

COURAGE

Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries

Country Reports



MOLDOVA

Author
Andrei Cusco

Regensburg 2018



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 692919.

About the author

Andrei Cusco is Associate Professor at the Department of History and Geography of the “Ion Creangă” State Pedagogical University in Chişinău, Republic of Moldova, and Researcher at the “A. D. Xenopol” Institute of History of the Romanian Academy in Iaşi, Romania
andreicusco@yahoo.com

To quote this report:

Andrei Cusco: “Moldova”, COURAGE Country Reports. Regensburg, November 2018, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.24389/cr-moldova>

Table of Content

1. Introduction: Shifting Attitudes to the Communist Past after 1991	4
2. Context.....	5
2.1. Research Trends and Historical Policy in Moldova after 2009	5
2.2. Institutional and Legal Framework	12
3. The COURAGE Collections: Typology, Topics and Actors . Hiba! A könyvjelző nem létezik.	
4. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations	18
Summary.....	21
Bibliography.....	22
Appendix.....	23

1. Introduction: Shifting Attitudes to the Communist Past after 1991

In the first years following the dissolution of the USSR, coherent attempts were made in newly independent Moldova to radically revise the attitude toward the Soviet past and to rethink the country's history through the prism of the "national paradigm." The sphere of official symbols and the public space were mostly "nationalized" relatively quickly and without significant resistance. These tendencies were expressed in several concrete forms, including: 1) the removal of most Soviet-era monuments or their transfer to special depositories, out of the public eye. This was applied, first of all, to the statues of V. I. Lenin and of other Soviet leaders. However, this process did not uniformly affect all Moldova's regions (e.g., the Soviet monuments were preserved in the Gagauz autonomous region in the south of the country). At the same time, some monuments associated with the Soviet past were left standing even in the republic's capital (e.g., the monument of the 'Komsomol heroes' or the statues commemorating the 'revolutionary fighters' Sergei Lazo and Grigorii Kotovskii); 2) the "de-communization" of the public space, which found its expression in the massive renaming of streets and institutions and in the gradual displacement of the Soviet "places of memory" from the broader public sphere. In contrast to the Ukrainian case, the symbolic "nationalization" of space did not result in a wave of protests and public discontent. The new nomenclature, heavily borrowed from the Romanian national canon, did not resonate with a large part of Moldova's population, both in the case of the majority Romanian-speakers and in that of the national minorities. The latter group, in particular, perceived the new names as 'foreign' and were unable to decipher their symbolic meaning. A concrete example concerns the elements of the purported continuity of the Romanian ethnicity on Moldova's current territory symbolized by the use of ancient Roman names and notions referring to the time of Dacia's conquest by the Romans while renaming streets, schools, public institutions etc. The same applied to the "symbolic rehabilitation" of little-known militants of the Moldovan national movement from the late 19th and early 20th century. The majority of the population perceived these innovations either neutrally or with outright indifference; 3) the radical revision of educational programs and curricula, particularly in the field of the humanities and social sciences.

On the whole, however, Moldova was very slow to move towards confronting its communist past since proclaiming its independence 27 years ago. Although some initial legal redress for the victims of Soviet-era repressions was undertaken during the early 1990s, when the interest for reclaiming the suppressed memory of the communist regime was high on the public agenda, no political action followed. Politicians were either avoiding sensitive issues due to their association with the former regime or citing low public interest to justify their reluctance to effectively engage with the communist past. The political stalemate was matched by a clear lack of interest and apathy of the public. Demand for open access to the files of the secret police was almost non-existent, aside from the occasional private initiatives and low-intensity lobbying promoted by victims' groups or professional associations (notably, the National Association of Historians). The main political stakeholders also had a shifting attitude to the communist past. The Declaration of Independence,

passed by the Moldovan Parliament on August 27, 1991, referred to the “liquidation of the political and legal consequences” of the Soviet-German “conspiracy” of August 23, 1939¹ and to the “illegal state of occupation” of the Republic of Moldova by the Soviet Union, starting from 1940/44 (the parallels with the context of the Baltic countries are obvious).² However, these radical tendencies did not lead to any corresponding sweeping political decisions. Moldova’s “transition” can be best described in terms of a gradual movement toward a compromise between the moderate elements of the “Old Regime” and the moderates within the nationalist opposition. Another important event occurring in this period (with long-term political impact) was the reemergence of the Party of Communists, which was based on a platform of communist “re-foundation.” Although the “national question” was the main point of contention on the Moldovan political landscape in the 1990s, after the Party of Communists came to power in 2001, it focused its attention on the communist era as well. The symbolism, rituals and rhetoric of the Moldovan Communists continued to effectively employ the Soviet legacy as a foundation for legitimizing their own political identity. If the solemn commemoration of the Soviet founding moments and memorial dates (e.g., November 7th) or Lenin’s glorification had the character of ‘intra-party’ rituals, other elements of the politics of memory promoted by the PCRM directly touched on the public sphere. Thus, a central motive for the symbolic space that the PCRM leadership strove to (re)construct was linked to the ‘Great Patriotic War.’³ The war memorial complexes were perceived as especially significant places of memory, and the war itself was to become a stimulus for “national reconciliation.” On the other hand, the memory of the war was cultivated much more intensively than the memorial practices dedicated to the victims of the communist regime. This emphasized the asymmetry and one-sidedness of the PCRM-supported version of the politics of memory. On the whole, such a policy hardly contributed to the closing of the ‘memorial rupture’ between various groups in Moldovan society, which continued to cultivate starkly opposed visions of the recent past.

2. Context

2.1. Research Trends and Historical Policy in Moldova after 2009

During the 1990s, only fragmentary research was carried out on the late Soviet period. Most scholars focused on the traumatic experiences of mass deportations, famine and collectivization occurring in the late 1940s and early 1950s or discussed the armed insurgency active during the

¹ Here the Declaration implies the provisions of the secret Soviet-German protocol dividing the spheres of influence in Eastern Europe, annexed to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact signed on August 23, 1939.

² Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Moldova. Available at: <http://www.presedinte.md/declaration>. Accessed October 10, 2018.

³ The ‘Great Patriotic War’ was the officially approved designation of the Soviet-German war (22 June 1941- 9 May 1945) during the Soviet period. It was meant to underscore the defensive and genuinely popular character of the hostilities emphasized by the Soviet politics of memory.

same period, thus disproportionately emphasizing the Stalinist era. Some noteworthy oral history projects were undertaken, but the published output was still minimal as of the late 1990s. The prevailing view within the established historiography was that open displays of cultural and political opposition were conspicuously absent in the Moldavian SSR, aside from several isolated cases of critical intellectuals who attempted to articulate an anti-regime message, mainly in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Even undeniable milestones in the Moldovan historiography of the communist period (such as the collection *Cartea Memoriei* [The Book of Memory]⁴, published in the late 1990s and early 2000s in order to inventory, catalogue and record the names of the victims of the Soviet regime) mostly dealt with the active phase of armed resistance. The editors of this collection aimed at a thorough coverage of the whole Soviet period (up to the late 1980s). The smaller proportion of the post-Stalinist victims in this catalogue is a consequence of the decrease in the scale of mass violent repressions after 1953 and cannot be interpreted as an editorial failure. However, this fact cannot entirely justify the lack of interest for the post-1953 period displayed by the Moldovan historiography as a whole, at least up to the early 2000s. This situation was complicated even further by the slow process of the opening of local archives, particularly of specialized depositories holding some of the most extensive materials dealing with cultural opposition activities (e.g., the former KGB Archive, transferred in 1992 under the jurisdiction of the reformed Intelligence and Security Service (SIS) or the Archive of the Ministry of Internal Affairs). Even the in-depth study of the narrowly defined cultural sphere (i.e., the literary and artistic field) and its relations with the regime, including open articulation of criticism and (quasi-)dissident positions, got under way only in the early 2000s. Only certain cases of the relatively few high-profile dissidents (such as Mihai Moroșanu and the Usatiuc-Ghimpu-Graur group) were extensively covered in the media and thus received public attention. However, this seemingly clear-cut picture of the local historiographical consensus gradually underwent a shift, which became noticeable by the early 2000s, when several scholars began systematically examining the late Soviet period in the MSSR. Among the scholarly works focusing on cases of cultural and political dissent and opposition in Soviet Moldavia, one should especially emphasize the monographs, studies and collections of documents produced in recent years by Igor Cașu⁵, Gheorghe E. Cojocaru⁶, Sergiu Musteață⁷, Petru Negură⁸, Valeriu Pasat⁹, Elena Postică¹⁰, and Mihai Tașcă¹¹. This growing historiography benefitted from the gradual opening of previously inaccessible archival collections and from an intensive and fruitful communication with their peers abroad.

These developments in the sphere of scholarship coincided with important changes in the political landscape after 2009, which led to the first and (until this moment) only full-fledged debate on the

⁴ Postică, *Cartea Memoriei*.

⁵ Cașu, "Political Repressions in the Moldavian SSR," 89-127; Musteață and Cașu, *Fără termen de prescripție*.

⁶ Bahnaru and Cojocaru, *Congresul al III-lea al Uniunii Scriitorilor*.

⁷ Musteață, *Basarabeanul bruiat de KGB*.

⁸ Negură, *Nici eroi, nici trădători*.

⁹ Pasat, *Православие в Молдавии: власть, церковь, верующие*.

¹⁰ Postică, *Cartea Memoriei*.

¹¹ Tașcă, „Manifestări de rezistență antisovietică și anticomunistă,” 939-969.

communist regime and its legacy, as well as to the first attempts at institution-building and coherent policy recommendations regarding the communist era. After the previously ruling Party of Communists lost the parliamentary elections of July 2009, a group of Moldovan historians launched the initiative to create a “Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime in Moldova”, a project openly supported by a part of the new governing coalition. The authors of this idea were inspired by the relative success of similar endeavors in other East European countries (e.g., Romania and the Baltic States) and suggested to apply this experience in the Moldovan context. This initiative was supported by Moldova’s acting president, Mihai Ghimpu, who agreed to place the new institution under the aegis of the Presidency (a clear analogy to the Romanian case). In the context of the escalating political crisis throughout 2009 and 2010, caused by the failure of the new governing coalition to elect a president, due to its insufficient parliamentary majority, Ghimpu sought to play the card of a radical historical policy. Although his political weight was not significant enough to impose his vision on the other coalition partners, he tried to follow in the footsteps of the Ukrainian president Viktor Yushchenko by advocating a radical break with the communist past. History in general, and the Soviet legacy in particular, thus became a prominent factor in the ensuing political battles and was used as a potent rhetorical tool to undermine one’s political adversaries.

The Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Totalitarian Communist Regime in the Republic of Moldova was established by a special decree of the interim President of the Republic, Mihai Ghimpu, on 14 January 2010¹². Its mandate was initially limited to a six-month period, expiring on 1 July 2010. In its preamble, the decree referred to the founding acts of Moldovan statehood – the Declaration of Sovereignty, adopted on 23 June 1990, and the Declaration of Independence of 27 August 1991, - which “signified for the Republic of Moldova not only the removal of the communist totalitarian regime, but also a chance for the construction of a democratic society.”¹³ The document strongly emphasized the need to establish “the truth concerning the totalitarian communist regime” and to inform the public “objectively and multilaterally”¹⁴ about its essence. It appealed to two potential precedents in international law: Resolution 1096 (1996) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on measures to dismantle the heritage of the former communist totalitarian systems and Resolution 1481 (2006) on the need for international condemnation of the crimes of totalitarian communist regimes. No details were provided on the chronological framework and the concrete aspects of the former regime’s activities to be investigated. This vagueness later resulted in controversies over the Commission’s mandate, mission and recommendations. The institution was conceived as a “truth commission,” but its relationship to the state authorities was loosely

¹² Decret privind constituirea Comisiei pentru studierea și aprecierea regimului comunist totalitar din Republica Moldova (nr. 165-V, 14 ianuarie 2010) (Decree concerning the creation of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime in the Republic of Moldova), in: *Monitorul Oficial al Republicii Moldova* (Official Bulletin of the Republic of Moldova), Nr. 5-7/ 19. 01. 2010, 3-4.

¹³ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 3.

¹⁴ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 3.

defined: the decree stated only that “the ministries and the other central and local administrative authorities will provide the Commission will all necessary assistance.”¹⁵

The Commission’s mandate, as defined in the decree issued on 14 January 2010, was limited to ‘truth revelation.’ The new institution had the following goals: “to study the documents and materials concerning the activity of the main institutions involved in the establishment and perpetuation of the communist totalitarian regime” while assessing its atrocities and human rights abuses¹⁶; “to inform the public, periodically, on its activity” and results¹⁷; to draft “a study, a collection of documents, and an analytical report regarding the historical and political-legal evaluation of the communist totalitarian regime;”¹⁸ to submit recommendations to the President of the Republic until 1 June 2010.¹⁹ A general provision also allowed the creation of subcommittees (‘working groups’) within the institution. The Commission was supposed to formulate policy proposals that would eventually lead to political and legal consequences, but was not granted any effective instruments to promote their enforcement.

The Commission included thirty members, being one of the largest institutions of its kind in the region. Of its overall membership, two-thirds were academic historians; the other ten members were divided between three lawyers / legal scholars, two political scientists, a linguist, a sociologist, a philosopher, an economist and a prominent writer (the only person without an academic background). The leadership of the Commission consisted exclusively of historians. It was headed by Gheorghe Cojocaru, an expert in 20th-century history, who was close to Acting President Ghimpu by his political views and orientation. One should emphasize the uncertain institutional status of the Commission. This uncertainty was enhanced by the absence of a permanent headquarters and by the lack of state funding. While the latter feature increased the Commission’s potential autonomy vis-à-vis the authorities, it also deprived it of an effective organizational framework. The work format of the Commission was based on monthly general (‘plenary’) sessions and on smaller working meetings, held in subcommittees twice a month.

Most of the Commission’s members were not directly affiliated with political parties, but shared a broad political agenda and consensus on the necessity of a radical break with the communist past. This often led to (partially justified) accusations that “anti-communism” was the main driving force behind the whole project. The public interest for the Commission ebbed and flowed according to the political situation and the immediate concerns of the local actors. The Commission’s leadership (entitled to represent the institution in its dealings with the authorities and the public) launched a vigorous press and PR campaign, which reached its apex during the late winter and spring of 2010. This resulted in a series of regular press conferences, interviews, round tables and TV shows which increased the Commission’s visibility and impact in the local media. The first press conference of the Commission on 18 January was immediately followed by a strongly worded reply from the

¹⁵ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 4.

¹⁶ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 4.

¹⁷ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 4.

¹⁸ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 4.

¹⁹ Decret privind constituirea Comisiei, 4.

Communist leader, Vladimir Voronin, who called the whole project a “stupidity” and a “heresy,”²⁰ viewing the intention of condemning the communist regime as a “slap on the face of those who fought against Fascism.”²¹ This was followed by a concerted attack in the PCRМ-affiliated press against a number of the Commission’s members (mostly senior historians, including the chairman, Gheorghe Cojocaru). They were accused of having actively collaborated with the former regime and of lacking any credibility as moral judges or neutral investigators of the communist past. Finally, the PCRМ attacks culminated with Voronin’s demand (in May 2010) to abolish the Commission, as a first step towards future political negotiations with the authorities for solving the ongoing political crisis.

However, the direct political consequences of the Commission’s work proved to be minimal and were generally not followed by concrete actions. This outcome was to be anticipated, given the unfavorable political conjuncture and the growing discord and controversy among the Moldovan political elite. Due to the limited duration of the Commission’s mandate and its scarce resources, its main achievements were related to the gradual broadening of the access to previously unavailable archival files (including those of the secret police). Its members benefitted from some government assistance (e.g., through the special committee on de-classifying official documents), and they were granted access to previously restricted departmental archives (e.g., the Archive of the Ministry for Internal Affairs, the Archive of the Prosecutor General’s Office and the former NKVD / KGB Archive, now hosted by the Intelligence and Security Service (*Serviciul de Informații și Securitate*, SIS). The access to the relevant documentary collections of the specialized historical archives was significantly improved (although problems persisted). A second dimension of the Commission’s activity concerned the organization of public events for the dissemination of its findings. Several symposia and scholarly conferences were organized (with the participation of international experts). The intermediary results of the Commission’s research were made public on this occasion. Possibilities of institutional consolidation were also discussed with foreign colleagues. Starting from late spring of 2010, the political climate in Moldova became less congenial for the Commission’s activity, while the political pressures increased. This became obvious once the deadline for the submission of the analytical report and the related policy recommendations approached. The initial vagueness of the Commission’s tasks (conflating the academic and policy dimensions, while depriving it of any effective legal tools and financial resources) led to serious limitations placed upon its effectiveness. These weaknesses were aggravated by the short period of its operation (barely four months).

In the closing stages of the preparation of the final report, serious internal disagreements emerged among its members. A group of younger academics with a Western educational background advocated a more neutral and scholarly-oriented report, without obvious value judgments and focusing on the concrete cases of the Soviet regime’s human rights abuses. A more militant faction,

²⁰ Vladimir Voronin, “Osnovnaia tsel’ “komissii Gimpu” - ustranit’ PKRM s politicheskogo polia” (The Basic Aim of “Ghimpu’s Commission” Is to Eliminate the PCRМ from Politics). *OMEGA News Agency*, 19 January 2010. Available at: <http://archive.omg.md/Content.aspx?id=6577&lang=3>, accessed on 20 November 2018.

²¹Voronin, “Osnovnaia tsel’ “komissii Gimpu” - ustranit’ PKRM”, <http://archive.omg.md/Content.aspx?id=6577&lang=3>

supported by the majority of the Commission's members and its chairman, Gheorghe Cojocaru, insisted on a radical anti-communist message and on wide-ranging and comprehensive policy proposals. This controversy resulted in the postponement of the publication of the full report and the drafting of a short (sixteen-page) analytical report summarizing the main "crimes, horrors, atrocities, abuses, and injustices"²² of the communist regime and advancing several recommendations for the state authorities. This text amounted to a barely veiled accusatory act against the Soviet past. The Commission also elaborated several policy recommendations that are an excellent illustration of its version of historical policy. These included the following points: the condemnation of the communist totalitarian regime in Moldova for crimes against humanity, followed by a moral condemnation of their perpetrators; the ban on the use of the term 'communist' for political parties and institutions, as well as the elimination of all Communist and Nazi symbols from the public sphere; the urgent drafting and adoption of the Lustration Law; the complete legal, moral and material rehabilitation of the regime's victims and their descendants; the creation of memorial complexes and museums for the commemoration of the regime's atrocities; the introduction of special 'days of mourning' commemorating the regime's victims and the traumatic pages of the country's history under Soviet rule (deportations etc.); the creation of a special group of experts for the evaluation of the material damage caused by the former regime; the transformation of the former Party Archive into the Archive of the Communist Totalitarian Regime in Moldova, with the transfer of all relevant funds from the departmental archives to the new depository; the creation of an Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism and the elaboration of a school textbook and courses on the history of communism; the organization of special debates on the 'inhuman essence of the totalitarian (Communist and Nazi) regimes'²³ in the mass media etc. This report was submitted to the acting President in late May 2010.

Although the Decree of 14 January 2010 is still valid (meaning that the Commission's period of activity has not officially expired), in fact it suspended its activity as a coherent institution in the late summer of 2010. The initial interest in its work, displayed by the media and a part of Moldovan society, has all but faded. The impact and effectiveness of the Commission's work were limited by several factors, including: the vagueness of its mandate; the short time span of its operation; the lack of effective legal tools (subpoena powers) and the absence of a corresponding legal framework; the limited political support for its work and the tendency of certain political forces to make it instrumental for their own purposes; the under-representation of the civil society and of certain social groups (victims' associations) and ethnic minorities within the Commission; the contradiction between the scholarly and political components of its activity.

²² "Raportul Comisiei pentru studierea și aprecierea regimului comunist totalitar din Republica Moldova" (Report of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime in the Republic of Moldova), *Timpul.md*, 2 July 2010, Available at: <https://www.timpul.md/articol/raportul-comisiei-pentru-studierea-i-aprecierea-regimului-comunist-totalitar-din-republica-moldova-12814.html>, Accessed on 14 November 2018.

²³ "Raportul Comisiei pentru studierea și aprecierea regimului comunist", <https://www.timpul.md/articol/raportul-comisiei-pentru-studierea-i-aprecierea-regimului-comunist-totalitar-din-republica-moldova-12814.html>

However, it achieved several important breakthroughs in the Moldovan context, notably through the opening of previously inaccessible archival (including secret police) files, which amounted to a local “archival revolution,” and the growing public awareness of the nature and consequences of the former regime. Although the height of the public debate on the communist legacy was reached during the active phase of the Commission’s operation in 2010, its long-term role in shifting the attitude of the public opinion toward the Soviet regime should be emphasized. This relative success was achieved on several levels. First, up until 2014, several Moldovan TV channels and radio stations, such as *Jurnal TV*, *Publika TV*, *Moldova 1*, *ALT TV*, *TVC 21*, etc. hosted a series of regular shows presenting the main findings of the Commission and discussing the most prominent cases of anti-communist opposition. A number of the Commission’s members featured as speakers and invited guests, taking advantage of this opportunity to publicize the Commission’s research and recommendations. Another lasting result of the Commission’s activity was the inauguration of a weekly two-page column in one of the leading dailies of that time, *Adevărul*. This column, published between 2010 and 2014 under the title *The Archives of Communism*, was devoted to discussing prominent cases of anti-regime resistance during the Stalinist era, but also extensively reflected upon the post-1953 cultural opposition. The daily *Timpul*, another important newspaper, was also instrumental in disseminating the information collected by the members of the Commission. Second, another significant consequence of the Commission’s activity was the revision of the school history curriculum, implemented as part of its general recommendations to the authorities. The new history textbooks for the ninth and twelfth grade, dealing with the twentieth century, included many of the materials and insights resulting from the Commission’s work and the newly accessible archival sources. These mandatory textbooks, published in 2013 in Romanian and Russian, are still in use. They propose a relatively balanced and comprehensive perspective on the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century, adequately reflecting on both the communist repressive policies and on the Holocaust. By avoiding both the ‘externalization of guilt’ and excessive national victimization, as was the case in other instances in Eastern Europe, these textbooks marked an obvious progress in the sphere of school education regarding the communist past in Moldova.

Although many other recommendations of the Commission were ignored, some of them were eventually put into practice in the political sphere. This point refers to the reemergence of the issue of the communist past in July 2012. One of the coalition partners suggested some legislative changes which boiled down to the ban on the use of the communist symbols and the propagation of the totalitarian ideologies in the Moldovan public sphere. In the informative note, which accompanied the initiative, its authors advocated the necessity of “the condemnation of the illegal acts of the totalitarian regimes: Nazism, Stalinism, Bolshevism (Communism), which committed crimes against humanity via genocide, deportations, organized famine, forced collectivization, political repressions etc.”²⁴ Parliament passed the law on 12 July 2012. The adopted version banned explicitly only the communist symbols, while Nazism did not get a clear mention: “ban the use by the political parties of the symbols of the Communist totalitarian regime (hammer and sickle) and any items carrying

²⁴ Available at http://particip.gov.md/public/documente/131/anexe/ro_1083_NOTA-INFORMATIVA-simboluri-comuniste-05-09-2013.pdf. Accessed October 10, 2018.

these symbols, as well as the propagation of totalitarian ideologies.”²⁵ The Party of Communists challenged the law in the Constitutional Court, claiming that it violated the Constitution of the Republic of Moldova and the constitutional rights to free expression and free association. The Court reached a decision on the case on 4 June 2013, ruling that the law did not correspond to the constitutional norms.²⁶ The tendency to discard the model of the anti-communist historical policy found its embodiment in the decision of the Parliament of 7 May 2015 to repeal the law on the ban of the communist symbols. To this end, Parliament elaborated a bill (quickly passed), which would rehabilitate anyone found guilty of breaking the 2012 law.

Thus, after the brief upsurge of interest toward the communist past during 2010-2012 (mainly due to reasons of political expediency), this topic again disappeared from public view, despite the efforts of professional historians, who did their best to preserve and promote public interest for the Soviet past during the following years, through all the channels available to them. The gradual dwindling of this subject in the public sphere coincided with the curtailing of the freedom of the press, especially after 2014. One of the main reasons for this situation is the total disinterest of political stakeholders, who, aside from occasional opportunities to exploit the subject for instrumental purposes, are reluctant to seriously engage with the communist past and its legacy.

2.2. Institutional and Legal Framework

Contrary to most other countries covered by the COURAGE Project, there is no special institution devoted to the study of the communist past in Moldova. Until the establishment of the Ghimpu Commission in 2010, the efforts to systematically research the communist era were mostly limited to the low-intensity lobbying efforts of specialized victims’ associations (e.g., the Association of Former Political Prisoners) or professional organizations (e.g., the National Association of Historians). In recent years, mainly after 2010, several small research centers affiliated with major educational establishments and specifically dedicated to the study of recent history and the communist experience have emerged. As a relevant example in this regard, I would mention the Center for the Study of Totalitarianism and the Cold War, founded on 9 October 2010 and headed by Igor Cașu, which is affiliated with the History and Philosophy Department of the State University of Moldova. The following topics are among this center’s research priorities: political repressions in the Moldavian SSR (1941/1944 – 1989); everyday life under communism; corruption during the communist period; the memory and legacy of the communist regime.²⁷ Cașu also registered an NGO under the same name to provide a legal cover for his center. Despite its founder’s efforts to systematically research cases of cultural and political opposition in the MSSR during the Soviet era

²⁵ Available at <http://lex.justice.md/md/344744/>. Accessed October 10, 2018.

²⁶ Available at <http://lex.justice.md/md/349032/>. Accessed October 10, 2018.

²⁷ More details are available on the center’s webpage: http://istorie.usm.md/?page_id=2327 . Accessed October 10, 2018.

(also reflected in Igor Cașu's private collection in the COURAGE Registry), its operation is small-scale, while the institutional impact is minimal. Another similar example is the *Pro Memoria* Institute of Social History, an informal research center affiliated with the History and Philosophy Department of the State University of Moldova. Headed by historian Anatol Petrencu, this organization focuses more specifically on issues of collective memory, the commemoration of the victims of the communist regime and certain oral history projects aimed at recuperating the voices of those who suffered under totalitarian and authoritarian rule²⁸. The establishment of both institutions was a direct consequence of the operation of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Regime, in which both Cașu and Petrencu were actively involved. Similarly to the previous example, this institution is rather an "umbrella" for carrying out various research projects than a formal establishment dedicated to the systematic study of the communist regime. Both these institutions lack the necessary funding and personnel, thus underscoring the general lack of interest of the Moldovan authorities and of the wider public for creating specialized research units with a well-defined legal status and adequate resources.

The biggest depositories of materials relating to the communist period are the Moldovan archives and state museums. The status of the country's archival depositories is regulated by the Law on the National Archival Fond of the Republic of Moldova (*Legea privind Fondul Arhivistic Național al Republicii Moldova*), which was passed by the Moldovan Parliament on 22 January 1992 and frequently revised afterwards. According to this law, a special institution for supervising and managing the National Archival Fond was created – the State Archival Service (*Serviciul de Stat de Arhivă*), which became the main state authority responsible for all the archival holdings in Moldova. The law also guaranteed, in principle, the free access of all interested citizens to the archival holdings, provided that the concerned persons "aim at obtaining objective information"²⁹ and are "responsible for the physical integrity"³⁰ of the documents (article 20). However, this presumed freedom of access was immediately curtailed by the provisions of the "legislation concerning the protection of personal data"³¹ (art. 20), as well as by specific restrictions applying to a variety of cases, notably: security threats impinging on the national interest, endangering the physical integrity of the original documents and violating the fundamental rights and freedoms through unauthorized access to personal data (art. 21, p. 2). The same article (art. 21, p. 4) refers to the state secret, the status of classified documents and the procedures for declassifying them, setting a limit of maximum twenty-five years in this regard³². However, throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s,

²⁸ More details on the institution's activity and research profile are to be found at its website: <http://promemoria.md/>. Accessed October 10, 2018.

²⁹ The Law on the National Archival Fond of the Republic of Moldova, in its most recent version, is available at: http://www.arhiva.gov.md/attachments/019_Lege.PDF. Accessed October 10, 2018.

³⁰ The Law on the National Archival Fond, http://www.arhiva.gov.md/attachments/019_Lege.PDF. Accessed October 10, 2018.

³¹ The Law on the National Archival Fond, http://www.arhiva.gov.md/attachments/019_Lege.PDF. Accessed October 10, 2018.

³² The Law on the National Archival Fond, http://www.arhiva.gov.md/attachments/019_Lege.PDF. Accessed October 10, 2018.

the Moldovan authorities abused these clauses, frequently denying access to sensitive sources or to documents from institutional archives.

The main Moldovan archives (represented in the COURAGE Registry) have in fact pursued different approaches in granting access to their collections. For example, the access to the files stored in the Archive of Social-Political Organizations of the Republic of Moldova (*Arhiva Organizațiilor Social-Politice din Republica Moldova*, AOSPRM) is completely free, securing the possibility of unrestricted research of the materials concerning the activity of the local party organizations and professional associations. The National Archive (*Arhiva Națională a Republicii Moldova*, ANRM) has also gradually opened its collections for the interested researchers, especially after the transfer of some important materials relating to notable cases of anti-regime opposition, in 2011. By contrast, due to its institutional specificity, the Archive of the Moldovan Intelligence and Security Service (*Arhiva Serviciului de Informații și Securitate*, SIS) has a stricter policy regarding public access, which is possible following a prolonged bureaucratic procedure and is subject to the approval of the agency's director. Although in principle the archival files dealing with cultural opposition and KGB surveillance can be consulted by interested researchers, access remains difficult. The SIS Archive holds the most comprehensive and representative sample of archival evidence relevant for the topic of anti-Soviet opposition. Therefore, full public access to this category of files would be essential. Initially, access to these materials was only possible because of the activity of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Regime in the Republic of Moldova, which functioned during 2010 and was granted unlimited access to all institutional archives. Despite certain recent efforts to improve the situation, it has not fundamentally changed. Most public operators (archives / museums) are reluctant to provide relevant financial data and other types of information viewed as sensitive (e.g., funding data). According to Moldovan laws, this type of information is considered classified and can only be disclosed under certain specific circumstances (e.g., a court decision or an official inquiry). These difficulties could be overcome only through private interviews with certain stakeholders.

The position of another important repository, the National Museum of History in Chișinău, is somewhat more ambiguous. On the one hand, it displays a permanent exhibition on the communist period, which features a representative selection of textual evidence and artifacts pertaining to the Soviet era, including a wide array of samples relating to the phenomenon of cultural opposition. On the other hand, the overall concept of the exhibition heavily emphasizes the topic of national victimization and oppression under communist rule, giving pride of place to the traumatic experiences of the Stalinist period, which is heavily over-represented. This results in a lopsided reflection of the late Soviet period. The public exhibition is abruptly interrupted in the late 1950s/early 1960s, without due attention to aspects of everyday life after 1960. This could be easily corrected, given the richness of available materials regarding the period of late Socialism, including examples of political and cultural opposition. This situation reflects not only the reluctance of the museum administration to revise the general concept of the main exhibition, but also the inadequacy of local networking and the lack of cooperation between the public institutions and the (admittedly few) private collection owners.

3. The COURAGE Collections: typology, topics and actors

A total number of fifteen Moldovan collections have been described in the COURAGE Registry. This is roughly similar to the case of the smaller Baltic states (Latvia and Estonia), reflecting some specific problems encountered in the Moldovan case, mainly the relative scarcity of relevant private collections and their overwhelming concentration in the capital city, Chişinău. Among the most frequent topics, I would mention: national movements, censorship, democratic opposition, human rights, surveillance and all its varieties, literature, film, and music. The main types of featured collections fall under the following categories:

1) collections based on archival files, focusing on various individual and collective forms of anti-Soviet resistance and opposition. The peculiar feature of these collections, stored in the main Moldovan depositories (the National Archive of the Republic of Moldova, the Archive of Social-Political Organizations of the Republic of Moldova and the Archive of the Intelligence and Security Service), is their emphasis on open acts of defiance against the regime. Therefore, most of them resulted from secret police (KGB) investigations carried out after the arrest of the protagonists. Although this kind of evidence is crucial due to the richness of information and the coherence of the narrative structure, its inherent bias should be taken into account, especially when the written accounts cannot be corroborated with the direct testimonies of the participants. This type of collections includes both articulate forms of opposition, originating from intellectual circles, and various cases of opposition from below. The most relevant examples within the first subcategory include the Usatiuc-Ghimpu-Graur, Alexandru Şoltoianu and Nicolae Dragoş Collections, which discuss the most important anti-Soviet groups emerging in the MSSR in the 1960s and early 1970s. In the second subcategory, I would highlight the cases of Gheorghe Muruziuc, Arsenie Platon and Zaharia Doncev, which focus on individual displays of anti-regime protest expressed by people originating from a peasant or working-class environment;

2) archival collections focusing on institutions / professional associations (mainly from the Archive of Social-Political Organizations of the Republic of Moldova), which allow a diachronic perspective on the dynamics and evolution of the relations between these associations and the Soviet state and party apparatus. The emerging picture of opposition, tacit subversion and compliance is rather complex, emphasizing the shifting strategies of their members and the changes in the balance of power within and outside these institutions from the early 1950s to the late 1980s. The collections focusing on the Moldavian Writers Union (MWU) and the Moldavian Union of Cinematographers (MUC) are especially relevant in this regard. Thus, the MWU Collection materials draw on several Party meetings, writers' congresses and national conferences which discussed significant issues related to the local cultural heritage, the language question, and the relations between the literary milieu and the Soviet regime;

3) private collections belonging either to direct protagonists and initiators of anti-regime activities (e.g., Mihai Moroşanu, also see above) or to researchers dealing with the subject of anti-Soviet resistance / opposition in the MSSR. The two subcategories highlight different perspectives and interpretations of the phenomenon of cultural opposition, but also serve as complementary examples of a more personal attitude. For example, Moroşanu's collection, reflecting the experience of one of the few authentic dissident figures in the Moldovan context, consists of personal files, interviews, photos and judicial materials and spans a longer period, from the early 1960s to the early 1990s. By contrast, Petru Negură's and Igor Caşu's private collections reflect their authors' scholarly preoccupations and feature both otherwise inaccessible archival documents and oral interviews conducted with prominent figures of cultural opposition active during the Soviet period. It should be noted that the above-mentioned examples do not entirely compensate for the relative scarcity of meaningful private collections in the Moldovan case. This is due, on the one hand, to the small number of people who had preserved their personal archives and related materials documenting their anti-regime attitudes and, on the other, to the reluctance of many protagonists to talk about their earlier experience. However, these private collections are especially valuable due to the alternative data (published and oral interviews, visual materials, fragments from the contemporary press, a variety of personal archives) which provide a different perspective from the official point of view prevailing in the archival files.

The rest of the Moldovan collections cover two forms of cultural opposition that are fundamental for understanding the full picture of the anti-regime activities in the MSSR. The first area is touched upon by the collection dealing with the *Noroc* musical band. It focuses on more elusive forms of everyday resistance and alternative lifestyles during the late Soviet period, with a peculiar emphasis on the musical sphere, which was especially difficult to control from the authorities' point of view and provided a meaningful space for forms of self-expression frowned upon or officially disapproved by the regime. The second field of interest concerns religious dissent and opposition to the Soviet system. Such examples could be found mainly within minority non-conformist religious communities (e.g., Jehovah's Witnesses and the Inochentist movement), while the official church entered a phase of *de facto* collaboration with the authorities after the mid-1960s. Despite the limited societal impact of most manifestations of cultural opposition, the Moldovan collections attest to their diversity (especially during the 1960s and 1970s) and allow the recovery of certain forgotten acts of defiance, frequently initiated from below.

A notable peculiarity of the Moldovan case is the relatively large number of ad-hoc collections. This is mostly due to the structure of the archival funds, which frequently focus on institutions rather than individual cases. Thus, the most representative examples of cultural opposition had to be often separated from the existing archival units, forming ad-hoc collections.

The size of the collections varies widely, reflecting differences in the provenance and intensity of oppositional activities. The largest examples in the Moldovan case are the Usatiuc-Ghimpu-Graur and the Nicolae Dragoş Collections. The first contains archival files (eleven volumes in total) from the depository of the former KGB (currently preserved in the National Archive of the Republic of

Moldova). The main types of documents within the collection consist of trial records (interrogations of the accused and of relevant witnesses), official reports, other categories of judicial files, and documents produced by the members of the organization prior to their arrest (memorandums, reports, letters, correspondence, private notes, etc.). The files also include a number of photos, mostly private photos of the defendants in various contexts or official photos taken during their arrest. The Dragoş Collection, which includes essentially similar content, consists of seven large volumes reflecting this oppositional group's activities. The typical size of an archival-based collection is several hundred pages, i.e., one or two volumes of investigative materials. On the contrary, private collections, if more diverse in their contents, are typically smaller in size. Thus, the Mihai Moroşanu Private Collection features several types of documentary materials (including archival documents, a number of interviews and newspaper articles from the protagonist's personal archive). Besides these two "extremes," the Moldovan case also includes more eclectic institutional collections of an intermediary size.

The geographical distribution of these collections is uneven, reflecting the centralized character of most institutions involved in their preservation, as well as the disproportionate concentration of the open manifestations of cultural opposition in the capital. Aside from Chişinău, another important territorial focus of anti-regime activities centered on the second-largest city of the republic, Bălţi, situated in the northern part of the MSSR (a fact confirmed by the Gheorghe Muruziuc and Arsenie Platon Collections). Although the protagonists of the collections hailed from all over the MSSR (and beyond), they overwhelmingly operated in the capital, which provided an adequate environment for this type of actions. The variety of actors involved in the anti-regime cultural and political opposition in the Moldavian SSR should be especially emphasized. Contrary to the initial expectations, our research showed that, while not having a broad impact on local society, the forms of oppositional activity were rather diverse. Besides the intellectuals' discontent or some forms of institutionally organized dissent, which were generally known and are easier to record, the COURAGE Registry includes a number of cases of opposition from below, articulated by persons of peasant or working-class background. This could represent one of the most promising avenues for future research, thereby making it possible to broaden the research agenda in this field.

The number of users of the collections depends on the open access provided by the responsible institutions or on the willingness of private collectors to share their materials with a wider public. The latter category is generally open to making their collections available to interested audiences. However, the primary beneficiaries of the collections are specialized researchers and academics, due to the absence of a developed memorial infrastructure in the Republic of Moldova. Since there are no official statistics on visitors, it is difficult to estimate their numeric range. In the case of private collections, the usual number does not exceed several persons a year, while the archival collections are typically consulted by several dozen people per year. This lack of impact has only partially been compensated for by the National Museum of History exhibition, open to a potentially much more diverse audience.

4. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

In contrast to the picture that seemed to prevail in Moldovan historiography in the early 2000s, the displays of anti-regime opposition in the MSSR (mainly in the guise of a nationally oriented opposition activity, discontent in the cultural sphere, but also occasional examples of dissent coming from below) were neither as rare nor as insignificant as previously thought. Certainly, there were ups and downs in this process (with the late 1950s and the late 1960s and early 1970s probably being the most prominent periods of anti-regime discontent). However, the Moldovan case is specific not so much due to the absence of substantial anti-regime activity (the collections in the Registry are the best proof to the contrary) as due to the almost universal lack of interest of the political stakeholders and of a large portion of the civil society in preserving and institutionalizing the memory of opposition and dissent under communism. In fact, aside from the case of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime (discussed above) and several sculptural projects, no enduring state initiative was undertaken in this regard in the post-independence period. The absence of a special research institution devoted to the study of the Soviet past is especially regrettable, making Moldova one of the few countries without such an establishment. Another major issue seems to be the lack of funding, which is a derivative of this broader situation.

A particularly serious problem concerns the low institutional capacity of most Moldovan public repositories to publicize and disseminate their collections. Only a handful of larger institutions (such as the National Archive, the National Museum of History and the Archive of Social-Political Organizations) have the necessary personnel and resources to set up permanent or temporary exhibitions or to organize public events with a noticeable impact. In terms of access to communist-era materials and their dissemination to the wider public, two examples that fall under the category of best practices could be invoked. First, the work of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime, despite its shortcomings, represented a high point of interest toward the communist past and was significant at least from three points of view: 1) the articulation of a serious public debate on the communist legacy; 2) the (temporary) opening of previously inaccessible archives and the ensuing "publication boom" and growing interest of professional historians for the subject and 3) the involvement of political stakeholders. However, the ultimate failure of this endeavor points to the inefficiency and inherent limits of such provisional arrangements. Another positive example is the policy of the Archive for Social-Political Organizations (AOSPRM), which provides unrestricted access to its holdings and is a researcher-friendly institution. The situation is rather mixed in the case of other archival repositories and museums, which, despite some recent progress, are still reluctant to lift all the restrictions concerning their materials. These repositories are also quite inefficient at networking, both among themselves and in establishing connections with potential private collectors. This is an especially salient issue in Moldova, where most private collections originate either with interested scholars and specialists or with a handful of prominent dissidents. However, no systematic efforts were undertaken to preserve these materials for the wider public or to make them available to potential

users in the future. A related problem is the opacity and reluctance of institutional stakeholders to share information about their operation (including budget data, information on ongoing projects and even, occasionally, personnel statistics). Although most of these problems could be overcome through personal interviews, the Moldovan institutions still lack openness toward the public, which hampers their occasional efforts at dissemination.

These conclusions could be the starting point for several policy recommendations (some of them country-specific and others more general):

1. A special institution devoted to the study of the communist period and its legacy should be established. In order not to be subordinated to the state and to avoid its transformation into a tool for official historical policy, this institution should be granted professional autonomy and allowed to apply for non-state (including foreign) funding, for academic purposes. Some of the smaller existing initiatives (research centers) could serve as an institutional basis during the initial period.
2. The existing repositories of relevant materials (primarily the above-mentioned archives and the National Museum of History) should be encouraged to explore and disseminate their collections more systematically. This could be achieved through a broader opening toward the research community, including through the easing or abolishing of still existing restrictions, and through increased funding from the government, aimed at stimulating the organization of permanent and temporary exhibitions, applications for international collaborative projects, networking and exchange with similar institutions abroad, etc. Another, related, priority should be the opening to the research community and the public of important departmental archives (especially the former KGB/ SIS Archive and the Archive of the Ministry of Internal Affairs), which hold essential materials pertaining to anti-regime opposition. In this sense, the ongoing transfer of the relevant documentary collections to the National Archive should be continued and accelerated.
3. An enduring partnership between the public repositories and potential private collectors should be established. In this sense, the public institutions should be much more proactive, seeking out potential donors and small-scale partners instead of simply relying on individual voluntary donations. Although this might be logistically challenging, it could work especially in those cases where the institutions in question have specially trained personnel able to fulfill these tasks (e.g., the National Museum of History would be a relevant case).
4. The universities and research institutes dealing with the history of the communist period should not only stimulate the students' interest for that era through curriculum development, but might also support their faculty's and research staff's efforts to publish relevant works based on their earlier investigations. In the case of Moldova, there is already the partially successful example of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime, whose work led to the emergence of a whole series of scholarly publications, textbooks, didactic aids, oral history collections, etc. Provided that

the necessary institutional support is given, external (including EU) funding is a viable solution, especially taking into account the constant and growing interest in the field of recent history (including the communist period).

5. The results achieved during the COURAGE Project represent an essential roadmap for further cross- and trans-national research initiatives on cultural opposition. This could serve as a viable model, especially for smaller countries like Moldova, where chronic lack of funding and weak state institutions enhance the relevance of international collaborative projects. More should be done to explain the relevance and benefits of international cooperation to the relevant stakeholders, who are often reluctant to engage in such endeavors either because of skepticism or because they perceive such projects as a low priority. Given the quasi-total indifference of state actors toward the legacy of cultural opposition under communism, such an approach from below, enhancing the visibility of local repositories and private collection owners, could prove more efficient in the long run.

Summary

During the first years after independence, when an increasingly nationalizing agenda prevailed in Moldovan politics, research on the communist era focused on the traumatic experiences of mass deportations, famine and collectivization occurring in the late 1940s and early 1950s or discussed

the armed insurgency active during the same period, thus disproportionately emphasizing the Stalinist era. In contrast to the picture that seemed to prevail in Moldovan historiography in the early 2000s, the displays of anti-regime opposition in the MSSR (mainly in the guise of a nationally oriented opposition activity, discontent in the cultural sphere, but also occasional examples of dissent coming from below) were neither as rare nor as insignificant as previously thought. The variety of actors involved in the anti-regime cultural and political opposition in the Moldavian SSR should be particularly emphasized. Certainly, there were ups and downs in this process (with the late 1950s and the late 1960s and early 1970s probably being the most prominent periods of anti-regime discontent). However, the Moldovan case is specific not so much due to a lack of substance of the phenomenon itself as due to the general lack of interest of the political stakeholders and of a large portion of the civil society in preserving and institutionalizing the memory of opposition and dissent under communism. In fact, aside from the case of the Commission for the Study and Evaluation of the Communist Totalitarian Regime – a short-lived, politically inspired “truth commission” established in 2010 – and several monuments erected to the regime’s victims, no enduring state initiative was undertaken in this regard in the post-independence period. The absence of a special research institution devoted to the study of the Soviet past is especially regrettable, making Moldova one of the few countries without such an establishment. Another major issue is the lack of funding, which is a derivative of this broader situation.

A total number of fifteen Moldovan collections have been described in the COURAGE Registry. This is roughly similar to the case of the smaller Baltic states (Latvia and Estonia), reflecting some specific problems encountered in the Moldovan case, mainly the relative scarcity of relevant private collections and their overwhelming concentration in the capital city, Chişinău. Among the most frequent topics, one could mention: national movements, censorship, democratic opposition, human rights, surveillance and all its varieties, literature, film, and music. The main problems uncovered during the project period were the following: 1) the low institutional capacity of most Moldovan public repositories to publicize and disseminate their collections; 2) the inefficiency of networking, both among public repositories and in establishing connections with potential private collectors; 3) the reluctance of institutional stakeholders to share information about their operation (including budget data, information on ongoing projects and personnel statistics). Despite the (admittedly not very successful) model of the above-mentioned Commission or several cases of “best practices” (e.g., the policy of the Archive for Social-Political Organizations (AOSPRM), which provides unrestricted access to its holdings and is a researcher-friendly institution, or the more ambiguous, but still generally open-access approach pursued by the National Museum of History), the general situation in Moldova is far from satisfactory. Several policy recommendations could improve this situation, including: 1) the creation of a special institution devoted to the study of the communist period and its legacy; 2) the systematic encouragement (both by state agencies and by professional historians) of existing repositories of relevant materials (primarily the main Moldovan archives and the National Museum of History) to explore and disseminate their collections; 3) the establishment of an enduring partnership between the public repositories and potential private collectors; 4) the increase in the number and quality of relevant publications in the field, including

through targeted institutional policies aimed at encouraging applications for external funding; 5) an emphasis on international cooperation and on its benefits for the relevant stakeholders, despite their reluctance to engage in such projects.

Bibliography

Bahnaru, Vasile, and Gheorghe Cojocaru, eds. *Congresul al III-lea al Uniunii Scriitorilor din RSS Moldovenească (14-15 octombrie 1965). Studiu și materiale* [The Third Congress of the Writers' Union of the Moldavian SSR (14-15 October 1965). An introductory study and the congress materials]. Chișinău: Tehnica-Info, 2016.

Cașu, Igor. "Political Repressions in the Moldavian SSR After 1956: Towards a Typology Based on KGB Files." *Dystopia: Journal of Totalitarian Ideologies and Regimes* 1, no. 1-2 (2012): 89-127.

Musteață, Sergiu. *Basarabeanul bruiat de KGB. La microfonul Europei Libere – Efim Crimerman, 1981-1990* [The Bessarabian jammed by the KGB. At the microphone of Radio Free Europe – Efim Crimerman, 1981-1990]. 2 vols. Chișinău: ARC, 2017.

Musteață, Sergiu, and Igor Cașu, eds. *Fără termen de prescripție: Aspecte ale investigării crimelor comunismului în Europa* [Without limitation period: Aspects of the investigation of the crimes of communism in Europe]. Chișinău: Cartier, 2011.

Negură, Petru. *Nici eroi, nici trădători: scriitorii moldoveni și puterea sovietică în epoca stalinistă* [Neither heroes nor traitors: Moldavian writers and Soviet power during the Stalinist period]. Chișinău: Cartier, 2014.

Pasat, Valeriu, ed. *Православие в Молдавии: власть, церковь, верующие. 1940-1991: собрание документов в 4 т.* [Orthodox Christianity in Moldavia: State power, the Church and the faithful. 1940-1991. A collection of documents in four volumes]. 4 vols. Volume 2. 1953-1960. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010. Volume 3. Spring 1961-1975. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2011. Volume 4. 1976-1991. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2012.

Postică, Elena, ed. *Cartea Memoriei. Catalog al victimelor totalitarismului comunist* [The Book of Memory. A catalogue of the victims of the communist totalitarian regime]. Co-edited by Vera Stăvilă. 4 vols. Chișinău: Știința, 1999-2005.

Tașcă, Mihai. „Manifestări de rezistență antisovietică și anticomunistă în RSS Moldovenească după moartea lui Stalin” [Manifestations of anti-Soviet and anti-communist resistance in the Moldavian SSR after Stalin’s death]. In *Basarabia-1812: Problemă națională, implicații internaționale. Materialele Conferinței Științifice Internaționale din 14-16 mai 2012* [Bessarabia 1812: A national problem and its international implications. Materials of the international scholarly conference

organized on 14-16 May 2012], edited by Gheorghe Cliveti and Gheorghe Cojocaru, 939-969. București: Editura Academiei Române, 2014.

Appendix

List of Collections

Alexandru Șoltoianu Collection at National Archive of the Republic of Moldova (founded in 1971)
Arsenie Platon Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1961)
Documents of Moldavian Union of Cinematographers (MUC). Fond P-2773 at AOSPR Moldova (f. 1962)
Documents of Moldavian Writers' Union (MWU). Fond P-2955 at AOSPR Moldova (f. 1946)
Gheorghe Muruziuc Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1966)
Gheorghe Zgherea Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1953)
Igor Cașu Private Collection (f. 2006)
Mihai Moroșanu Private Collection (f. 1961)
Nicolae Dragoș Collection at National Archive Moldova (f. 1964)
Noroc Collection at AOSPR Moldova
Pavel Doronin Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1972)
Petru Negură Private Collection (f. 2001)
Usatiuc-Ghimpu-Graur Collection (National Patriotic Front) at National Archive Moldova (f. 1972)
Viktor Koval Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1982)
Zaharia Doncev Collection at SIS Archive Moldova (f. 1957)

List of Operators / Owners

National Archive of the Republic of Moldova (ANRM) (operator / owner)
Archive of the Intelligence and Security Service of the Republic of Moldova (SIS Archive) (operator / owner)
Archive of Social-Political Organisations of the Republic of Moldova (AOSPRM) (operator / owner)
Soviet Moldavian KGB (initial owner)
Moldavian Union of Cinematographers (MUC) (initial owner)
Moldavian Writers' Union (MWU) (initial owner)
Igor Cașu (private operator / owner)
Mihai Moroșanu (private operator / owner)
Petru Negură (private operator / owner)

List of persons researched

David, Gheorghe
Dolgan, Mihai
Doncev, Zaharia
Doronin, Pavel
Dragoș, Nicolae
Ghimpu, Gheorghe
Graur, Valeriu
Kalik, Mikhail
Koval, Viktor
Loteanu, Emil
Lucinschi, Petru
Lupan, Andrei
Marinat, Alexei
Moroșanu, Mihai
Muruziuc, Gheorghe
Negură, Ion
Petrache, Ștefan
Platon, Arsenie
Șoltoianu, Alexandru
Usatiuc-Bulgăr, Alexandru
Vieru, Grigore
Zgherea, Gheorghe

List of persons interviewed

Cașu, Igor (multiple collections)
Moroșanu, Mihai
Negură, Petru (multiple collections)
Petrache, Ștefan