and the practice of denunciations (“the commission has discovered by roundabout ways..., etc.”), and especially the appearance of the secret police: if they infringe the law, the printed publications are withdrawn and... “destroyed”. The printing offices and lithographer's offices can even be “smashed”, and the “police has the duty...too arrest the owner.”

The introduction of stereotyped language, of a terminology typical of the repressive language of the power of occupation is something notable. We will meet with the same phenomenon on a full scale a century later, after 23 August, 1944. The similarity is astonishing. To use French expressions: criminelles intentions, écrits dangereux, doctrines subversives, la censure, élément essentiel au repos public etc. In Romanian version: “ideas blocked by the government”, “wrong systems”, “revolutionary principles”, books “subversive of public order”, etc. The word independence or “independence” must disappear by all means, etc. We have reached the phase of meticulous administrative and repressive vigilance.

The goal of censorship is to isolate the Romanian principalities totally from the influence of Western ideas, to establish an ideological blockade, to ban dangerous foreign publications. This is a constant preoccupation of Hapsburg, as well as Russian, authorities. In 1812, emphatic orders and protests were issued by the Praesidium du Conseil Aulique de Guerre Autrichien against the importation or rather smuggling into the Principalities of “printed publications and printing material” meant for the setting up a Greek printing office in Iași. The Russian Consulate, whose members are also engaged in activities away from the capital cities, proves to be extremely efficient. Control at the customs is total. Parcels with books must not be “unsealed”. Foreign newspapers are banned strictly. They can be read only at foreign consulates and by their personnel. The controversy on whether the distribution of newspapers should be allowed to subscribers and alien residents continues during the reigns in the period covered by the provisional constitution and even after.

There is a close religious-political collaboration in the field of censorship in the nineteenth century, until 1848. It is not only a question of resistance to the loss of the monopoly of printing. The aim is to ban Transylvanian religious publications completely (especially those of the Uniate Church), as well as the translations of “The English Biblical Society”. “The censorship by the clergy” is, in so far as this is concerned, implacable. Two reactions—considered especially from the present-day perspective and that of the development of the Romanian culture on the whole—prove to be highly obscurantist. In 1815 the Metropolitan seat of Moldavia bans Petru Maior's Istoria... because of its quotations in...the Latin language. In 1817, the înștiințare (Notification) by Gh. Lazăr contains, likewise, “heresies”. Other details can also be given.

How efficient was this censorship—extremely severe in terms of its intentions—is, however, a different question. A Russian observer, officer in the forces of occupation, discovers, in 1829, that in Bucharest there is “a bookshop in which I found many of the

books banned in Russia”. As early as 1804 in Moldavia there are reports of pamphlets made by the middle class landowners, who “terrify by their poems reverberating with the example of France”. An anonymous letter is also reported, in the same year, during the rule of Alexandru Moruzi, also in Moldavia. Of effective historical importance is the first demand that censorship should be lifted, in the Ponturile of the confederate conspiracy of the Moldavian equerry Leonte Radu in 1839. The latter demanded: “The freedom of printing, of thought and writing, which should not be under censorship” (art. 7). The idea makes progress, because by indirect ways it reaches the Wallachian press. Allusively, C. Boliac speaks in *Curierul* (after *Journal de Petersburg*) about the Censorship of the Theatre. The journal was short-lived: 1836-1837. The idea that the free press is creator of “public opinion” is implicitly formulated in the article *Despre publicitate* (On Publicity) (*Curierul românesc*, XVI, 1844, pp. 299-300), even if, formally, the “ruler's censorship” is accepted.

6. The 1848 revolutionary moment—of capital importance— brings the first official abolition of censorship, included in a Romanian Constitution project, which is also justified by a significant number of proclamations, leaflets, and petitions signed by great personalities of the age. The Proclamation of Islaz, written for the most part by I. Heliade Rădulescu, printed on leaflets and read on 11 June, 1848 provides in its preamble that “The Romanian people decrees freedom of printing, freedom of speech, freedom of association, in order to speak and write usefully, to show the truth. The freedom of printing can do no harm to anyone but the children of the dark”. Point 8 “decrees”: “The absolute freedom of printing”. Even more explicit is point 6 of a revolutionary brochure titled *Ce sunt meseriaşii* (What are the Artisans) (1848). It demands “the abolition of censorship”. The idea of “the freedom of the press” surfaces again in *Memoriul remis Comisarului Sublimei Porţi Talaat-Efendi in numele partidului liberal al Ţării Româneşti* (Memoir Remitted to the Commissioner of the Sublime Porte-Efendi in the Name of the Wallachian Liberal Party) (May, 1848).

In Moldavia, the 1848 revolution, poorly planned, is easily repressed. However, the authorities cannot stop the expression of the underlying idea. V. Alecsandri demands in a “Protestation” *În numele Moldovei, a omeniei şi a lui Dumnezeu* (In the Name of Moldavia, Decency and God) (May, 1848), point 3: “The lifting of censorship as regards all the internal affairs and interests”. M. Kogălniceanu insists even more, speaking in very clear terms about the lack of internal legislation in the matter of censorship. Among the *Dorinţele partidei naţionale din Moldova* (The Wishes of the Moldavian National Party), (Czernowitz, 1848) is also Freedom of printing, at point 7: “Printing has always been free in Moldavia and as of today there is no old or new law that can stop it or set limits to it. On the contrary, the reply to the question asked by the Minister Plenipotentiary in 1830, during the Russian occupation, as to what laws apply to printing in Moldavia, is the statement made by the *Divanul împlinitor* (The Acting Divan)...to the effect that in the Principality of Moldavia printing has never been the object of any censorship except religion and public morality”. The national tradition of freedom of speech is thereby invoked and the introduction of censorship by the “Russian occupation” is directly denounced. A *Protestaţie* (Protestation) (22 July, 1848) blames the Hospodar's First Counsellor for “restricting his mission as a censor exclusively to enchaining any free thought and to blocking the spread of any useful writing in the country”. Finally, a *Proiect de Constituţie pentru Moldova* (Constitution Project for

Moldavia), also from 1848, drawn up by the same M. Kogălniceanu, makes the following provision in article 102: "Printing is free, censorship will never be firmly established, like something that has never existed in the country". Short-term radicalism, but with essential consequences. Despite the repression and the new foreign occupation the idea of censorship enters a phase of irreversible decline.

The euphoria of freedom by suppressing censorship is, however, short-lived. In September 1848 the Turkish troops and the Cossacks enter Bucharest and the old practice of censorship is reinstated. This repression is otherwise typical of all Central Europe after suppressing the 1848 revolution. But the Russian Consulate carries out its prerogatives as supreme instance of censorship also during the "provisional government", and it blocks the circulation of some foreign books, etc. In a communication dating from 4 September, 1848, labelled secret, it demands in the clearest terms "strict surveillance", and that all authors of "unprincipled books and journals written in an instigating spirit", of "libels and discrediting pamphlets" should be "strictly guarded" (that is, detained) and the respective materials confiscated.

The entire terminology of the modern police state is established in this period, and it passes into current use in the language of administration: "official book", "political censorship", "the regulations" and "general instructions of censorship", "the stamp of censorship", etc. They are typical, richly documented, expressions. The mentality and the methods of repression seem to be (and they really are) specific of the "secret police". Hospodar M. Sturza makes it his "duty to contain any tendency...to upheaval and anarchy". Hence meticulous regulations for making up blacklists ("On the Duties of the Liberals"), for drastic customs regulations, and the ban on foreign publications, for "rigorous interrogation", for "police surveillance", for vigilance and inquiry ("what will be discovered by the police"). We have to do with a police system well-known and efficient as early as 1848.

The manner in which censorship terminology penetrates, becomes stabilized, and gets generalized in the official language of the administration ought to be studied in detail (we will confine ourselves to brief indications). This terminology evinces two versions. In French one speaks of *idées, principes, cachet or écrits subversifs, idées prohibées par le gouvernement, ouvrage défendu, publications calomnieuses, inquiétantes*, etc. They demand d'autant plus appeler la vigilance, la prohibition, etc. French terminology is more abstract and, sometimes, more subtle, more diplomatic. In the native, let us call it, patriarchal language, the same notions are translated by "statements against the Government", introduced—that beats all!—illegally, too, by way "contraband". It follows that one more new term comes into use, let us remember this, which will enjoy extensive use.

The moment is important in the history of Romanian censorship also because, on the one hand, its range of operation expands considerably. It tends to become, in the period 1848-1859, "totalitarian". But, on the other hand, the protests also intensify. The ideological resistance grows. Rifts appear even in the repressive system. The liberal spirits are harder and harder to be silenced. The mechanism, as is natural, is fully operative. In 1840 M. Kogălniceanu's journal *Dacia literară* (Literary Dacia) is suspended. In 1844, *Propășirea* (M. Kogălniceanu, V. Alecsandri, I. Ghica, P. Balș) follows suit, being accused of "fabrications that provoke a scandal". At the same time, the demand for freedom of speech and the lifting of censorship becomes, in intellectual

circles, a very topical question. Some names play a historic role. C. A. Rosetti, first of all, who notes in his personal diary, as early as 1846, that there is “no freedom of printing” in the realm. An article, effectively anthological, by M. Kogalniceanu, *Jurnalismul românesc in 1855* (Romanian journalism in 1855), which could appear at a time of relaxation, sums up the entire drama of the Romanian press. It is strangled by “the tight limitations imposed by censorship”, mangled by “the scissors of the most severe censorship”, etc. The unionist newspaper *Steaua Dunării* (The Danube Star) of the same militant scholar, suppressed in 1856, inspired him with an energetic protest: “If Your Highness wishes to have the right to suppress the journals, abolish censorship first... introduce the press system known throughout civilized Europe. C. Boliac, too, in 1859 expresses his conviction, in *Romanul* (The Romanian), edited by C. A. Rosetti, that “freedom of the press is the only escape from the government's mysticism”.

Against this backdrop the continuation of the repressive measures appears to be even more anachronic. They are implemented in a traditional spirit, as before, in the fields of instruction and religious publications. With regard to Jewish books, the censor is a converted Jew, Vitimescu, accused of abuses and excessive neophyte zeal. The chapter on literary history is often amusing. Toderica by C. Negruzzi is a “moralizing and worthless fabrication”. Some poems by Al. Pelimon comprise suspicious lines. Another book (the topic is worth being retained) “on prejudices or imperfections contains in itself revolutionary principles”. The Moldavian chief censor, Gh. Asachi, has very severe instructions (in 1851), “in the contemporary age when the license of the press has kindled so many illusions and has caused social upheavals”. He is extremely vigilant...and misogynist. A certain play “ought to be banned the more so because it has been translated by a woman”. The argument, however, is so weak that it is rejected by the hospodar's chief counsellor himself. Theatre censorship is the most severe of all: each role must be countersigned by the actors lest they should introduce expurgated material—and, what is more serious— “seditious improvisations”.

7. In spite of the extremely unfavourable political context (the Russian-Turkish occupation of the Romanian principalities, continued until 1851, their reoccupation—after the Crimean war—again by the Russians, in June 1853, by Austrians in 1854), the idea of freedom of speech and resistance to censorship continues to make great progress. Almost paradoxically, we witness the second major historic event after 1848: the abolition of censorship in Moldova—even if it is short-lived—by prince Grigore Alexandru Ghica on 12 May, 1856. A well-meaning unionist, sympathizer with the 1848 revolutionaries, he will step down in June 1856, at the end of the seven-year period stipulated by the B-alta Liman Convention. One might say this was his swan song. Some articles of his decree are memorable: art. 26: “Censorship is abolished”, art. 27: “Everybody will be free to express his ideas in the press, observing the rules established by this institution”. The latter are fixed in “Chapter IV: The Prohibitive Section of These Laws”. It comprises all the provisions that will become part of the modern Penal Code, with its modifications. “Caimacan” (deputy prince) Teodor Bale is quick to cancel the decree. He is also called upon by the Porte to do so—the latter demanding expressly that the issuance of “license...for new journals of whatever kind” should be stopped. The new “Caimacan” Nicolae Vogoride continues the same repressive policy.

The situation changes after the Union of 1859. Alexandru I. Cuza's reforms are decisive for Romania's modern history. Among them is the first *Lege a presei* (Law of the Press)

(1 April, 1862). This law takes up and develops many of the articles of the 12 May, 1859 decree. It is worth mentioning art. 26, especially: "Censorship is and will be abolished forever". It is an ample, well studied law, accompanied by a *Regulament pentru aplicarea legii presei* (Regulation for the Application of the Law of the Press). This would not have been possible had it not been for the 1848 revolution and the increasingly radical reaction of public opinion guided by the Romanian intellectuals and politicians at the time of the Union. There are a few texts that can function as terms of reference: *Trecut si viitor* (Past and Future) by C. A. Rosetti (*Românul*, 8 January 1859), which demands: "Genuine freedom of printing and installation of jurors in charges because of publication in the press, as well as in criminal charges", or *Libertatea tiparului* (Freedom of printing) (*Românul*, April, 1859), which the same liberal ideologist and journalist wishes to be "absolute". M. Kogălniceanu, too, is for "the greatest and most comprehensive freedom of the press, which moulds public opinion and gives a death-blow to the bad press". Only Cezar Boliac—the most intransigent of all—rejects the 1862 law, denouncing it abusively as the *Legea contra presei* (The Law against the Press). In the period 1859-1861 other protests are also registered against "strangling the freedom of the press" and the banning of some newspapers (*Aripile furtunoase* "Tempestuous wings", for instance), the interdiction and republication with altered titles of some humorous, inconvenient periodicals, edited by N. T. Orasanu, etc.

The new climate makes possible a completely original phenomenon: the first trials of the press for deformation of character or situation in the Principalities. The top of the list seems to be C. D. Aricescu, arrested, tried and "exiled" for ten months to Snagov, as early as 1848, for anti-Russian poems and "subversive" translations from J. P. Marat (*Lamentațiile robiei* "The Lamentations of Slavery"). He has the modern sense of publicity, because—taking advantage of the favourable moment—he puts into circulation the complete "dossier": *Procesul si exilul meu la Snagov* (My Trial and Exile to Snagov) (Bucharest, 1859). The interrogations and the rejoinders of the accused are notable. The self-publicity method, which will be used by all of "the resistant" individuals, continues with *Procesul meu pentru Oda la Grecia* (My Trial for Ode to Greece) (Bucharest, 1863). Charged with "the apology of revolution" (eulogy of the Athens revolt of 24 October, 1862), C. D. Aricescu is also challenged to duel by some zealous officers and is to serve five months of correctional detention, on the basis of art. 49 of the 1862 law. The law, however, lends itself to interpretations, also in the opportunistic sense of the term, allowing the perpetration of revenge. This is also the case with B. P. Hasdeu's offence against the press. He was sued in 1863, in Iași, for a licentious passage in the short story *Duduca Mamuca*. He will be acquitted, but "dismissed" from his position as a history professor. In 1864 M. Kogălniceanu, who in the meantime has become Prime Minister, bans the *Buciumul* newspaper, edited by C. Boliac, which has inveighed against the (fraudulent) returns of the latest elections. He will do the same with *Aghiuță*, edited by B. P. Hașdeu. From now on we will constantly meet with this topic, which becomes classical.

8. The Constitution of 30 June, 1866, modelled on the 1831 Belgian Constitution, sanctions the freedom of the press and the definite abolition of censorship. Freedom of speech and juror trials are considered inalienable and imprescriptible rights. In the Constitutional debates these rights are invoked with pathos, and justified by famous

quotations. Articles 5 and 24 sanction them, the latter stating explicitly that everybody is “accountable for abusing these liberties in the cases defined by the Penal Code.” The same article specifies that “neither censorship, nor any other measure preventing the printing, selling or circulation of any publication can be reintroduced”. Even King Carol I declares himself, in 1868, “for unlimited freedom of the press in the realm. This is infinitely less dangerous than a limited freedom”. The numerous personal attacks, slanders in the media, and especially the antidynastic attacks put to a serious test the tolerance of the governments and the consistency of the principles.

It is mainly the conservatives who demand that “abuses” be tried in correctional courts. The *Petiția de la Iași* {The Iași Petition} of 1871 observes that “the license of the press has become a real scandal in this country”. In 1870 the Lahovary cabinet uses preventive detention in press crimes. T. Maiorescu, too, declares himself against the absolute freedom of the press, demanding measures for purging the public spirit. The liberal government, however, opposes trials of the press, even in the case of pamphlets, antimonarchistic and republican leaflets. In exchange, the conservative cabinet led by Al. Lahovary orders the arrest of poet Al. Macedonski, in March 1875. He will be acquitted after a three-and-a-half months detention at Văcărești prison. This is a well-known case, significant for the constant, but in a sense unavoidable, fluctuation between the absolute freedom of the press and its Juridical treatment. C. Boliac is also a hero of a trial for publication in the press in 1868.

Liberal radicalism continues to demand “the total freedom” of the press. In 1876, preventive detention in charges because of publishing in the media is abolished. I. C. Brătianu declares, in 1884, that the press is the “fourth power in the state”. Article 24 of the Constitution is, however, changed by the legislative assembly: the attacks against monarchy and other crowned heads will now fall within the jurisdiction of civil courts, much to C. A. Rosetti's indignation, who leaves the debates. A famous trial follows after the injurious article directed against King Carol I, declared *Omul periculos* (The Dangerous Man) by G. Panu (1 April, 1887). The author is sentenced to two years imprisonment and a fine of 5,000 lei. But in 1888 he is elected deputy in the legislative assembly and is therefore pardoned.

Sometimes censorship is spontaneous, being practised by the public opinion. The press also exposes itself to the risk of aggression, and editorial offices are devastated. This happens indeed in Bucharest with the newspapers *Epoca* and *Voința Națională* (in 1886), after an attempt to assassinate I. C. Brătianu. In 1894 a group of officers molests the director of the *Adevărul* newspaper, Al. Beldiman, following an antimonarchistic and antimilitaristic article. These indicate that the public opinion, as a whole, had not yet assimilated the principle of total freedom of the press.

9. In the nineteenth century, in Transylvania, the problems of censorship are basically identical. There is, however, an important difference: the freedom of the press is a weapon for the preservation and the assertion of the rights of the Romanian nation. All the texts written by Gh. Barițiu, the most important journalist of the age, couple “the words freedom and national emancipation”. They turn up in a programmatic article *Tiparul nostru român din punct de vedere politic* (Our Romanian Printing-Press from a Political Point of View) (1864), and in many other interventions (for instance, *Gazetele române și publicul lor* (Romanian Periodicals and Their Readership), (1846). The press needs “an air of freedom and not a stifling air”. What is meant is, of course, censorship.

The latter is intensified after the revolutionary events of 1848 and, especially, after the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian “dualism” in 1867.

*The censorship practiced by the Transylvanian authorities, a step ahead of that in the Principalities, is well organized and experimented. The victims are, first of all, the Romanian periodicals, whether they are due to appear or they have a license (T. Racoce), *Espatriatul* (The Expatriate), (1848), edited by C. Boliac, burned by the Austrians, *Organul luminării* (The Enlightenment Review), edited by T. Cipariu, approved after six years of insistence (1839-1845), as well as other publications of the time. G. Barițiu continues, however, to remain the main suspect, being watched not only by the censors in Brașov, but also by those in Cluj and Vienna. The *Journals Gazeta Transilvaniei* (The Transylvanian Review) and *Foaie pentru minte, inimă și literatură* (Review for the Mind, Heart and Literature) are obstructed, subjected to inquiries, banned. The editor is charged with *Halsstarrigkeit* (obstinacy). The publications resume their activity only in 1850, but their editor is removed definitely. He is also placed under severe “police surveillance”. This is also the case in Bucovina, where K. und K. Landes Praesidium censors (1964) the theatrical productions.*

*A phenomenon is typical of the repressive censorship conditions: the numerous trials for publication in the press. The main “hero” is well known: *Dare de seamă asupra procesului politic de presă al d-lui George Barițiu* (Report on G. Barițiu's political trial for publication in the press), (1877). Dr. V. Lucaciu is tried in 1887. “I had three trials for publishing in the press”, Ioan Slavici also declares. He is imprisoned in Văteș for one year (1888-1889). Great difficulties appear especially after the trial of the Memorandum authors (1894). An inquiry is made about Aurel Mureșianu, and he is sentenced for a “subversive article” (1895). Valeriu Braniște, director of the *Dreptatea* newspaper, is treated similarly in 1899. In the period 1893-1903, the Romanian journalists in Transylvania “served”, between them, 17 years in jail and paid fines totalling 40,000 crowns.*

*10. The censorship conditions in the 20th century mirror closely all the political and historical events. They are the direct consequence of the uprisings, wars, dictatorships and foreign occupations. The freedom of the press is drastically restricted or simply abolished for a long period of time. We return, basically, to the censorship conditions existing at the time of the Organic Regulations. At the beginning of the century, the 1866 Constitution is still in effect, even though the Penal Code has undergone several adjustments. Symbolically speaking, in 1900 the first synoptic work is published on *Delictul de presă și legislația noastră* (Offences because of Publication in the Press and our Legislation). It is the well documented, juridically convincing, Ph.D. dissertation of Radu D. Rosetti, Moldavia's future historian of the censorship.*

The first serious attempt on the freedom of speech is the consequence of the 1907 uprising. A large part of the press is denounced as instigative, as consisting of “anarchists serving an oligarchic society”. Romania muncitoare is confiscated, the socialist publications are denounced for “criminal tendencies” by the head of the D. A. Sturza government. A second, more powerful, shock is the direct consequence of Romania's going to war. The newspapers, without any exception, are subject to the jurisdiction of military courts. The latter are granted the right (Monitorul oficial, 14 August, 1916) “to censor the press and any publication..., to block the release of any newspaper or publication, or only of some news or articles”. A manifesto of the Work

Party is, however, distributed in the Legislative Assembly, in Iasi (6 May, 1917) by 6. Diamandi. The influence of the events in Russia is obvious.

After victory, in 1918-1919, as a result of a spectacular move occasioned by the trial of the collaborators to the publications controlled by the German authorities, the press becomes topical again: *Gazeta Bucureștilor* (12 December, 1916--1 November, 1918), the duplicate of *Bukarester Tageblatt*, founded as early as 1880. It is a trial (22 February—8 March, 1919) on a charge of “high treason” and “the demoralization of the Romanian army on the front”. The newspaper (a detail as a rule “forgotten”) was dropped in the trenches of the Romanian troops on the front. Among the defendants there are famous names: I. Slavici, A. de Herz, Dem. Teodorescu and Tudor Arghezi. The latter is pardoned in 1919 following N. Iorga's intercession. As a matter of fact, all the defendants get sentences between 10 and 5 years, but are freed in less than a year. It is the first Romanian trial for “collaborationism” with a winning occupation power. Censorship, which we can call “war censorship” will continue to be in effect. In 1920, the newspaper *Țara* (The Country), in Timișoara, is banned after some numbers are published. In 1922, *Adevărul literar și artistic* (Literary and Artistic Truth) protests at least twice, in signed and an unsigned articles, against “the monstrous institution of censorship”. The Society of Romanian Writers is also accused for not reacting against this restriction.

The 1923 Constitution “guarantees” (art. 25) “to all the right to communicate and publish their ideas and opinions by way of speech, writing, the press, everybody being responsible for the abuse of these liberties in cases defined by the Penal Code, which can by no means restrict the right in itself”. But the order of the state of law is forced to dissolve the Romanian Communist Party and to suppress all its publications by the *Legea liniștii publice* (Law of Public Order) (1924), better known as “the Marzescu law”. The Romanian Communist Party, in keeping with the directives of the Communist International, pursued the dismantling of the unitary Romanian State. A tendency to render the law in question more severe and to make the Penal Code stricter can also be noticed. In 1930 a new law for keeping public order and guarding the good name of the country is brought into effect, known by the name of law against alarmism. In 1933 it will be supplemented with measures that effectively amount to reintroducing censorship. In 1934, Mircea Eliade complains, for instance, that one of his articles has been “terribly mangled by censorship”. And this is not the only example.

The question of pornography comes once again to the fore. The sequence opened by B. P. Hasdeu's 1863 trial acquires, in the new repressive context, much ampler political connotations and reverberations. Both the “leftist” and the “rightist” press and writers are charged with “offence against good manners”. In the first case, a typical example is the trial against the *Facla* magazine (1913), for a cartoon: *Rusinea Tigancei* (The Gipsy Woman's Disgrace). In Germany, too, the cartoonist George Grosz will be convicted on a similar charge, of “pornography” (1923). Following C. Mille pleading, the editor-in-chief (N. D. Cocea) is, however, acquitted. It should be noted that some literary circles are also concerned with this topic, the poet Al. Macedonski defending himself against the same charge (in 1916). In the “leftist” circles provocation and contestation are practiced, with the intention of creating scandal and of defying “petty-bourgeois” indignation. Another typical case is Geo Bogza's *Poemul invectiva. Cu amprente*

digitale ale autorului (Invective poem. With Fingerprints of the Author's), (1933). The writer is detained. His case will be reopened, in 1937, in a radically different context. The ideological and political rise of the far right, in the twenties and thirties, uses "pornography" successfully, in the double sense of the term. The writers considered to belong to the "left" are denounced in the far right newspapers and even arrested (G. Bogza again, but also F. Aderca and H. Bonciu, the latter being sentenced to three months' imprisonment). The fact that a member of the Academy (Al. Brătescu-Voinești) reopens and denounces the "Bogza dossier", says a lot about the mentality and censorship of the age. However, the situation becomes even more complicated when King Carol II establishes royal dictatorship and the repression is also directed against the far right. It is now the turn of a rightist writer, Mircea Eliade, obviously an iron guard sympathizer, to be charged with "pornography" for his novel Domnișoara Cristina (Miss Cristina) (1936). This was a pretext for removing him from the university. A new scandal as well as aggressive campaigns and noisy inquiries in the press ensue, especially in the sympathizer weekly Vremea (1937). High ranking personalities intervene in the dispute, expressing their opinions pro and against (N. Iorga, E. Lovinescu, etc.).

11. Scenes typical of the police system of censorship— some even more picturesque— can be noticed in the same period, at the beginning of the 20th century, in Transylvania, too. The repression continues relentlessly, until the Union. The control of Romanian schools, the confiscation of publications from Bucharest, the strict surveillance of the literary and cultural personalities coming from Romania, but also of foreign philologists interested in the Romanian language and literature (E. Picot, G. Weigand), the banning of some newspapers (Tribuna, in 1903), etc., all these are part of the landscape of the period. The deception of local authorities is just as savory, they lacking... "informers": "There are hardly any reliable persons among the Romanians"...

A highly picturesque character, great diffuser and smuggler of Romanian books, who travels on foot to Rome and sleeps covered in a fur-coat near Trajan's Column, who is detained several times and is under permanent surveillance, is "Badea" Gheorghe Cârțan, a peasant from Cârțișoara. He had specialized in collecting Romanian books and journals, and ingetting them through the customs, to the consternation of the Brașov police. He used false covers sometimes, as well as pages with altered titles, etc. Finally, exasperated, the authorities take energetic and definite measures. In 1903, the whole "supply" is confiscated and loaded in four waggons: 4,858 titles, 76,621 copies. What follows is something entirely bureaucratic: complete inventories, of bibliographical value today. This operation was, however, practically useless, because "all confiscated books" were to be "destroyed by fire"... "without calling the attention of the public opinion". This happened, indeed, in 1907, in... a brick factory. It follows that the holocaust of books has its own precursors, some of them insufficiently put to use as yet.

In 1912, the Romanian consul in Budapest demands official statements regarding the banned Romanian publications. The result? A new long bibliographical list (8 pages, 214 positions, 230 titles): Tabel asupra tipăriturilor românești Interzise a circula pe teritoriul sfintei coroane ungare (List of Romanian Publications Under Ban on the Territory of the Sacred Hungarian Crown). This is a document typical of the Jr. und. k. censorship, also of documentary interest. The political trials, of course, continue. The most notorious one concerns O. Goga, a poet, imprisoned in Debrecen in 1909. He will

be visited in gaol by I. L. Caragiale, generous in giving substantial tips, who brings him...two bottles of champagne. He will publish a protest in the press at home (1910). Unlike in Lehar's operetta *the Fledermau*, the gaol was not quite "merry".

12. The finishing stroke against the freedom of the press consists in massively banning publications and establishing a drastic censorship. It is the work of the authoritarian, dictatorial, totalitarian regimes in Romania. First royalist, then fascist, then communist, starting in the thirties and extending down to 22 December, 1989. They should be considered only within the European context of the age, of World War II, then of the cold war. Actually, one can speak of a genuine freedom of the press in Romania only during Carol I's reign, and after the Union—with a "break" during the war—only until 1933. This is a seminal period, full of achievements in the field of publishing, but, nevertheless, it is too short for consolidating a genuine and solid tradition.

In December 1933 Prime Minister I. G. Duca is assassinated by the Iron Guard, against the backdrop of the ascension of fascist and Hitlerite regimes. Censorship is reintroduced, and two far right publications *Calendarul* and *Cuvântul* are suspended. Their directors, Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu, are arrested. The second newspaper will reappear again, but only for a few months, in January 1938. The leftist press is also under surveillance, especially after the strikes of February 1933. The royal dictatorship (10 February, 1938) introduces a new Constitution, which cancels, almost totally, the earlier ones (1866, 1923). Article 7 stifles the press. It bans "the exhorting of people by way of the spoken word or by writing to change the form of government". The formula—a historian remarks—is very close to the Callimachi Code (1817). However, articles 10 and 22 continue to guarantee "the freedom of the press", "the freedom to communicate and publish one's ideas and opinions." The regress is complete. The democratic press is subject to violent attacks. The *Adevărul* and *Dimineața*, dailies are burned in the street, their diffusion is stopped, their editors are molested. They are on the brink of bankruptcy and are sold out, in 1936, to a "liberal" group, and are finally banned by the rightist Goga-Cuza government (1937). The Iron-guardist regime and General Antonescu's dictatorship (1940-1941) render censorship (director E. Filotti) even more radical. The Minister of Propaganda has a "department of the normative", where the texts of the official communiques are elaborated, which are obligatory for the press. The ban on *Dimineața*-, Mircea Damian's daily, inspires its director to write a vigorous pamphlet, addressed to Marshal Antonescu, against the Minister of Propaganda, Nichifor Crainic. The text is consistent and the arguments are valid.

We are still far from the totalitarian communist perfection. Censorship was, of course, politically inflexible. Nevertheless, it allowed for some freedom. The liberal *Manifestul cercului de la Sibiu* (Manifesto of the Sibiu Circle) in *Vremea* (1942) is proof of this. Tudor Arghezi's articles in 1943 in *Bilete de papagal* evince the same orientation. A "tabloid," *Aia de-atunci* (The Then Thing), expresses the nostalgia for the former free press. The ironic eulogy of censorship is still possible: "...For twelve years since censorship has been operative, the mobility of the pen has learned a classical style of expression, which expression has remained vulgar. Without being aware of it, censorship serves form, more ethereal, more resilient, more indirect, artistically better equipped to render the cruelties of old". The idea will be reasserted, in a different context, after

1989, too. A token of extreme resistance is the text *Baroane* (You, Baron) (30 September, 1943) (a pamphlet against the German ambassador in Bucharest, Manfred von Killinger). As a result, the journal is banned, and its author is confined in a camp. In 1946 Tudor Arghezi will say the following about the press conditions of that age: “The pen was watched closely by a ministry, a censorship and seven police departments, one of which, the Secret Service, would send the press that had some specific orientation notes, remarks, appreciations of the degree of conformism, as well as threats”.

13. Nothing can compare, however, to the inflexibility and perfection of the censorship imposed by the new regime of Soviet occupation after 23 August, 1944. This is, in fact, the second major time of “glory” for Romanian censorship, after the establishment of censorship by the Kiseleff regime in 1831. In both situations censorship is introduced and rendered official by a foreign power. It must be noted, however, that in the latter case it was characterized by an unprecedented repression, bureaucratization and organization. The facts indicate that out of all the former satellites of the Third Reich, the most severe Soviet directives became operative in Romania. They kept getting worse as the totalitarian regime took over the power completely and introduced the totalitarian system. Within this framework, censorship was an essential ingredient.

The Truce Convention between the Romanian government and the governments of the United Nations, signed on 12 September, 1944, establishes the Allied (Soviet) Control Commission. Article 16 of this Convention introduces censorship of all mass media. On 27 September, a decree prohibits the publication in the press of all those who have propagated fascist ideas. “The newspapers that will publish articles signed by the ones to whom the decree applies will be banned”. As a matter of form, the censorship service will now be subordinated to The Council of Ministers (20 October, 1944). The new head of censorship is colonel Gh. Marinescu, from The General Staff. A law-decree of 2 May, 1945 enjoins “the immediate withdrawal from circulation of all periodicals or other publications...of a fascist-Hitlerite nature or of those that contain elements which can do harm to Romania's good relations with the United Nations and the Soviet Union”. (After Germany's surrender on 9 May, 1945, all the “militarist, racist and national-socialist” publications will be likewise banned and destroyed). Prime Minister P. Groza declares (14 February, 1946) to an American correspondent that “we are not yet in a position to grant complete freedom to the press. We are still under truce control”. A law (5 March, 1946) changes the Ministry of Propaganda into the Ministry of Information. The task of the latter is to “direct, organize and control all the activities of information through the press, radio, films, etc.” Thereby the career of the well-known “Department of the Press” begins.

The resistance of the free press is short-lived. B. Berry, the American representative in the Allied Commission of Control, notifies Washington (8 February, 1945) that any attempt to retort to attacks in communist newspapers is blocked, either through the agency of Soviet censorship or the “refusal” of printers to print the newspapers of the National Liberal Party or the National Peasant Party. As a matter of fact, the Soviet authorities are quick to ban the *Dreptatea* and *Viitorul* newspapers (1 March, 1945). The appeals to the freedom of the press have no effect. The country is governed not only “through censorship, but also through the shield of silence”. The reappearance of *Dreptatea*, before the 1946 elections, enables some important writers (Șerban

Cioculeseu and Vladimir Streinu) to protest against censorship. An article titled *Lămurire în legătură cu cenzura* (Explanation Regarding Censorship) lets the readers of the official newspaper of the National Peasant Party (9 February, 1947) know that “where confused, our articles bear the mark of the claws of the censorship specially established to honour us”. The director of *Dreptatea*, N. Carandino, denounces, in that very difficult period, the “severe conditions imposed by censorship”. The purges in the press, and the trial of “traitor journalists” by People’s Courts, as well as other measures are part of the same repressive move. The National Peasant Party will be banned on 14 July, 1947.

The constitutional and legal framework of censorship is secured by the 1948, 1952, 1965 “Constitutions”, and especially by article 5 of the Peace Treaty, signed in Paris, on 18 February, 1947. The idea of banning “propaganda hostile” to the U. S. S. R. and the Allied Powers is, however, so flexible that it allows all kind of abuses. The strictly centralized control and bureaucratization of censorship, which make great progress, is exercised by the *Direcția generală a presei și tipăriturilor* (The Department of the Press and Printed Matters) (1964), then by the famous *Consiliul Culturii și Educației Socialiste* (The Council for Culture and Socialist Education) (1971), which replaces the *Comitetul Socialist de Cultură și Artă* (The Socialist Committee for Culture and Art) (1952). The deepening of censorship is justified ideologically by class struggle, the fight against “iron-guardist, racist, chauvinistic” ideas, as well as against “bourgeois literature”, or materials that are “anti-democratic, antimarxist or hostile to peace”.

A notion specific of the institution of communist censorship is the Secret Fund of public libraries. It practically withdraws from circulation all the banned publications. Its activity falls under the rubric “state secret”, “professional secret” or secret data or information, which, “even though they are not state secrets, are not meant for publication”. Explicit articles in the Penal Code (1948, 1953, 1969, 1973) legalize this mechanism. The terminology reflects the typical conspiratorial communist mentality. In 1945 an official directive stipulates that the Cluj-Sibiu University “should destroy all the materials and documents...that can do harm to our good relations with the allied powers (for instance, paintings, photographs, books, etc.)”.

The improvement of censorship is best revealed by the constant systematization and amplification of the official lists of Banned publications. If the first list, dating from May 1945, was relatively modest, by 1 June, 1946 it had 150 pages and about 2,000 titles, while by 1 May, 1948, the number of pages grew to 523, and that of titles exceeded 8,000. The method is applied in the entire sphere of Soviet influence. In the occupied zone of Germany a *Liste der auszusondernden Literatur* appeared in 1948. It was preceded by the first official...Hitlerite list, on May 16, 1933: only 131 authors and 4 anthologies. The list was of course followed by new and massive additions. A secret list of *Publicații nedifuzabile* (Nondiffusible Publications) recommends, at the same time, that “the withdrawal from circulation...must be done tactfully and discreetly”. The internal nomenclature of libraries is variable. In 1960, the entire book “fund” is classified into three categories: current, documentary, special. In 1967, there are only two “funds”: of current and special circulation.

The method of these Lists gives the real ideological dimension of the censorship conducted by the communist regime. At first, it is extremely rigid and simplistic. Starting with 1945 the “reactionary books”, which propagate “the poisoning theories of

imperialism”, are withdrawn. Everything is done in the name of “class struggle” and the “ideology of the working class”. In 1948 the “chauvinistic, reactionary, racist” ideas are hunted down, together with “bourgeois literature” in general. In 1949, the shift is on publications whose content “is either directly or indirectly hostile to the regime, or creates confusion”. Censorship turns so radical that, according to the Instructions given during 1950-1955, practically all the original publications and translations are banned, not only the “chauvinistic, anti-communist, antimarxist ones”, but also those that belong to popular literature (detective stories, for instance), paraliterature, “religious works”, etc. Censorship shows its highest degree of ideological commitment in communist Romania.

Another notable peculiarity lies in the great variability of criteria along which the purge should be conducted, they depending upon changes in the party “line”, leadership, the new relations with the U. S. S. R. Hence a very uncommon phenomenon: censorship and checking of the lists of socialist and marxist publications, but which... “correspond no longer to the present circumstances”. Not even the Communist Party periodicals, beginning with *Scnteia*, are accessible. Only the collections of the last two years can be consulted. Thus, Gh. Gheorghiu-Dej, Ana Pauker and other former leaders of the Romanian Communist Party are moved to...the “secret fund”. The situation is not devoid of irony (1955-1957). Last but not least, the names of...I. V. Stalin (1961-1962), N. Khrushchev (1965), etc. are also withdrawn from circulation. In the meantime, the new party line, set by the new Secretary General N. Ceausescu, had become “nationalist”, (formally) “independent” from the U. S. S. R.

This ideological zigzag, sometimes vertiginous, defines the whole spirit and the letter of the communist censorship under Ceausescu. In 1964 things get somewhat relaxed. This is followed by the putting into circulation of no more than 5,861 volumes from the “S” fund. The July 1971 directives once again enhance censorship. In 1977, however, it is formally “abolished” (an effect of the “Geneva spirit”, as well as of the claim to “the most favoured nation status” with the U. S. A.). In fact, censorship is merely transferred to the editorial offices and the publishing houses, under the surveillance and obligatory assent of the Council for Culture and Socialist Education. Selfcensorship undergoes an unprecedented development in this period. In fact, the pure arbiter is in full charge. Any librarian can withdraw books “whenever... it seems to him/her” that they do not correspond with “the new democratic spirit”. Two completely extravagant decisions illustrate the true nature of this censorship, which can be termed, without exaggeration, surrealist-Ceausist: the “transcendental meditation”, in 1982, which also has as an effect the withdrawal of all books on...“yoga”, and the 1983 decree that stipulated that all type-writers and copiers should be registered with the police. This is unprecedented in the whole socialist system. So is the periodic updating of the lists of “banned writers”, “defectors” or, in other words, of political refugees. Such lists become longer and longer: 36 names in 1983, 152 in 1988. They have an objective historical-literary utility. They help draw an almost accurate map of the places of Romanian exile and of the diaspora.

14. Finally, an outline can be given, as sketchy as the previous one, of how the Romanian authors relate to the communist censorship. Practically speaking, all writers have “passed” through censorship. A general case. But only some had open conflicts, with direct consequences. A complete study of this question is still missing. A number of

typical situations can, however, be distinguished, arranged in a rank depending upon the interventions and punitive measures taken by censorship. Our information, bibliographically speaking, does not propose to be complete.

a. The most current, the most common situation: the “removal” of a passage only, of one or more poems, of a chapter, of a title. This is partial, almost benign, censorship: some “religious” poems by Ioan Alexandru, a cycle by Ileana Mălăncioiu, the title of an essay on I. L. Caragiale, by Mircea Iorgulescu from *Marea Trăncăneală* (The Big Chatter), which becomes a “harmless” *Eseu despre lumea lui Caragiale* (Essay on Caragiale's World) (1988), etc. These are merely some examples. Everything depends, in such circumstances, on the courage and firmness of the editors of the reviews or from publishing houses, who stood up for their authors (I. Mălăncioiu, G. Dimiseanu, etc).

b. In the case of foreign writers, a kind of “prudish” censorship was operative, of the type *ad usum Delphini*. Rabelais was published in such translations (1962, 1967), bowdlerized of obscene or “taboo” words, a thing otherwise acknowledged.

c. Much more often texts are “rejected” (novels, theatre plays, or volumes of poetry) by reviews or publishing houses, or are withdrawn from circulation after publication, because they contained “material” that has escaped the censor's vigilance. This, however, does not have a negative impact on the former or the future works of the respective writers.

There are numerous examples: censored novels by S. Tanase (*Corpuri de iluminat* “Illuminating Objects”, *Playback*), I. Chimet (*încide ochii și vei vedea orașul* “Close Your Eyes and You Will See The City”), banned in 1950, published only in 1970), volumes of poetry (for instance, I. Mălăncioiu, *Urcarea muntelui* (The Mountain Climb), banned in 1985), an anthology by N. Manolescu, *Poezia română modernă* (Modern Romanian Poetry) (1968), withdrawn after its release. Because of the “transcendental meditation” a play by Marin Sorescu, included in the repertoire of the National Theatre, is cancelled in 1982.

The literary and ideological studies present a wealth of “cases”. They will be disclosed only after 1989. *Dreptul la memorie* (The Right to Memory), a three volume anthology by I. Chimet, banned in 1974, is published only in 1995. The literary history volume *Sub zodia proletcultismului* (Under the Sign of Proletcult), by M. Nițescu, submitted to the publisher in 1979, will appear only in 1995. Fate had it that *Dicționarul scriitorilor români* (The Dictionary of Romanian Writers) by M. Zăciuș, A. Sasu, M. Papahagi, “submitted” for publication in 1984, sabotaged not only by the authorities, but also by...colleagues, appeared (vol. I) also in 1995. When some authors become undesirable or go into exile, the works that mention their names are banned, too (for instance, *Istoria poeziei române* (The History of Romanian Poetry) by M. Scarlat (1982, 1984, 1986). The burlesque episode of banning the history volume *Scornicești. Vatră de istorie românească* (Scornicești. Abode of Romanian History), by Ion Spălatelu (1983), is the funniest of all: the author claims that the village Scornicești, where N. Ceaușescu was born, is in fact the homeland of... “Free Dacians”. Hence a direct and unbroken filiation. The idea has been the object of immense ridicule (Radio Free Europe has also contributed to that).

d. Sometimes the banning of a work—as the intransigence of censorship grows toward the end of the Ceaușescu regime—is accompanied by the disagreeable show of a trial and by “unmasking” in the public. Two cases are well-known: *Plicul negru* (The

Black Envelope) (1986) by Norman Manea and *Viapa pe un peron* (*Life on a Platform*) (1988) by Octavian Paler.

e. Censorship is fully operative on all Romanian writers living in exile, especially if they are “of the Right” and are abroad at the time of the events in 1944. It is hard and highly selective for them to rejoin Romanian literature, even if they become very renowned (E. Ionescu, R. M. Cioran, Mircea Eliade, etc). The last, for instance, penetrates with much difficulty by way of his fiction (*La pigSnel si alte povestlri* “*With the Gipsies and Other Stories*”), 1969). His phenomenology studies and those of the history of religions are faced with great obstacles. The first of this kind, *Aspecte ale mitului* (*Aspects of the Myth*), appears, in Romanian translation, only in 1978, but a passage about K. Marx is expurgated (with the assent of the concessive author).

f. Censorship may turn more severe in the case of the second edition. This is the case of a successful novel (*Delirul* “*The Delirium*”), 1985) by Marin Preda, a typical one, based on documents, but also on the lived experience of general Antonescu's government. It is a “delicate” topic of internal and foreign policy (relation with the U. S. S. R. Bessarabia, etc).

g. There are circumstances and contexts when censorship bans an author's entire work, after the publication of some extremely dangerous text. The authors forfeit the right to sign their works. An example: M. Sora, who—after the “transcendental meditation” affair—can publish only under a pseudonym in the Iași students' reviews, aided by the editors. The poetess Ana Blandiana is a great “success” especially in 1988, after the publication of the poem titled “*motanul*” Arpagic (“*tomcat*” Arpagic), a direct allusion to N. Ceaușescu. She had great difficulties also before, because of some nonconformist poems, published in the same students' review, *Amfiteatru*. Poet Mircea Dinescu is in a similar situation. He is under house arrest, also in 1988, for writing poems against Ceaușescu. A group of six writers sign a “Pro Dinescu” letter. This, in itself, is a *première*. The case of poet Doru Tudoran, a fighting temperament, is analogous. The latter got also involved in the unmasking of the plagiarism of Lao Tze by an official poet, Ion Gheorghe. Adrian Păunescu, too, another official poet, is among those censored after publishing three pamphlet-poems (in *Familia*, 1988). One is addressed directly to the *Analfabeți* (*The Illiterate*) (*apparatchiks*, members of the party, etc.). The mechanism of repression is also illustrated by the steps taken after the publication by Vasile Gogea (in the Brașov magazine *Astra*, 9/1988) of a text about the Secret of Pyramids built by... “free people”. The author is dismissed, the editor-in-chief is moved from the journal, the censor at the Council for Culture and Socialist Education, insufficiently vigilant, is moved on disciplinary counts. Elena Ceaușescu herself took care of this “case”.

h. A situation typical of this period is that of the authors who started their career by publishing in the country. They are then banned by censorship and send their texts abroad secretly. Published abroad, they are definitely and totally banned in the country. The most notorious case is Paul Goma, author of *Ostinato*, a novel published first in German and French versions (1971). Bujor Nedelcovici does the same, with his *Le second messenger* (1985), an antitotalitarian utopia.

Other names worth mentioning are: A. E. Baconsky, V. Tanase, Dorin Tudoran. Constantin Dumitrescu, the author of the first systematic ideological criticism of Ceausescu's regime, sends it directly and secretly to the Parisian publishing house Seuil,

where it is released under the emblematic title *Le cite totale* (1980). The first Romanian version dates from 1992. Faced with the fact—and in order that there should not be any “dissident writers” in the country—the authorities banish the author. An (apparently) anecdotic detail: he is put on the first plane, flying to Köln, without being...arrested. The book, given the concurrence of circumstances that we do not analyze here, continues to be the victim of a gross injustice, being totally ignored, etc., even though it is the first book of this kind. Such cases are, of course, more numerous. The extensive lists of “banned writers”, which I have mentioned, is evidence for this. D. Tepeneag is also a notable name. To the same category belongs *Jurnalul fericirii* (Diary of Happiness) by N. Steinhardt, which is confiscated by the Securitate (Secret Police). The author publishes, under a pseudonym, in a review of the Romanian exiles in Paris (1975), the allusive essay *Secretul “privirii pierdute”*. Other names can also be mentioned: Mircea Saucan, for instance (the novel *Isidor Mănecupa-Cioburi*). The memories *Cinci ani si doua luni in penitenciarul de la Sighet* (Five Years and Two Months in the Sighet Penitentiary) by C. C. Giurescu were written confidentially after his release from prison and buried. Then they were “taken” to the U. S. A. by Paul Michelson, an American professor, from where they were recovered after 1989.

Some activities that fall under the rubric “cultural resistance” are also connected with censorship. In 1973 A. E. Baconsky stages a protest, in front of N. Ceausescu, against “inner censorship”. However, formally he accepts censorship.

M. Nițescu, another censored writer, also protests by addressing petitions to the Writers' Union, to the editor-in-chief, and even directly to N. Ceausescu (February and August 1988). Very ample and well documented is the Dossier “*Dicționarul scriitorilor români*”. *Piese pentru o istorie a cenzurii* (Dictionary of the Romanian Writers. Specimens for a History of Censorship) (vol I, 1995), which contains many episodes and aspects that have been given a successful publicity. It comprises reports, notes, counterreports, letters, addresses, petitions made to central cultural authorities (The Council for Socialist Education and Culture., The Writers Union, The Central Committee of the Communist Party), or addressed directly to...N. Ceausescu himself. In all these situations the protests are formulated in careful language, exclusively within the system. An episode is (absolutely) unusual and unprecedented: Geo Bogza's recital at the Poetry Colloquium in Iași (October 1978), to everybody's surprise, of his old censored poem, *Poemul invectiva*, this being motivated by the fact that... “now I can tell it”.

Other episodes are associated with *Opinia studențeasca* and *Dialog*, the Iași students' nonconformist, combative, expurgated reviews, whose editors were changed several times (Al. Călinescu, Sorin Antiohi, Liviu Antonesei). The “adventures” came to an end in 1983, by the dismissal and the radical replacement of the boards of editors of the two reviews. The drop in the bucket, in the *Dialog* case, was the introduction, in the last moment, on the front cover, of the reproduction of a (banned) painting by Dan Hatmanu, which had the apparently misleading title *Homage*. Number 4-5, 1983, of *Opinia studențeasca* is withdrawn from circulation because of a poem by Liviu Antonesei. All his close collaborators—Luca Pițu, Tereza and Dan Petrescu, Valeriu Gherghel, Dan Alexe—are interrogated and searched. In this phase, the steps of censorship were: the communist party secretary of the University, the local correspondent of the *Scînteia* daily newspaper, and the Department of the Press, the

higher forum. Other procedures of censoring publications cannot be omitted either. The literary chronicler of the *Cotidianul* weekly, N. Manolescu, is obliged to contradict himself after a week and to sign a favourable, radically different, review of the same book, by an apparatchik, which he attacked the preceding week. These are rare situations, the practice is deplorable, the humiliation extreme. The tables of contents of the *Magazin istoric* journal (1977) were often altered, etc. But this was, in fact, the general situation of the whole cultural press.

I myself, as actor and spectator of this period, have gone through all the situations evoked above: banned as a whole and deprived of the “right to sign” my works for two decades (*Viața lui Macedonski* “*The Life of Macedonski*”, due to appear in 1946, was released in 1965), my texts were mangled (for instance, the article *Decadentismul* in *Dicționar de idei literare* “*Dictionary of Literary Ideas*”, I, 1973), whole chapters were deleted (*Autonomia literaturii* “*Autonomy of Literature*”), removed from *Hermeneutica ideii de literatură* (*Hermeneutics of the Idea of Literature*), 1987), reintroduced only in the Italian version (*Teoria della letteratura*, 1994), a preface to a volume of Romanian-Hungarian comparative literature, edited only in 1993, is “stopped”, etc. These are mere documentary bibliographical data, nothing more. I have “ignored” censorship by publishing texts abroad without presenting them for approval or a “visa”, or by collaborating to foreign radio stations (*Radio Free Europe*). Other things form part of the same scenario, which, after 1989, suffers from being overrated, in one case, and minimized (just as polemic and partisan) in another.

The most positive and enduring aspect of the age of censorship (with its overall mentality and coercive institutions) is, quite paradoxically, theoretical and analytical: the beginning of meditation and of an original Romanian typology of censorship. Matei Călinescu's typology has all the chances to become classical: “precensorship” (it includes all the pressures exerted on an author, with “selfcensorship” as its most important aspect), “censorship” (censorship proper, official and repressive) and “postcensorship” (the afflicted consciousness of the “approved” author, who blames himself, assuming the presumption of “guilt”). The distinction between “negative” censorship (banning) and “prescriptive” censorship (which imposes ideas, topics, etc.) is also worth mentioning. The author also took a course on *The History of the Idea of Censorship*, in 1973-1974, at The Institute of Russian and East-European Studies of the University of Bloomington. Matei Calinescu confesses to a feeling of “postcensorship” when he reedited *Viața și opiniile lui Zacharlas Lichter* (*The Life and Opinions of Zacharlas Lichter*), in 1995. Convergent, discontinuous remarks on the first two steps of censorship are also made, to the same effect, by Ana Blandiana, Ștefan Augustin Doinaș and I. Mălăncioiu, in the said confessions (*Amintiri despre cenzura* “*Remembrances of Censorship*”) (1994).