

**STUDIES AND MATERIALS
OF
CONTEMPORARY HISTORY**

**NEW SERIES
VOLUME 16/2017**

ABSTRACTS

Radu TUDORANCEA, *The Ordeal of Captivity: Romanian Prisoners of War during World War I*

This study sets out to analyse a rather omitted, if not forgotten issue of the Romania's participation into the First World War, namely the fate of the Romanian prisoners of war, their captivity experiences and, of course, the wide range of violence and mistreatment that Romanian prisoners of war have endured from the first moments of their captivity and continuing with their life within the enemy prison camps, until their release from captivity. The research had also explored the size of violence against Romanian prisoners of war as well as the traumatic impact upon individual captives. Following a comparative approach, the study revealed that death percentages among Romanian prisoners of war were significantly higher than, for instance, in the case of German prisoners of war kept in captivity in France, or French prisoners of war held in Germany. The study also underlines the fact that, despite some actions, initiated particularly by the Romanian Red Cross, the scale of (Romanian) state involvement in the matter of improving the status of the Romanian prisoners of war (and limiting the violations of prisoner's rights to bodily and mental integrity, during the years of captivity) were rather poor, when compared to other Governments involved in the war. An explanation for that could be the dramatic situation faced by Romania at that time, after losing two thirds of the national territory to Central Powers (which could have jeopardised its very existence), due to the disastrous campaign of 1916.

Mihaela DENIZE, *The Stakes of the Establishment of the Romanian Scientific Institute in Istanbul (1943)*

Since 1941, Romania worked to find an alternative to the alliance with Nazi Germany. Observing the trajectory of the war in the last phase of its development, Ion Antonescu and Mihai Antonescu sought to initiate a dialogue with the representatives of the Great Powers in order to get Romania out of the conflict. Therefore, between 1942 and 1943, Romania held secret armistice negotiations, either through representatives of the Antonescu government or by important figures of the historical parties. Nevertheless, the Allies' decisions at the conferences in Casablanca, Moscow and Teheran, where Romanian delegates had to negotiate with the Soviet Union, did not allow their rapid implementation.

Camelia ZAVARACHE, *Transition and Strategies of Adaptation: Mihai Ralea and the activity of the Philosophy Department of the Institute of History and Philosophy of the PRR Academy (1949-1952)*

The evolution of the Romanian Academy's Institute of History and Philosophy during the late 1940s and the beginning of 1950s has brought extreme institutional and scientific changes that were meant to reorientate the Romanian humanities research towards the Soviet paradigm. Analyzing the content of the monthly reports and annual meetings one can observe the dynamics of the relationship between the Academy and the institute; all decisions were made by the first one, and executed dutifully by the latter. This complete lack of autonomy meant that the teams working in the institute had no control over the topics they were researching, their activity being under the scrutiny of their superiors and consequently of the ruling party.

This situation must therefore be taken into consideration when judging the professional evolution of some members of the pre-war intelligentsia, such as Mihai Ralea, that have transitioned successfully into the new elite. Even though they had a major contribution to implementing the new directions in the field of research, one should also bear in mind the fact that these individuals had in fact no actual authority. Therefore, they are most guilty for allowing the communist leaders to use them as instruments of this massive change process, not for the decisions that have been made during that period. After analyzing the four years on which this article has focused, it is obvious that things were unlikely to have had a different course, since the researchers hired at the institute were under the immense pressure of adapting to the new realities or be replaced.

Cristian VASILE, *Political Biographies of Intellectuals – „Fellow travellers“ under the Communist Regime. Some considerations regarding G. Călinescu, George Oprescu, Iorgu Jordan, and Tudor Vianu*

The aim of this article is to present the essential elements of the political biographies of some prominent intellectuals, influential members of the Romanian Academy after 1948, who were also directors of humanistic research institutes (G. Călinescu, George Oprescu, and Iorgu Jordan), or chief of institute's research programme (Tudor Vianu). All of them knew each other before 1944 and in general were very close. In the interwar period and during Antonescu's dictatorship they were rather attached to center left politics without being communists.

While existing works on the topic focus either on the elimination of previous elites in times of radical social change or on the creation of new elites by each new political regime, we focus on a third mechanism: the recuperation/conversion of previous intellectual elites for new modernization projects. This mechanism of historical and social change appears at every major transition (“historical fracture”) but is given less importance both in history/social sciences and in public discourse.

Despite communist terror, ideology, and censorship, the Gheorghiu-Dej regime recuperated and encouraged the reconversion (especially after 1955) of some influential members of Romanian intellectual elite, i.e. directors of humanistic research institutes of the Academy. In the same time, as a warning, the secret police put such intellectuals under strict surveillance, also through the agency of networks of informants, and arrested few of their protégés who worked as research fellows.

Valentin SĂNDULESCU, *Academic Elites and their Trajectories in Troubled Times: the Case of Traian Herseni*

Born in 1907 in a Transylvanian village from the county of Făgăraș, Traian Herseni moved to Bucharest in 1924. Here he enrolled in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy and soon became part of Dimitrie Gusti's sociological school, one of the most influential intellectual enterprises in interwar Romania, gradually becoming one of its main representatives.

After 1989, some sociologists regarded Traian Herseni as an example for the sociological craft, a disciple and then colleague of Dimitrie Gusti, an important sociologist and an anthropologist, while also remembering him as an academic who helped re-launch the sociological profession during communist times. Although his political allegiances have been discussed, Herseni's transformation from a left-wing intellectual in the early 1930s to a supporter of the fascist Iron Guard in the second half of the same decade still needs to be debated and contextualized. Furthermore, his trajectory since the 1940s, from holding an official position during the National-Legionary State, fully supporting the I. Antonescu - H. Sima regime, to post-war imprisonment in the 1950s and then to reconversion as a professional who also praised the communist regime deserves extensive attention.

A thorough, book length, account analyzing Herseni's public and political stance throughout various regime changes that he experienced during his life and academic career is still lacking. Using primary sources such as archival records, memoirs, interwar and postwar books and journals, the present contribution aims at partially filling this gap.

Mihai Sorin RĂDULESCU, *Alexandru V. Perietzianu-Buzău and the Modern Genealogy studies*

Alexandru V. Perietzianu-Buzău (1911-1995), lawyer and landowner before the coming of the communist regime, contributed substantially to the development of Romanian genealogical research. The descendant of a Muntenian boyar family documented from the seventeenth century, a family which he studied with great passion, he obtained a doctorate in Law in Paris, and later practised in his native Bucharest. After the Second World War, he was forced to work as a duty-roster clerk, but from the 1970s to the 1990s he was a member of the Commission on Heraldry, Genealogy, and Sigillography attached to the „Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History. At the meetings of the Commission, he presented numerous interesting papers concerning the genealogies of boyar and merchant families, both Romanian and foreign – in particular those of certain families of foreign origin who settled in Wallachia. His research was always based above all on archive documents, and he made use in the first place of his own rich family archive.

The appendix contains two letters sent from Canada after the Revolution of December 1989 by Alexandru V. Perietzianu-Buzău, who was visiting his two sons there, to Mihai Sorin Rădulescu (born 1966), at the time a young historian and emerging genealogist, who considered Perietzianu-Buzău to be one of his principal masters in the field of genealogical study.

Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, *Ana Pauker and the Stalinist political religion*

Thanks to the Comintern's propaganda machine, Ana Pauker's name became an international symbol of opposition to fascism. Until 1952 Ana Pauker – *Passionaria of the Balkans*, as she was called – played a paramount role in the history of Romanian communism. Ana Pauker's downfall did not occur merely, or even primarily, because of Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej's skillful maneuvering – as some Romanian novels published in the 1980s would have us

believe – but foremost because of Joseph Stalin’s decision to initiate a major political purge in Romania. Ana Pauker embraced until the end the objectives of Stalinism as Political Religion.

Cosmin POPA, *The Struggle for the Privilege of Lying: Ion Popescu-Puțuri versus Miron Constantinescu*

The appointment of Miron Constantinescu in 1970 at the leadership of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences (ASSP) meant the climax of his post-1965 career as ideologue. The establishment of a new scientific center for human resources under the aegis of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) led to the emergence of bipolarity within Romanian cultural-scientific and ideological apparatus. The role of ASSP was to scientifically replicate the ideology of the communist regime through the agency of academic publications, books, periodicals and so on. However, the Party Academy „Ștefan Gheorghiu“, another ideological institution with scientific goals, has similar objectives. Moreover, the aforementioned institutions, together with the History Institute of the RCP (ISISP), had to contribute both to Soviet type cadres formation, and the career planning of cadres. Only apparently their prerogatives seemed different. In fact, all of them competed for the good graces of Nicolae Ceaușescu, the secretary general of RCP, who guided their scientific and ideological activities.

Mioara ANTON, *Everyday Life in the Enquiries of the “Scântea” Newspaper: Shortcomings and Miscellaneous notes*

In the middle of 1960s, through its special sections, the „Scântea” newspaper mediated the dialogue between society and Communist power. Inspired by the Soviet experience and successfully inaugurated in the 1950s, they also fully proved their usefulness during the consolidation of the regimes and the relaxation of repressive practices. Voluntary correspondents – some of whom became professional journalists – maintained their special status as careful observers of the Socialist constructions consolidation process. The consumer goods supply, transport, alimentation, the construction of new homes, leisure, the introduction of new products, the education of the young generation, justice, production rates or thematic competitions were common subjects amongst the correspondence received by the „Scântea” newspaper from vigilant readers.

Cristian VASILE, *Studying the History of Romanian Communism at the „N. Iorga” History Institute (1989-2011)*

This paper shed more light on the historical research which covered the history of communism in Romania after 1989; preeminently the article describes the activities and the academic biographies of some historians mainly from „Romania and Europe in XXth Century” Research Program who focused on the study of post-war Romania, USSR, and Eastern Europe. On the other hand, one underlined the fact that studying the History of Romanian communism at the „N. Iorga” History Institute was not the monopoly of the aforementioned Research Program; some historians specializing in Medieval and Modern studies chose also to cover important issues of recent history, particularly the history of communist regime. Finally, one tried to analyze the post-1989 historiographical context in which „N. Iorga” History Institute’s researchers worked, mainly in comparison with the better-financed governmental agencies such as INMER (National Institute for the Memory of Romanian Exile), and ICCMER (The Institute for the Investigation of the Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile).

Simion GHEORGHIU, *Transylvania in the Soviet Planning (1939-1946)*

The purpose of this study is to underline the policy of the Soviet Union towards Romania and Hungary, two countries included in the hegemonic sphere of Moscow after the Second World War.

The Soviet documents showed that the USSR wanted to offer Romania a compensation for the loss of Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina. Therefore, the Peace Treaty from the 10th of February 1947 stated the entire repossession of the Northern Transylvania by Romania, in this way being consecrated the postwar border between Romania and Hungary.

Raul DENIZE, *Egon Bahr's Memorandums during the Grand Coalition (1967-1969)*

This article examines Egon Bahr's activity during the Great Coalition of the late sixties. While working for the Federal Foreign Office, Bahr became the author of several important memorandums about the European security issue and Germany's place in Europe. He considered himself a realist and believed that in order to surpass the status quo one first needed to accept it. His views were greatly influenced by events such as the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia and his recommendations paved the way for the „new eastern policy“ implemented from 1969.