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Romania

Research into the communist past of Romania which aims to highlight what has been referred to as cultural opposition must overcome a triple handicap as compared to similar research on circumstances in other former communist countries, in particular the former Yugoslavia or the countries of the Visegrád group. The first handicap concerns the poverty of dissent and opposition to the former dictatorial regime in this country, which implicitly means that previous research on this topic is scarce. The second derives from the conflict between the concept of cultural opposition, which the COURAGE project proposes, and the existing discourse on dissent and opposition during the communist period in Romania, which has already been established as the canon of remembering the recent national past. The third originates in the methodology of the project, which measures acts of cultural opposition in accordance with the existing collections which have preserved their material or digital remnants. The preservation of such items involved greater risks, perceived or real, in communist Romania, so very few individuals ventured to collect such materials systematically, while only very few state institutions have been involved in such ventures, apart from the ubiquitous secret police, the Securitate. This chapter illustrates how the research on Romania conducted within the framework of the COURAGE project made a virtue out of necessity, overcame these handicaps, and uncovered previously unknown collections which shed new light on the mental horizon of the silent mass of citizens who quietly embraced other ideas and values than those imposed on them by the party state. Of the collections which were discovered, only those which were underpinned by values and ideas compatible with the legacy of the European Enlightenment have been made the subject of this research. The individuals involved in their creation and conservation were never courageous enough to become heroes of the anti-communist and democratic opposition. Most of them have not been canonized as such in historical writings on the recent past, for they were not necessarily instrumental in the regime change of 1989. However, they constitute the critical mass which was crucial in supporting the transition to democracy and Romania’s integration into the European Union, I argue, since they understood well before the regime change the difference between dictatorship and democracy.
The poverty of political dissent under the communist regime in Romania represents a handicap in the research on the more widely defined notion of cultural opposition not only because there is little existing research to build upon, but also because any inquiry concerning the pre-1989 past has to deal with the obvious question: why was Romania different? Since the early 1990s, public intellectuals in the country have exonerated themselves of any responsibility for their passivity under communism by arguing that the act of defying the former regime differed in Romania precisely because they were not political, but cultural. More precisely, intellectuals in Romania maintained that their specific way of opposing the former regime was so-called “resistance through culture,” the only possible strategy under a regime which made extensive use of the secret police to silence any political opponents. Resistance through culture represented, according to one leading proponent of this concept, a model of opposition which “hampered the systematic and total destruction of culture, sticking to the idea that only the spirit can ensure the survival of a historically menaced country.”

This concept became a prominent element of the post-1989 public discourses, exerted an insidious influence on collective memory and shaped professional reconstructions of the recent past to such an extent that it became the cornerstone of the dominant narrative on Romanian communism. This explanation was also transnationally promoted, so it made the Securitate famous worldwide for its appalling methods, ranking third among the former communist secret police organizations after the KGB and Stasi. The self-mocking response to this tragic vision on resistance through culture added its grain of salt to the debate, but without challenging the centrality of the concept in the canonization of the communist past: “We were good professionals. […] We were not against institutions in a militant way, but we did our best to remain in their shadow. […] Later we found out that this was ‘resistance through culture.’ At the time, we did not know. We were simply having a good time.”

Following the counterargument above, the COURAGE research in Romania distanced itself from the existing canon of historical writing on the communist past in order to highlight the novelty of its approach. Accordingly, resistance through culture, as conceived by intellectuals in Romania, and the cultural opposition, as researched and defined within the framework of this project, do not overlap. Rather, they conflict in the very use of central concepts in the economy of the COURAGE project, such as collection, culture, and opposition. First, resistance through culture represents above all a discourse on the past which highlights the (post-communist) anti-communist attitude of its proponents. It is not necessarily supported by material or digital evidence, but by the public prestige
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and influence of those who articulated this discourse. Cultural opposition refers exclusively to collections which preserved material or digital evidence of thinking and action which conflicted even in an oblique way with the ideas and values promoted and imposed by the former regime. Second, while resistance through culture refers exclusively to high culture and the thin stratum of public intellectuals, cultural opposition includes a wide range of activities, because it adopts the broader definition of culture that is currently used in cultural studies. Third, resistance through culture was defined after 1989 as an activity not openly against the former regime, yet at best tolerated, if not repressed, which represented a strategy of avoiding any discussion of collaboration with the Securitate, though many such resisters had been engaged in this kind of collaboration before 1989. Against this static (self-)view, cultural opposition is defined as a dynamic stance, because it acknowledges that individuals living under a dictatorship crossed borders more often than not from repressed to tolerated and even to supported, while people who initially enjoyed support could fall into disgrace at any time. In short, the existing concept of resistance through culture in Romania and the new concept of cultural opposition, which this chapter seeks to define in the case of this country, differ in regard to the existence of collections as supporting evidence, the adopted definition of culture as representing a system of shared meanings and everyday practices, and the idea of opposition to the former regime as variable in time.

On the road to the discovery of collections of cultural opposition in Romania, the following working definition guided the field research: collections of material or digital items which preserve traces of past actions or discourses that illustrate the existence of a critical, alternative, non-conformist, independent thinking in relation to the system of ideas and values imposed by the party state at a given moment (since the latter underwent recurrent changes). These collections must reflect a systematic activity of conservation rather than an occasional one, which was carried out in Romania or in exile for the purpose of creating a transnational link with an activity of cultural opposition in the country. These collections must refer to activities from before 1989, but they could have been created even after 1989 for the purpose of preserving the publicly suppressed but privately preserved memory of the communist period (in particular that of the repressive measures taken in the late 1940s and the 1950s). These collections could deal not only with officially prohibited or marginalized activities, but also with tolerated or even supported activities, as long as these conflicted partly with the official system of meanings. These collections could be a separate assembly of items, preserved for their historical significance as part of the cultural heritage which the members of cultural opposition created, but they could be part of larger collections, created with a different purpose than to preserve valuable traces of non-conformism. The

latter are the so-called ad hoc collections, which the COURAGE researchers redefined by selecting only those items which illustrate thinking which differed, consciously or not, from the official vision. This is primarily, yet not exclusively, the case of the ad hoc collections from the former secret police archives, which in Romania represent the largest category of collections of cultural opposition, though they hardly can be said to have been made the subject of adequate study.

The COURAGE research in this country started from the openly confrontational discourses and activities, the direct collisions with the communist authorities, which were already known but essential to the overall picture of cultural opposition in Romania. This category includes political dissent, which found manifestation in two separate waves, first immediately after the communist takeover and then prior to the regime change. In the methodological framework of the project, the former category is reflected in collections which were created after 1989 for the purpose of preserving the memory of the innocent victims of the repression and of those who organized armed resistance in the mountains in the hopes of carrying on guerrilla warfare. Several collections of oral history interviews conserve this significant part of the collective memory, which was of prime importance in the first stage of the transition, when the open discussions on a formerly taboo topic such as the crimes of the communist regime marked the break with the non-democratic past and gave expression to the desire to build a democratic future. Of such collections, the most important are those of the Sighet Memorial,7 which preserves not only post-1989 testimonies, but also an impressive number of artefacts in a former place of detention for political prisoners that was turned into a major site of European remembrance.8 As for political dissent prior to the regime collapse, the most significant collection is the Memorial of the Revolution in Timișoara. This collection of artefacts related to the popular revolt of 1989, which spread from Timișoara to Bucharest and ultimately led to the regime change, highlights that the communist regimes never ceased to use violence against citizens; in the case of Romania, the Revolution of 1989 resulted in 1,100 deaths and 3,300 casualties.9

Prior to the unexpected collapse of communism, open confrontations and direct collisions with the regime represented individual endeavors more than they did collective protests, and they usually were met with harsh repressive measures by the secret police. The best known case of a collective act against Ceaușescu’s regime is that of the so-called Goma Movement, which generated a substantial collection of documents in the former secret police
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As for individual cases of defiance, a few private collections preserved by former dissidents are worth mentioning, most notably by Doina Cornea\(^{11}\) and Éva Gyimesi-Cske,\(^{12}\) to refer only to two examples of prominent personalities in the field of culture who also managed to challenge Ceaușescu’s regime politically for a longer period. Both constitute rare cases when collections created by members of cultural opposition can be compared with the collections created by the secret police about them, because the latter survived until the belated and contested transfer of files to CNSAS (the Romanian acronym for the National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives), the post-communist institution entrusted with the preservation, screening, and study of the Securitate documents. Most former political dissidents preserved almost nothing of their activities, so only the CNSAS collections include something about them. At the same time, the secret police must have destroyed the files of many dissidents still active in 1989. Thus, some cases of open confrontation and direct collision with the former dictatorial regime can be reconstructed only from the pre-1989 transnational network of support. This is reflected in the diaspora collections, gathered either by those who worked for the Romanian desks of Western broadcasting agencies, such as Radio Free Europe or Voice of America, or by those who supported publications, organizations, and associations of the exile community. Examples of the first type in Romania include the Michael Shafir Collection\(^{13}\) at Cluj County Library, the Mircea Carp Collection at BCU Cluj-Napoca,\(^{14}\) the Mihnea Berindei Collection at the National Archives Iași,\(^{15}\) and of the second, the collections held in the custody of the Institute for the Study of the Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Exile.\(^{16}\)

Alongside these already known cases of open confrontation and direct collision with the communist regime, the broader definition of the COURAGE project discovered a wide range of forms of non-conformism among people active in various professions and occupations. These were tolerated and even supported types of opposition which included alternative forms of thinking and acting that only partially conflicted with the official views. Their practi-
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tioners were able to survive professionally and even get support by presenting their endeavors as fully in compliance with the value system of the regime in that given moment by downplaying the aspects that might have been inconvenient. Representatives of this category carried out a wide spectrum of cultural oppositional activities, ranging from literary works which bypassed censorship to samizdat and tamizdat publications, from visual arts to independent journalism, and from religious activism to folk culture. They followed different strategies of pursuing a professional career which by-passed the system. The most radical form was to ignore completely the state institutions and live as a freelance intellectual, as reflected in the Adrian Marino Collection of books, manuscripts, and correspondence gathered by this literary critic who survived professionally without any institutional affiliation.

This was possible due to the transnational connections which he maintained in order to get support for scholarships and backing for publication abroad and the instrumental help of the secret police, which allowed him to travel outside Romania in exchange of providing information, while others never received an exit visa.

Beside this rare case, there were the artistic and creative occupations which enjoyed greater freedom of expression than those which required regular employment in a state institution. In communist Romania, writers, artists, composers, and cinematographers were organized in professional associations which were responsible for organizing the distribution and retribution of their works. For example, the Writers’ Union paid royalties for the published books but also administered a special fund from which writers could contract huge loans. Thus, many writers were willing to produce works consistent with the official ideology as formulated by Ceaușescu’s famous Theses of July 1971 and even to collaborate with the secret police, while playing to be dissidents. However, many others resisted the temptation to comply and tried their best to maintain their independent thinking and their connections with literary trends abroad. This was easier for people who belonged to the German minority, as they could draw inspiration from contemporary Austrian and German literature, as the CNSAS ad hoc collection related to the Aktionsgruppe Banat illustrates. Romanian writers who tried to resist conformism practiced a strategy of writing phrases with double meanings, which apparently were banal, but which could also be read as critical statements about the communist regime and its policies. The epitome of this strategy was Ana Blandiana’s poem for children entitled “Arpagic,” seemingly about a tomcat
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that was praised by everyone, in which astute readers could recognize a skillfully disguised criticism of Ceaușescu’s personality cult.\textsuperscript{21} The Dan Petrescu Private Collection\textsuperscript{22} includes books with hidden meanings which bypassed censorship but were withdrawn from bookshops after their messages were decoded. Authors engaged in this risky adventure of publishing non-conformist books due to existence of a parallel literary canon, which literary critics in exile created and maintained through their programs at Radio Free Europe.\textsuperscript{23} Their role in offering an alternative legitimacy to those whom the regime marginalized is illustrated by the Monica Lovinescu-Virgil Ierunca Collection,\textsuperscript{24} now preserved in the National Archives of Romania.

It was more difficult to create art collections that could be associated with a form of cultural opposition because the official market for such works was regulated by the Artists’ Union, which paid the authors whose works had been accepted and then distributed their works to museums. Because of this quota system and the systematic marginalization of avantgarde or experimental works, there are few contemporary art collections in the same institution. The Art Museums in Timișoara\textsuperscript{25} and Brașov\textsuperscript{26} include such collections, due to the existence of local non-conformist artists whose works were not directly confrontational with the communist aesthetics. The post-communist Museum of Contemporary Art in Bucharest could only retrospectively reunite many of the works of art which were kept on the periphery under communism.\textsuperscript{27} Private contemporary art collections were far more difficult to create due to the price barrier, yet the Sorin Costina Collection is worth mentioning because the owner’s passionate devotion helped many marginalized artists survive when no museum wanted to include their non-conformist works.\textsuperscript{28}

Other types of visual arts, which were less costly because they were easier to duplicate or make in many copies (such as drawings and caricatures) survived more easily in the collections of their creators. Perhaps the most notorious are the collections preserved by Imre Baász, an illustrator who chose experimentalism to refresh the dogmatic art of the communist period,\textsuperscript{29} and Mihai Stănescu, a caricaturist who remains famous for his witty drawings which captured the absurdity of Ceaușescu’s policies.\textsuperscript{30} Even less significant is the production of non-conformist films. In fact, only four cinematic narra-
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tives are known to have been banned in communist Romania, two of them by
the same director, and paradoxically, three in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{31} The activity in the-
atre and film of the most interdicted and simultaneously most internationally
acclaimed Romanian director of the time is reflected by the secret police files
gathered in the Lucian Pintilie Ad Hoc Collection.\textsuperscript{32}

Compared to the artistic and creative occupations, professions which re-
quired full employment in a state institution had even fewer liberties. Profes-
sionals in these fields could only take advantage of the inconsistences in the
official views to pursue their research interests. They sometimes even received
supplementary financial support from the local authorities, which had more
liberty than the central authorities. Among the collections which reflect this
type of bargaining two are preserved by the ASTRA Museum in Sibiu: the
Cornel Irimie Collection,\textsuperscript{33} and the Ethnographic Research in Dobrogea Ad
Hoc Collection.\textsuperscript{34} Both include documentation about the rural cultural heri-
tage that was saved from the total destruction to which the modernization
drive of the communist regime condemned it by presenting remnants of the
peasant architecture as landmarks of national identity. Masking their profes-
sional interests in the nationalist arguments which the regime promoted, eth-
nographers were able to bend the system and pursue activities which can be
evaluated as forms of cultural opposition against the distorted communist
version of modernization.\textsuperscript{35} In the same category is the collection related to
the Black Church Restoration, which is held in the Library and Archive of this
parish community in Brașov. This collection tells the complex story of a Goth-
ic monument of tremendous significance to the collective identity of the Sax-
on community in Transylvania, which was restored to its former glory under
communism despite the atheist system of values and the policy of so-called of
“systematization of urban and rural settlements.” The latter meant massive
demolitions in urban areas, including the razing of Romania’s historical and
architectural heritage, and it hit many cities hard, above all Bucharest, where
professionals reacted by carrying out an unusual activity of cultural opposi-
tion: the relocation of churches to less visible locations. This operation saved
several historical monuments from total destruction and required considera-
ble inventiveness on the part of the engineers, who found a way not to diso-
bev orders directly, but rather to moderate their consequences by proposing
tolerated solutions.\textsuperscript{36}
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The demolitions in Bucharest and other cities also triggered the most significant activity of passive clandestine resistance to Ceaușescu’s absurd policies. Unlike professionals who tried to bend the rules from the inside of the state institutions, those who pursued this type of cultural opposition opted for a dual strategy, a kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde approach. While pursuing their professional careers within tolerated boundaries, they acted in their spare time totally independently and immortalized on photo, film, or in paintings historic monuments that were about to be destroyed. Examples of this kind of resistance include the materials in the Alexandru Barnea Private Collection of Photographs, which includes images of vanished urban landscapes and demolition sites, and the Gheorghe Leahu Private Collection, which preserves the owner’s watercolors capturing architectural landmarks and ordinary streets of Bucharest before they were completely razed. In fact, most professionals in the fields of history or the social sciences adopted the same kind of dual strategy. The most interesting example, due to its post-communist societal impact, is the Zoltán Rostás Private Collection of Oral History, which illustrates the transformation of a passion that developed before 1989 in the grey zone of tolerance into a profession after 1989. His interviews, which capture the multicultural dimension of Bucharest, were conducted outside the world of his daily job, and he had little or no hope of ever being able to use it to develop professionally, since the stories he collected contradicted the official homogenizing vision of the party state. Yet this collection, which also preserved the memory of the school of sociology that was destroyed by the communist regime, made a decisive contribution to the institutionalization of oral history in post-1989 Romanian scholarly life.

The collections created by representatives of the Hungarian community living in Romania definitely deserve separate discussion. While the official ideology always spoke of “Romanians, Hungarians, Germans, and other nationalities” as if they lived together in harmony, the quietly institutionalized policies of Ceaușescu’s regime endangered the cultural of minority groups, in particular of the Hungarians living in Transylvania. It is often argued that anything created by the members of minority groups should be considered an act of cultural opposition to a communist regime that attempted to homogenize society by erasing cultural difference. However, as stated in the introduction, the COURAGE research in Romania considers only non-conformist discourses and activities that were also consistent with democratic values, and it applies this principle to the majority group of the Romanians and the minori-
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ty groups of the Hungarians and Germans. Accordingly, the most noteworthy collections are those which include the samizdat publications produced by members of the Hungarians in Transylvania, Ellenpontok (Counterpoints) and Kiáltó Szó (Screaming word). Both collections are preserved by individuals who contributed decisively to their content and dissemination. In Gothenburg, the Tóth Private Collection\(^4\) includes the largest number of items related to Counterpoints and the beginnings of the struggle to enlarge the concept of civil rights from a definition exclusively based on the individual to one that includes collective rights as a fundamental legal instrument in the protection of minority groups.\(^4\) The latter collection, which is preserved in Cluj-Napoca, represents a subsequent stage in this struggle for the recognition of minority rights as a tool against the discriminatory policies of Ceaușescu’s regime.

The ethno-cultural diversity of Romania is also reflected in the diversity of its religious communities, which the communist regime did not openly persecute, with the exception of the suppression of the Greek Catholic community by forceful integration into the Greek Orthodox Church. Church attendance, however, was heavily discouraged, so simple attendance at a Sunday mass and the organization of a baptism or a religious marriage represented non-conformist acts of the everyday life, which defied the atheist regime and had negative consequences for people’s professional careers. The collections of cultural opposition corresponding to the Catholic or Calvinist denominations of the Hungarian minority are to be found either in the archives of the secret police or the archives of ecclesiastical institutions, such is the Áron Márton Collection from the Archiepiscopal Archives in Alba Iulia, or in the János Dobri Collection from the Archives of the Calvinist Parish Church of Dâmbov Rotund (Cluj).\(^4\) Similarly, the activities of the Lutheran community of the Germans in Romania are preserved in the collections held by the Teutsch Haus in Sibiu, and in the Archives of CNSAS.\(^4\) The archives of the former secret police are extremely important in any assessment of the resistance of the religious groups which are characteristic of the Romanian majority, including the clandestine activities of the suppressed Greek Catholics and the alternative groups created by the Greek Orthodox denomination,\(^4\) which had no other alternative repositories to conserve traces of their activities. These collections illustrate that many hierarchs tried to defend religious education against the atheist state, endeavored to maintain rituals and save or conserve Church properties. In comparison, conspicuously absent are protests on the part of the hierarchs of the Romanian Greek Orthodox Church against the systematic destruction of their churches, which included fine examples of late
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medieval and early modern architecture. However, for many people, religion was an escape into a parallel world that survived on the periphery of the society and became central only at Easter and Christmas, which most individuals celebrated quietly with family members.

Parallel worlds of non-conformism existed for a limited time during holidays and more generally during people’s spare time. The Andrei Partoș – Radio Vacanța Costinești Private Collection exemplifies the work of a seasonal radio station and its associated activity on the Black Sea coast, which represented a crucible of the alternative culture of the younger generation. This radio station, in fact an amplification station that only broadcast via loudspeakers within the bounds of the Costinești resort, had only a limited audience, but this allowed broadcasting without prior censorship, which would have been obligatory routine procedure in a “normal” radio station. Diverse activities related to the theatre, film, music, and sports were held during the summer holidays in Costinești, but the most peculiar were several highly unconventional competitions, including for instance an ironic contest which involved sitting for 48 hours on a post. The contest was a way of ridiculing the useless and faked communist records. In addition, clandestinely procured Western music made young people forget about restrictions in their everyday lives and act as if the communist regime did not exist. Interestingly, this seasonal activity was quietly supported by Ceaușescu’s son, who preferred an alternative lifestyle and thus was present for and supported many of the activities in Costinești. Similarly, the mountains represented a space of liberty, where social conventions and political control ceased to exist for a while. The Anonymous Mountaineer Collection of self-made escalade materials and other technical equipment for alpinism demonstrates the creativity of those who wanted to climb the mountains but lacked the necessary items. As Romanian state factories did not produce equipment for leisure alpinism, but only for military purposes, people with a passion for climbing had to make a wide range of items, such as ice axes, crampons, and pitons, by copying Western catalogues and risking their lives with untested materials for the sake of a hobby which allowed them to feel free for a while. Finally, the Irina Margareta Nistor Private Collection shows how everyday spare time was transformed into a time of liberty. This collection reminds one of the Western films that were introduced clandestinely into Romania between 1985 and 1989 and which were then translated, dubbed and then distributed on video cassettes (semi)clandestinely. This chain of activities emerged in reaction to the reduction of the official television program to just two hours per day and to news
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about Ceauşescu and the Romanian Communist Party. It is worth noting that this type of cultural opposition was lucrative, and this dissemination scheme allowed many to enrich themselves. It is also worth mentioning that this activity required the silent support of the secret police, without which such a large-scale endeavor could not have survived for several years, so this collection exemplifies the tacit deals that existed among the people who were once engaged in acts that can be considered forms of cultural opposition and the representatives of the communist regime. Several private collections of posters, LPs, and photographs related to jazz, rock, punk, and other non-conformist music which was performed in student clubs also offer testimony to the ways in which spare time became a temporary moment of liberty, most notably the Mihai Manea and Nelu Stratone Private Collections.

The above cartography of collections which reflect non-conformist thoughts and actions is inevitably incomplete, but it suggests a large variety of activities which can be grouped under the umbrella of cultural opposition and thus offers a sense of the practical meanings of this concept in the Romanian context. Three main conclusions can be drawn from this sketch. First, the collections which were the focus of COURAGE research in Romania are highly polarized in terms of ownership. The largest group of collections was created and preserved by the former communist secret police, the Securitate, and are currently in the custody of CNSAS. The secret police carried out systematic efforts to collect information about and confiscate items from prominent members of groups involved in what the project refers to as cultural opposition. This activity of collecting had a different rationale than merely preserving items for their historic, intellectual, or artistic value, so the largest majority of the CNSAS collections are ad hoc, as defined by the COURAGE researchers. In fact, many non-conformist activities left no traces in any collections, so they can only be documented on the basis of CNSAS ad hoc collections like the ones identified within the framework of the project from the larger archive of the former secret police, and for the purpose of offering a guide for further research on cultural opposition. At the other end of the spectrum, there are the private collections of cultural opposition. These collections are conserved by individuals who have not hitherto been associated with an activity worthy of study, and the collections have been featured for the first time as valuable sources for the study of communism in Romania within the framework of the COURAGE project. Between these two extremes, there are a few collections of cultural opposition operated by libraries, museums, or other archives which received them as donations from private individuals. Worth underlining is
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the absolute novelty of the private collections of cultural opposition discovered by the COURAGE project, which were not part of the canon of remembering communism in Romania, so relevant institutions ignored their importance, while their owners are rather reluctant to donate their collections for the same reason. The direct consequence of this situation is that the private collections remain of very limited, primarily local interest, while the CNSAS collections became nationally and internationally relevant, especially after serving as primary source for the Report made in 2006 by the Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania.52 This dichotomic cartography of the collections might be criticized as simplistic, as it obviously duplicates the long-contested view that the communist societies were separated between “them” and “us,” between those in power and those who were powerless. The collections in Romania, however, more or less fit this view because there were no mediating structures between the individual and the secret police, as no networks of dissent and only a few short-lived groups who represented forms of cultural opposition acted against Ceaușescu’s regime, not one of which was still active in 1989.

The polarization between the secret police collections and the private collections is directly connected to the second significant conclusion that can be inferred from the research carried out in this project. The chronological cornerstones of the two main types of collections do not coincide. For the secret police, the main chronological markers are 1956 and 1977. The first obviously refers to the Hungarian Revolution and its echoes in Romania. It was this event in the neighboring country that triggered a wave of terror which hit intellectual circles from all ethno-cultural communities. The Noica-Pillat Trial Ad Hoc Collection at CNSAS is only the most famous such case due to the renown of those involved, but there were several other arbitrarily defined oppositional groups which the secret police created to serve as deterrents.53 The second cornerstone for the secret police was 1977, the year in which an ephemeral movement for human rights emerged in Romania on the model of Charter 77 to grow in two months to the same number of supporters. Illustrated by the Goma Movement Ad Hoc Collection at CNSAS,54 the activities of the secret police and the implicit creation of related collections entered a new phase with this unprecedented challenge. Unlike the groups which emerged in the aftermath of 1956, this movement was not a creation of the Securitate, which had to gather complex data rapidly about each individual involved for the purpose of breaking a collective protest for a common cause into a multitude of personal ventures with personal motives.55 Contrary to a prevalent
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commonplace, the subsequent collections of the secret police illustrate that the methods used against those who did not comply hardly differed from the Romanian majority to the minority groups, in spite of the fact that the files were archived according to the ethnic origins of those involved. As for the chronological cornerstones of the collections created by the members of cultural opposition, they are related to 1964, the year of in which all political prisoners were released, as the Adrian Marino Collection illustrates. In the case of Romania, 1968 represents a conspicuous absence as a turning point for the opposition, because 1968 as it was experienced by Romanians differed strikingly from 1968 as it was experienced by the other countries of the Eastern Bloc because of Ceaușescu’s skillful use of the invasion of Czechoslovakia to capitalize politically and gain unprecedented popular support. However, some private collections related to the preservation of the cultural diversity of youth subcultures, such as the Mihai Manea and Nelu Stratone Collections, emerged around the late 1960s and early 1970s, while the official cultural policies of the regime became increasingly harsh, especially after their recodification in Ceaușescu’s Theses of July 1971. The following chronological cornerstone is again not a year, but a period, that of the first half of the 1980s, when a variety of arbitrary measures caused silent but steadily growing societal resistance from among majority and minority communities, although there was hardly any cross-ethnic collaboration. Once Gorbachev came to power in 1985, a definite turn occurred among the members of the cultural opposition, which not only grew in number, but also changed their goals from past-oriented collections meant to preserve the pre-communist values into future-oriented collections meant to make changes for the better, as the Marian Zulean Private Collection\textsuperscript{56} suggests.

This leads to the third conclusion that can be drawn from the research carried out in Romania. Trying to respond to the problems common to all European societies that experienced communist dictatorships and are still in a wavering process of democratic consolidation, the COURAGE research identified some of the silent agents of change who were instrumental in re-Europeanizing Romania. Their previously unknown collections of material or digital items bear witness today to the diverse forms of critical thinking and action which were independent from the system of meanings imposed by the former communist dictatorship. Neither heroes nor mere opportunists, these “common” individuals simply refused to think and act in ways that would have harmonized entirely with the values that the communist regimes sought to impose because they let themselves be influenced by the values of the European Enlightenment from before the regime change of 1989. Thus, these individuals understood before others the fundamental difference between a dictatorship and a democracy. Sometimes without realizing this, after 1989

they turned into the social segment which actively contributed to Romania’s transformation into a democracy that remained feeble but was not called into question. At macro-societal level, some of the members of former cultural opposition people were instrumental in triggering public debates on the communist past, and more importantly, they constantly pressed for the application of transitional justice and the opening of the Securitate files, as the Ion Monoran Collection\textsuperscript{57} illustrates. These individuals marked the break with the communist past. At the mezzo-societal level, many of those who refused to adopt the value system of the communist regime were active in redefining professional fields or modelling new institutions by copying Western models and adapting them to the local context, as suggested by the Alexandru Barnea or Zoltán Rostás Collections, along with many other private collections. These individuals definitely marked the post-1989 societal transformation in the direction of democratic consolidation. At the micro-societal level, all the non-conformists of yesterday, who conserved collections illustrating their efforts to think and act as if in a free country while under a ruthless dictatorship, created invaluable sources which will contribute to a more nuanced grasp of the communist past. Their legacy is for members of generations to come, who perhaps will be better able to understand the difference between a democratic and a non-democratic system after having familiarized themselves with the exciting stories uncovered by the \textsc{COURAGE} project.
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