

COURAGE

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

Country Reports



ROMANIA

Author

Cristina Petrescu

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

Cristina Petrescu is Associate Professor at the
Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest.
cristina.petrescu@fspub.unibuc.ro

To quote this report:

Cristina Petrescu: "Romania," COURAGE Country Reports. Regensburg, November 2018, DOI:
<http://doi.org/10.24389/cr-romania>

Table of Content

1. Introduction
2. National and Transnational Contexts
 - 2.1 Public Remembering and Professional Reconstructions
 - 2.2 Legal Framework and Institutional Actors
3. Romanian Collections in the COURAGE Registry
 - 3.1 Typology and Topics
 - 3.2 Actors and Prospective Users
4. Concluding Remarks and Policy Recommendations

Appendix

Map of the Romanian Collections

1. Introduction

The communist past is a continuous presence in Romania, in electoral campaigns, public discourses, and historical writings. Yet, there is rather public agreement than controversy over the narrative on the communist regime in Romania. This state of affairs is directly influenced by: (1) the characteristics of the pre-1989 single-party political system, (2) the nature of the 1989 regime change, and (3) the early transition from communism. The pre-1989 regime began its 45 years of rule with a massive wave of terror and repression, which is estimated to have touched directly 10% of the population and indirectly approximately half; while repression was a taboo topic until 1989, many individuals had personal or intermediate experiences of state political violence. The political regime established by the Romanian Communist Party was not only undemocratic as all the other similar regimes in East-Central Europe, but also largely unpopular for it failed to establish any type of welfare system. This regime ended with a violent popular revolt in which more than 1,100 individuals died, but the former communist bureaucrats preserved power through elections, while those responsible for the crimes committed in 1989 remained unidentified to this day. Thus, it is widely believed that the Revolution of 1989 did not represent a genuine break with the past. The transition from communism was more difficult in this country than in any other in the region, so opinion polls illustrate that some people regret what they perceived as social security provided by the former regime, yet few regret the regime change of 1989. Consequently, public remembering and professional reconstructions are almost unanimous in emphasizing the “criminal and illegitimate” nature of the communist regime in Romania, while few who lived under the communist dictatorship question Romania’s membership to the European Union. The huge anti-governmental demonstrations in the last years and the massive boycott of the referendum of 6-7 October 2018, which tried to consult the population on the issue of the so-called “traditional family,” meaning in fact to ask support for introducing a ban on gay marriages in the constitution, clearly illustrate that the pro-European option is equally strong in the new generation. For the communist regime in Romania, unlike in other countries of East-Central Europe, was also nationalist in its latest phase, the opposition to this regime was fundamentally democratic and anti-nationalist. Its legacy lives on in the next generation who manifests an increasingly active political participation from a pro-European perspective. At the same time, the coming of age of the generation who does not have the direct experience of communism illustrates that the consensus on the interpretation of the pre-1989 past is about to fade away. This change does not announce the development of the much-needed plurality of views, but the increasing popularity of an idealized image on the communist past which emerged out of disappointment with the grim present of the faulty democracy, and represents the exact opposite of the hitherto dominating consensus on the past as “criminal and illegitimate.” In short, if the Romania’s democratic future is largely imagined only entangled with Europe,

Romania's undemocratic past generates confusion about the fundamental differences between democracy and dictatorship. The COURAGE project which offers an enormous open database of collections of "cultural opposition" remind that the communist past was "another country" in which the secret police did exist to harass legally innocent but non-conformist individuals, the human and citizen rights were constantly violated, the citizens could express their critical opinions only through underground media and street demonstrations. In other words, the COURAGE project illustrates that the type of modernization proposed by the communist regimes in East-Central Europe lacked the fundamentals of western modern democracies, i.e. mechanisms of limiting power, granting political representation, guaranteeing basic rights. Briefly put, the COURAGE project teaches the difference between dictatorship and democracy, while emphasizing that in spite of the European memory divide of the twentieth century, there is a common cultural heritage which still cherish the fundamental values of democracy. The cultural legacy discovered in the frame of this project is thus part of the European heritage and should be protected from public oblivion.

2. National and Transnational Contexts

2.1 Public Remembering and Professional Reconstructions

In post-communist Romania, the particularities of the pre-1989 regime, the nature of the Revolution, as well as the post-1989 political developments made amnesty impossible and amnesia undesirable. While retribution was considered the crucial step in dismantling the legacies of the past, its adoption was nevertheless late and its application incomplete. As a reaction to this, the preservation of the memory of the wrongdoings committed by the defunct communist regime was turned into a societal priority. The recollections of the victims that survived the Romanian Gulag emerged as the most powerful vector of memory, which essentially influenced the representation of communism, generating a historical narrative on that period of the recent past centered on prisons, surveillance and shortages. The very production and reproduction of this public representation constituted yet another way of taking distance from the communist past. The widespread perception in Romanian society—according to which the Revolution of 1989 did not lead to a genuine break with the communist past and thus to a moral regeneration of society—has triggered the following responses: (1) retribution for the past wrongdoings has become synonymous with the moral regeneration of society; (2) remembering the past sufferings has become a surrogate for the never-fulfilled transitional justice; and (3) a hegemonic public representation of communism—centered on prisons, surveillance and shortages—emerged, and has become an expression of anti-communism and a surrogate break with the non-democratic past.

As the blood spilled during the popular revolt of 1989 made any reconciliation with the past impossible, the genuine break with the past could not have been accomplished otherwise than by punishing the perpetrators, i.e., those who inflicted immense sufferings on their fellow citizens under the defunct communist regime. It was in Timișoara – the city in which the Revolution in December 1989 sparked – that a document asking for the institutionalization of lustration was made public soon after the regime change, on 11 March 1990. Known as the “Proclamation of Timișoara,” the appeal included the famous “Article 8,” which requested the banning of all former nomenklatura members, party activists, and officers of the former secret police from running in the next three elections. It was also the issue of lustration that triggered the first major wave of protests in post-communist Romania that took place in downtown Bucharest in the spring of 1990 and it is known since as the “University Square” phenomenon. Between 1990 and 1996, as long as politics was dominated by the so-called neo-communists, the idea of lustration gained momentum. In popular understanding, lustration meant above all the unmasking of the former secret police employees and collaborators. The instrumental force behind this interpretation of lustration was the Association of the Former Political Prisoners in Romania – AFDPR, which represented a considerable force with its almost 100,000 members and a most active component of civil society. Yet, the first legal frame for transitional justice was issued by the Romanian Parliament only in 1999, while the archives of the former secret police became really available only after 2005.

As long as the communist perpetrators remained unpunished, and the wrongdoings of the past unmasked, political and societal conflicts were shaped by the battle of memory over amnesia. “When justice does not succeed in being a form of memory, memory itself can be a form of justice,” this is how former dissident Ana Blandiana formulated the priority of recording for the next generations the recollections of those who survived the Romanian Gulag. In order to finally put the communist past behind it was of paramount importance to make public the atrocities committed under communism and reveal the criminal nature of the system to the generations that were too young to have experienced directly the terror. Unlike in other former communist countries, the living memory of the sufferings in the Romanian Gulag was never allowed to surface into publications, but remained underground as “counter-memory,” transmitted between friends, family and unofficial networks. A publicly untold story until 1989, this counter-memory was institutionalized as the type of remembering communism most consistent not only with the violent essence of the former regime, but also with the priorities of the transition from communism. The preservation of the testimonies by those who suffered was considered an act of moral responsibility. A few drawer books and testimonies recuperated from exile opened the process of recuperating the inhumane experiences of the former political prisoners from the 1940s and the 1950s. Many started to write down prison memoirs after 1989, while almost all post-communist oral history projects focused on the memory of the Romanian Gulag. The story of suffering was complemented by a story of bravery, which

comprised the recollections of those who had tried over the years, in various forms, to say “no” to the communist regime and thus clashed with the secret police. Through association with the memoirs from prisons, the more recent memories of the hardships of everyday life endured in Romania during the last decade before the collapse (1980-1989) also receive a moral significance that they in essence lacked, since protests against the system in this period were really scarce. Remembering the “normalized” 1960s seems indecent not only compared to the prison memories, but also to the memories of late communism. In short, remembering communism in Romania meant remembering sufferings, for everyone suffered, though in different ways. The common denominator in the two stories of suffering is the former Romanian communist secret police, the Securitate: it was the omnipotent and omnipresent institution that is taken responsible for the great terror of the early period, as well as for the surveillance to which it subjected the entire society through its huge network of informers.

Remembering communism as exclusively a period of suffering has generated a common place according to which Romanians experienced the most atrocious dictatorship in the Soviet bloc, which remained in power for 45 years due to the Securitate. This view has definitely shaped the memorialization of the communist past. The main museum of communism is to this day that organized in the former prison of Sighet, where a majority of the interwar politicians found their death and were buried in a common grave. This year, the Sighet Memorial received the European Heritage Label in recognition of its importance as major site of European remembrance. The very name of this *lieu de mémoire* – “Memorial to the victims of communism and of the resistance” – illustrates what part of the dictatorial past is worth remembering during the period of democratic consolidation: it is the part that speaks about the sufferings and bravery of the Romanians and which would teach the present-day generations about the dignifying past of their nation. Apart from the monuments commemorating the victims of the Revolution of 1989, memorials dedicated to the victims of the communist regime were erected mainly by the association of former political prisoners, AFDPR, sometimes with the help of the local authorities, near most of the former communist prisons. To sum up, in post-communist Romania, anti-communism is widely considered the morally correct perspective in publicly representing the communist past. What is more, this interpretation of the communist past was codified into an officially and politically endorsed historical account. At the request of civil society organizations, the then president of the country, Traian Băsescu, established in 2006 the Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania, which produced by the end of the same year a report of around 700 pages. The report is consistent with the collective memory of the miserable 1980s, and the memory of the Romanian Gulag, very actively promoted in the public sphere by the generation of the former political prisoners in the late 1940s and the 1950s, with the instrumental support of public intellectuals from the next generation. On this basis, the report characterized the communist regime in Romania as “illegitimate and criminal,” while the head of state took it as basis to

officially condemn the human rights violations committed under communist rule a few days before Romania's accession to the European Union. That public gesture was meant to symbolize the final break with the communist past. Otherwise, the report did not highlight new research, but aggregated the knowledge on communism produced in post-communist Romania. At the same time, the report reflects the lived experiences of two different generations, those of 1945 and those of 1968 considering the time of reaching political maturity. Both reinforced each other's perspectives on communism and influenced the professional writings on the recent past authored largely by the third generation of historians, those of 1989 considering the same criteria of defining a generation as above.

The post-communist historical writings on the communist past were initially shaped by the works of Western authors or exiled Romanians, which at the time of the collapse were the only works on the period which were free of ideological interference. In other words, the field of communist studies emerged after 1989 due to these transnational transfers of knowledge, unfortunately in terms of missing information rather than concepts and methods. The domestic input in this field came mostly from "re-qualified" historians, who had concentrated up to 1989 on distant periods of the past for the simple reason that those epochs were more likely to be addressed in a professional manner and with less official interference. However, these historians' professionalism suffered greatly because of Romania's cultural isolation in the 1970s and the 1980s, when the circulation of ideas and individuals across the borders was controlled to a much greater degree than in other countries of the region. Thus, the large majority of historians in Romania still consider the archives as the hallmark of their discipline and the ultimate repository of "historical truth." The next generations of historians educated after 1989 widely reproduce the same model of historical writing. As a consequence, the large majority of works on the communist period can be characterized as event-oriented political histories, which are based on archival sources. Writings that take into consideration other type of sources, apply innovative methodologies, employ explanatory theoretical models or interdisciplinary approaches, and focus on "unusual" topics do exist, but are very few.

If before 1989 the official narrative on the postwar history of Romania conveyed the idea that this was the happiest period in national history, the prelude of the final historical stage of communism, post-communist historical writings quickly re-converged to a new consensus by turning upside down the previous imposed consensus. The largest majority of the historians did not contradict the above-described public remembering of communism in Romania, as the ideas conveyed in their works can be summarized as following: the communist regime meant the darkest period of the national past, possible only due to the instrumental intervention of the Soviet Union which brought to power a small group of ill-intended apparatchiks who managed nonetheless to gain control over society and maintain their rule for 45 years. The major question that shaped historical writings is related to the way the communist domination

over Romanian society was actually imposed and preserved. In this respect, public discourses and historiography provide a similar answer: it was due to the ability of the secret police, the infamous Securitate, the third most famous communist institution of the kind, after the KGB and Stasi. Given this view, one might say that the largest majority of the post-communist narratives on Romanian communism perfectly fit the totalitarian paradigm, in spite of the fact that most historians only adopted the concept without really understanding the methodological implications. Their works usually portray the communist period as a confrontation between the perpetrators in the communist elite, among whom the secret police officers and collaborators rank high, and the rest of the society, which included only innocent victims who tried desperately but inefficiently to oppose.

This wide consensus was not reached on the basis of archival documents, for the new law regulating the access to these records, which was passed only in 1996, stipulated a closure of 30 years that was maintained as such in spite of several subsequent amendments. As mentioned, it was the enormous amount of testimonies by the former political prisoners about the extreme experiences of sufferings that shaped not only the public perceptions of the past, but also the professional narratives. The provision of the archival law is also greatly responsible for shaping the historians' agenda: to this day, the late 1940s and the 1950s are far better researched than the later periods of communism, for which archival documents only gradually became available for research. Implicitly, most historical writings convey the same story about communism as the Sighet Memorial; it is story of suffering and bravery, which includes only victims and heroes, worth remembering and researching. This unbalanced research rightfully revealed the dimensions of repression in Romania, although the actual number of the people arrested, tortured, and imprisoned is still a matter of debate. Records of imprisoned population were poorly kept by the regime, but most estimates indicate that around one person in 10 was directly touched by repression in communist Romania, mostly during the period of terror that came to an end in 1964, when all political prisoners were quietly released. As a tribute to those who suffered, several series of dictionaries cataloguing not only the names of the victims, but also those of the torturers were published. However, studies on the secret police rather overlooked the collaboration of a significant segment of the population with this institution in late communism, in spite of the fact that the archives of this institution revealed that collaboration was by no means compulsory. Many secret informants were unmasked after the opening of the Securitate files in 2005, but their cases remained mostly in the domain of media headlines, and only rarely triggered systematic research.

Another important question that shaped historical writings refers to the response of the Romanian society to the communist rule; the answer is resistance. Opposition and dissidence in late communism were much less developed than in Central Europe and cannot not illustrate such view. Most researchers, however, concentrated on the early communism and

demonstrated that Romanians were also anti-communists. Indeed, in the aftermath of WWII, many former officers of the Royal Army, peasants, students, members of the former political parties organized themselves in small groups that tried to hide in the mountains in the hope that the Americans would start a new war against the Soviet Union and implicitly restore the Romanian monarchy. This form of reacting to the establishment of the communist rule faded away, especially after the defeat of the Hungarian Revolution, so the Securitate suppressed it by the early 1960s. Resistance in the mountains did never develop into a movement at the country scale. However, it offered to the Romanians the privilege of arguing that in spite of the feeble opposition to communist rule in the 1980s, a fierce opposition to the communist rule took place beginning in the late 1940s, that is, allegedly earlier than in any other country of East-Central Europe. In fact, the so-called “resistance in the mountains” represents the most popular topic of research in post-communist Romania, as it is the very source of restoring a sense of national dignity. If one evaluates Romanian communism on the basis of what has been researched so far, it might have the impression that all the mountains in Romania were filled by the courageous anti-communist resisters. By contrast, later protests against communism by students, workers or intellectuals – fewer, indeed, than in other countries, but which did exist – received less attention. Briefly put, due to the fact that post-communist historiography concentrated primarily on the first two decades after WWII, one is given the impression that Romanians are an exceptionally heroic people, who resisted communism adamantly, and it was only the unparalleled intensity of the repression that crushed them.

Finally, it must be emphasized that there is no disconnect between the mainstream academic discourses on the communist past and the coverage of that period in textbooks. Both focus on communist repression and condemn its crimes. This view underpins democratic consolidation by highlighting differences between a democracy based on the rule of law, and a dictatorship that imprisoned innocent people. To learn what democracy is means to recognize what it is not, and detect derailment from the path to democratic consolidation. However, delivery of school curricula depends on teachers, who can transmit different messages that reflect their own experiences and memories of communism. Thus, knowledge of communism acquired in school or family might be disconnected from the professional reconstructions of the past presented in academic writings and textbooks. Teachers or parents might transmit to generations that never experienced communism a conflicting message that depends not on the way they once experienced communism, but on their memories of that time, which are influenced by their experience of post-communist transition. The more painful the transition, the happier the memories of the pre-1989 period. These selective memories of the past — an alleged social security, an illusory better education or medical care, or a presumed lower crime rate — imply that some aspects of life were better before 1989. Some young people, whose chances of social and professional success are grim, buy into these memories. The disconnect between historical writings and personal memories exists also because the former do not fully integrate the latter.

Most historical writings hardly illustrate that people who never experienced repression perceived the communist regime in neutral or even positive terms because it increased their living standard by moving them from village to city. As long as these experiences are not integrated in the narrative on the communist past, the disconnect between history and memory will continue to disorient the young generation. The COURAGE research represents a much-needed different perspective on communism in Romania, which might finally trigger debates due the open access descriptions in the national language from the registry.

2.2 Legal Framework and Institutional Actors

Chronologically, the first institution exclusively dedicated to the study of the recent past in post-communist Romania was the National Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism (INST), which was established in 1993, under the patronage of the Romanian Academy of Sciences. This institute mirrors the representation of the communist past promoted through the joint efforts of the former political prisoners and the public intellectuals, i.e., focusing on the repressive character of the regime. The name of the aforementioned institute might imply that it deals not only with communism, but with fascism as well. Its program of research, however, focuses mainly on the former type of “totalitarianism.” In fact, in Romania, the very term totalitarianism is generally employed as synonym for communism. As argued, the regime that ended in 1989 is selectively remembered as a terror period dominated by the secret police, and no other concept seems to epitomize better its total control over the population than the term “totalitarianism.”

As for the legal frame for researching the past, the main battle fought by the Romanian historians has been, in fact, not for reconstructing the past, but for the complete opening of the archives covering the communist period. Aside the repressed forms of memory, such as those of the former political prisoners, official records from various archives represent a major source for the reconstruction of the recent past. Quite naturally, the breakdown of the communist regime was followed by debates concerning the role of archives and archivists in supporting the widely claimed need for writing the “true” history of Romania. The break with the past meant also pressing for the issuance of modern regulations to govern not only the reorganization and development of archives, but also the difficult problems related to the access to documents. A post-communist law regulating the functioning of the National Archives was adopted in only in 1996, but following the communist legislation of 1971 it stipulates that documents belonging to the Romanian National Archives can be consulted only after 30 years from their creation. Furthermore, Article 22 states that the documents which could affect “the national interests, the citizens’ rights and liberties” because of the information they contain or “those whose physical state is endangered” cannot be released for research. Nevertheless, the 1996 law does

not state very clearly the procedure of defining which documents fall in these categories, but simply stipulates that the decision has to be made by their legal owner. Such an ambiguous formulation facilitates the abuse of power and contributes to the making of arbitrary decisions regarding the access to some documents. Moreover, it fuels an old dispute in Romania between archivists, who regard themselves as preservers of documents, not as those meant to make them available for research, and historians, who are the main users of such documents. Numerous organizations, associations, and individuals have questioned the usefulness of any general closure period. Many historians specializing in recent history asked the reduction of these periods, including the general closure period of 30 years, arguing that the opening of documents related to the communist past is crucial for coming to terms with a troubled past. Nothing changed significantly since the law was issued, but in the meantime almost 30 years have passed since the collapse of communism, so the archives of this recent past have become anyway increasingly available. However, the research of the early communist period is to this day far more consistent than that on the later period, as argued above.

A breakthrough in the making archival material available for research occurred with the opening of the former secret police files for research. This was a rather long and gradual process, yet more successful than in the case of the files of the former communist party files, which are subject of the general archival law of 1996. After the defeat of the so-called neo-communists in the elections of 1996, when for the first time in post-WWII Romania political power was peacefully transferred from the communist bureaucracy to non-communist politicians, a draft law envisaging lustration was debated in the parliament and was finally sanctioned in 1999, after three years of polemics. The instrumental force behind this law was the Association of the Former Political Prisoners in Romania – AFDPR. The Law 187/1999 regarded solely the former employees and informers of the secret police, and was inspired by the Stasi Records Act of 1991, based on which Der Bundesbeauftragte für die Stasi-Unterlagen (BStU) functions. The Romanian law also established a new institution under parliamentary control, the National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives (Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității – CNSAS) to take over the files of the former secret police in order to make them publicly available and at the same time assess if the candidates for public offices were involved in the activities of “the Securitate as political police.”

The principle that stayed behind the law was that of individual responsibility, and by no means that of collective guilt, based on the simple association of certain individuals with the Securitate. In other words, the Romanian law disqualifies individuals on the basis of what they did, similar to the German legislation, and not according to the position they occupied, like in the case of the Czecho-Slovak lustration. The board of CNSAS was empowered to assess to what extent the activity of an individual resulted in the violation of the basic human rights, which were guaranteed by the Romanian communist constitution. Thus, it did not imply any

retroactive application of justice. Moreover, the law guaranteed the right to appeal to a court of law. In addition, disqualification was not automatically triggered by the law. Only those persons that failed to acknowledge their collaboration prior to their acceptance of the public office were subject to disqualification, which makes it similar to the Polish law of 1997. In short, this law was conceived to be as consistent as possible with the rule-of-law principles.

As compared to societal expectations, Law 187/1999 produced limited results, but it triggered important public debates on the meaning of collaboration with the secret police and led to increasingly restrictive provisions of the law. In fact, the ups and downs of its subsequent application can be separated by means of three chronological landmarks, as follows: 1999 – very limited implementation of legislation due to the fact that a majority of the documents produced by the former Securitate were practically withheld by the institutions that preserved them; 2005 – transfer of the bulk of the Securitate archives to CNSAS and de facto opening of the files; a wave of public exposure of former Securitate collaborators and agents followed suit; 2008 – change of legislation meant to defer to a court of law the final assessment concerning the quality of collaborator or agent, which prolonged the process of public disclosure, but the process of opening the files has continued ever since. However, the rather insufficient personnel could not do wonders with an already disorganized archive due to the mission-oriented handling by the Securitate and the successive reorganization by three different institutions after 1989. Nonetheless, the most remarkable cases of collaboration with the Securitate were revealed not by personal files, which were generally not preserved, but by the files of the victims, in which evidence of collaboration (usually copies of informative notes) were found. In other words, even in the absence of personal files, informative notes can still be found in the files of those on whom the respective persons provided information. Thus, the files of the victims contributed to the public exposure as former collaborators of some public figures, mostly politicians. Gradually, CNSAS began to touch more and more persons from among all the segments of society, from politicians to the higher clergy, and from all fields of activity, ranging from the judiciary to the academia. Besides applying transitional justice, CNSAS is also a public archive open for research and a research institute. Especially the former type of mission is directly related to the role of CNSAS as operator of several collections described in the registry, as it is analyzed below.

Finally, the third institution dedicated to the study of the communist past is the Institute for the Investigation of the Communist Crimes in Romania. The declared scope of this new public institution – whose independence in terms of research agenda is debatable since it is directly financed from the Chancellery of the Prime Minister – is to “investigate and identify the crimes, abuses and violations of human rights during the period the communist regime was in power in Romania.” Besides, it is intended to “calling the attention of the authorized institutions to the above instances for adequate measures to be taken.” Although this institution was meant to

enlarge the rather narrow focus of CNSAS on the secret police, it only managed to supplement the CNSAS mission, especially by disclosing individuals directly involved in repression. Indeed particular in Romania is that, while amnesty was ruled out from the very beginning, the belated transitional justice legislation focused solely on the former secret police agents and collaborators, while the communist apparatus was left in peace after several aborted attempts of legalizing their purge from public life. The Securitate haunted the Romanians not only until the revolution, but also after it: before 1989 it was believed to control everything and everyone, while after 1989 it was believed to have staged and carry out the regime change to its own benefit, manipulating an entire country. This explains the disproportionate attention given to the secret police in designing new institutions for researching and representing the communist past in post-communist Romania.

3. Romanian Collections in the COURAGE Registry

3.1 Typology and Topics

On the road of discovering 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 was subject of recurrent change). These collections must reflect a systematic activity of conservation rather than an occasional one, which was carried out in Romania or in exile in 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 in the purpose of preserving the publicly suppressed but privately preserved memory of the communist period (in particular that of the repression 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 preserving 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, yet insufficiently explored.

Taking into account the above-mentioned definition and conditions, the three-year COURAGE research in Romania was conducted in such a way as to cover the canonical actors of dissent and opposition under communism, but also to illustrate the widest variety of topics and implicitly operators in the given research period. The UB team managed to describe **67 collections** in the registry by 1 November 2018. Each of these collections refer to more topics than one, but altogether they refer to the following **27 topics**: alternative forms of education, alternative lifestyles and resistance of the everyday, avantgarde, censorship, democratic opposition, emigration/exile, film, folk culture, human rights movement, independent journalism, literature and literary criticism, minority movements, music (rock, punk, alternative, classical, etc.), party dissidents, philosophical/theoretical movements, popular culture, religious activism, samizdat and tamizdat, scientific criticism, social movement, student movement, surveillance (various), survivors of persecutions under authoritarian/totalitarian regimes, theatre and performing arts, underground culture, visual arts, youth culture. These collections are to be found in several cities. The largest number are preserved in the capital city of Bucharest, many are in private possession, while the National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives (CNSAS) preserves the files created by the former secret police and grouped by the UB team in several ad-hoc collections. In the large cities of Romania, such as Cluj, Sibiu, Timișoara, Brașov, Iași, there is more than one collection housed by public institutions or private collectors. Finally, collections related to cultural opposition exist in smaller cities, such as Sighet, Târgu-Mureș, Alba Iulia, Oradea, Brad. There was insufficient time to explore the existence of such collections in rural areas. Finally, the UB team also explored a few collections preserved in exile, in Paris, Berlin and Gothenburg (Sweden).

The COURAGE research in Romania started by covering the openly confrontational discourses and activities, the direct collisions with the communist authorities, which were already known but essential for the overall picture of cultural opposition in this country. This category includes political dissent, which manifested in two separate waves, first immediately after the communist takeover and then prior to the regime change. In the methodological frame of the project, the former category is reflected in collections which were created after 1989 in the purpose of preserving the memory of the innocent victims of the repression, as well as that of those who organized an armed resistance in the mountains in the hope of carrying on a guerilla warfare. In this category are the Sighet Memorial Collections, which preserve not only post-1989 testimonies, but also an impressive number of artifacts in former place of detention for political prisoners that was turned into a major site of European remembrance. Besides, the Memorial of the Revolution in Timișoara is primarily a collection of artifacts and oral testimonies related to the popular revolt of 1989, which highlights that the communist regimes

never ceased to use violence against citizens. Finally, the CNSAS Archives include an enormous number of files related to cases of open dissent, ranging from groups and movements to isolated individuals. The COURAGE research highlighted a number of such ad-hoc collections in order to offer a research guide for those interested in understanding how the secret police perceived and acted against those who did not conform with the patterns of behavior imposed by the communist regime. Worth a special mentioning due to its significance in a history of Romanian opposition to the communist regime is the Goma Movement Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS, which has also an interesting corresponding private collection that writer Paul Goma preserves in Paris.

Beyond 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 originating from various professions and occupations. These were tolerated and even supported types that include those alternative forms of thinking and acting which only partially conflicted with the official views. Their practitioners were able to survive professionally and even get support by presenting their endeavors as fully complying with the value system of the regime in that given moment by downplaying the aspects that might have been inconvenient. Representatives in this category carried out a wide spectrum of cultural oppositional activities, ranging from literary works which by-passed censorship to samizdat and tamizdat publications, from visual arts to independent journalism, from religious activism to ethnographic research. They followed different strategies of pursuing a professional career by-passing the system. The most radical form was to completely ignore the state institutions and live as a freelance intellectual, as reflected in the Adrian Marino Collection of books, manuscripts and correspondence gathered from the activity of this literary critic, who survived professionally without any institutional affiliation.

Besides such a rare case, there were the artistic and creative occupations which enjoyed a greater freedom of expression than those which required a 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. Few individuals who fit into this category preserved collections of their own, the most important repositories were either created in exile or by the secret police. The literary critics in exile created and maintained by their programs at Radio Free Europe an alternative literary canon and thus offered an alternative legitimacy to those whom the former regime marginalized. The Monica Lovinescu-Virgil Ierunca Collection preserved in the National Archives of Romania in Bucharest represents one of the most important assembly of items related to literary non-conformism in communist Romania.

As for visual arts, the state system of collecting such works and distributing them to museums, while systematically marginalizing avantgarde or experimental works, allowed the establishment of only few contemporary art collections in the same institution. The Art Museums in Timișoara and Brașov include such collections, due to the existence of local non-conformist artists whose works were not directly confrontational with the communist esthetics. Private contemporary art collections were far more difficult to constitute due to the price barrier, yet Sorin Costina Collection is worth mentioning because the passion of the owner helped many marginalized artists survive when no museum wanted to include their non-conformist works. Even less significant was the production of non-conformist films, for directors rather used to resort to self-censorship in order to assure the circulation of their works rather than risking to be banned. The activity in theater and film of the most interdicted and simultaneously most internationally acclaimed Romanian director of that time, Lucian Pintilie, is reflected by the secret police files gathered in the Censored Theater and Film Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS, which is an example of surveillance of an individual who did not fit the category of openly criticism of the communist regime.

Compared to the artistic and creative occupations, professions which required full employment in a state institution had less liberties. Such professionals must speculate the inconsistencies in the official views to pursue their research interests, which sometimes required supplementary financial support from the local authorities that had larger liberties than those at central level. Among collections which reflect this type of bargaining are those preserved by the ASTRA Museum in Sibiu, the Cornel Irimie Collection and the Ethnographic Research in Dobrogea Ad-hoc Collection. Both include documentation about the rural cultural heritage that was saved from the total destruction to which the modernization drive of the communist regime condemned it, by presenting monuments of the peasant architecture as landmarks of national identity. In the same category is the collection related to the Black Church Restoration, which is preserved the Library and Archive of this parish community in Brașov. This collection tells the sinuous story of a Gothic monument of highest significance for the collective identity of the Saxon 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 “urban systematization.” The latter implied massive demolitions in urban areas, including the razing of Romania’s historical and architectural heritage, and hit hard many cities, above all Bucharest, where professionals reacted by carrying out an unusual activity of cultural opposition: the translation of churches in less visible locations in order to save them from total destruction.

The demolitions in Bucharest and other cities also triggered the most significant activity of passive clandestine resistance to Ceaușescu’s absurd policies, which is currently preserved mostly in private archives. While pursuing their professional careers within tolerated boundaries, some individuals acted in their spare time totally independent and immortalized on

photo, film or in paintings historic monuments about to be destroyed. Examples of this kind are the Alexandru Barnea and Andrei Pandele Private Collections of Photographs, which include vanished urban landscapes and demolition sites, and the Gheorghe Leahu Private Collection, which preserves the owner's watercolors capturing architectural landmarks and ordinary streets from Bucharest before their complete razing. In fact, most professionals in the fields of history or social sciences adopted the same kind of dual strategy, separating between a conformist profession and a non-conformist hobby. 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.

The ethno-cultural diversity of Romania is also reflected in the collections described in the COURAGE registry. The Hungarian and German communities in Transylvania created and preserved numerous collections which testify for their struggle to produce items meant to reproduce and/or redefine their collective identities. The minority rights struggle of the Romanian-Hungarian Ellenpontok group is reflected in two collections, one privately preserved in Gothenburg and one identified as ad-hoc collection in the CNSAS Archives. The quest of the Romanian-German literary circle Aktionsgruppe Banat for articulating a social and cultural criticism of the communist regime in their literary works is similarly reflected in a private collection preserved in Berlin and an ad-hoc collection at CNSAS. The diversity of the religious communities in Romania, which the communist regime did not openly persecute, with the exception of the suppression of the Greek-Catholic community by forceful integration into the into Greek-Orthodox Church, is also highlighted in the COURAGE registry. 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 ecclesiastic 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 Dâmbul Rotund (Cluj). Similarly, the activities of the Lutheran community of the Germans in Romania are preserved in the collections held by the Teutsch Haus in Sibiu, as well as in the CNSAS Archives. In addition, the archives of the former secret police are extremely important in preserving documents related to the resistance of the religious groups which are characteristic to the Romanian majority, respectively to the clandestine activities of the suppressed Greek-Catholics and the alternative groups created by the Greek-Orthodox denomination, which had no alternative repositories to conserve traces of their activities.

Quite a number of private archives preserve the memory of the parallel worlds of non-conformism that existed for a limited time during holidays and more generally during spare time. The Andrei Partoș – Radio Vacanța Costinești Private Collection illustrates the activity of a seasonal radio station and its associated activity on the Black Sea coast, which represented an

epitome of the alternative culture of the younger generation. Besides, the clandestinely procured Western music made young people forget about the restrictions in their everyday life and act as if the communist regime did not exist. 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 the Romanian state factories did not produce equipment for leisure alpinism, but only for military purposes. Finally, the Irina Margareta Nistor Private Collection shows how everyday spare time was transformed into a time of liberty. This collection reminds of the Western-produced films that were introduced clandestinely into Romania between 1985 and 1989, to be translated and dubbed and then distributed on video cassettes (semi)clandestinely. The spare time as a time of temporary liberty is also illustrated by several private collections of posters, LPs, and photographs on the jazz, rock, punk and other non-conformist music, most notably in the Club A – Mirel Leventer, 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 considered under the methodological umbrella of cultural opposition and allow a first evaluation of this concept. Three main conclusions can be drawn from this sketch. First, the collections which made the object of COURAGE research in Romania are highly polarized in terms of ownership. The largest category of such collections is that created and preserved by the former communist secret police, the Securitate, currently in the custody of CNSAS. The secret police carried out a systematic activity of collecting information about, and confiscating items from, prominent members of what the project names cultural opposition. Unlike the latter, its activity of collecting had a different rationale than 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 of the past left no other collections, so they can only be documented from such CNSAS ad-hoc collections identified in the frame of the project from the larger archive of the former secret police, in 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 are conserved by individuals who have not hitherto been associated with an activity worth researching, and which have been featured for the first time as valuable sources for the study of communism in Romania in the frame of the COURAGE project. In between, there are a few collections of cultural opposition operated by libraries, museums or other archives, which received them as donations from various private individuals. Worth underlining is 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 geographical interests, 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. Such dichotomic cartography of the collections might be criticized as simplistic, for 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. Yet, the collections in Romania fit more or less this view because there were no mediating structures in between the individual and the secret police, for no networks of dissent and only a few and short-lived groups of cultural opposition acted against Ceaușescu’s regime and none was still active in 1989.

3.2 Actors and Users

As dissent was feeble in communist Romania, the canonical collections are very few. As preservation of such items implied greater perceived or existing risks in communist Romania than in other countries, only few individuals ventured to systematically collect such materials, while only very few state institutions involved in such venture apart from the ubiquitous secret police, the Securitate. Thus, the most important actor in the preservation of collections related to cultural opposition during the former communist regime in Romania is the National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives (Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității – CNSAS). The circumstances of the 1999 establishment of this official authority in Romania that operates under the control of Romanian Parliament and administers the archives of the former communist secret police, the Securitate, have been presented above. As international actor in preserving the heritage of cultural opposition in former communist countries, the CNSAS Archive is the third largest archive of its kind in Europe, after those of BStU in the Federal Republic of Germany and IPN in Poland. According to the law, the CNSAS has a triple mission: (1) archive; (2) public authority entrusted with transitional justice; (3) research institute; from among which the first mission is the most relevant for this report. As an archive, CNSAS ensures the free access of individuals – Romanian citizens and foreign nationals who were citizens of Romania after 1945 – to their personal files devised by the former Securitate during the period 6 March 1945 to 22 December 1989. Regarding the accessibility of these archives, a major change occurred when a massive transfer of documents to CNSAS was made during the period March–December 2005, and consequently the holdings of the CNSAS Archives increased from approx. 9,400 files comprising approx. 19,000 volumes (around 700 linear metres) to some 1.3 million files comprising over 1.5 million volumes. Currently, the archival holdings amount to over 2 million volumes (around 25 km). The CNSAS Archives are arranged according to the logic of its founder, that is, the former Securitate. The main collections which preserve documents related to activities of cultural opposition are: the Penal Fonds (files of those put on trial), the

Informative Fonds (files of those put under surveillance), the Documentary Fonds, the Romanian Exile Fonds, and the Manuscripts Fonds (confiscated materials). To these collections of documents created before 1989, either by the secret police or by those it kept under surveillance, we may add the Oral History Collection at CNSAS, which includes interviews with former victims of the Securitate who came to consult their files. From the documents included in these collections, COURAGE research defined – to the benefit of potential researchers – a series of ad-hoc collections, which gather all those records related to the repressed cultural activities of a certain groups or isolated persons. This is especially important in the case of those individuals who did not or could not preserve anything related to their pre-1989 underground cultural activities. It is also relevant to compare the archives preserved by the persecuted individuals or groups with those created by the secret police about them; the late dissidents Doina Cornea and Éva Cseke-Gyimesi or the Goma Movement for human rights, the Ellenpontok samizdat group and the literary circle Aktionsgruppe Banat can be studied from both perspectives due to descriptions for both types of collections in the COURAGE registry.

As a public authority entrusted with transitional justice, CNSAS contributes to the process of restitution by providing to victims in search of legal compensation and rehabilitation the necessary documentation on the basis of Law 221/2009 regarding political sentences passed between 1945 and 1989. In addition, as analyzed above, CNSAS discloses on the basis of its founding legal frame and additional legislative changes former agents and informal collaborators and exposes the repressive actions of the former communist secret police. As a research institute, the CNSAS creates and disseminates knowledge on the repressive dimension of the communist regime, playing a fundamental role in the process of coming to terms with the communist dictatorial past. Its political, social and cultural role resides in educating younger generations, who do not have a direct experience of the communist past, in the spirit of democratic values by emphasizing the non-democratic essence of the former regime, which is epitomized by the acts of violation of human and citizen rights and liberties. Accordingly, CNSAS is engaged in a wide range of dissemination activities. The institution reaches the general public through travelling exhibitions on the communist period, of which the most popular are “The Securitate as instrument of the dictatorship” and “My youth under communism.” CNSAS addresses in particular the young generation by offering internships to university students and organizing documentary visits in collaboration with high-schools and universities. The most efficient dissemination is performed via on-line resources. The CNSAS has devised an educational section of its website dedicated to digital resources, where it posts original documents from the Securitate archives, as well as scholarship and teaching support materials produced by its own researchers. All materials can be downloaded for free and are described in the registry as CNSAS Online Collection.

The second important actor in preserving the collections of cultural opposition in Romania is the Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile (IICCMER). It was established in 2005 under the coordination of the Romanian Government as the Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes in Romania (IICCR). The current institution is the result of the merger in November 2009 between IICCR and the National Institute for the Memory of Romanian Exile (INMER). The main purpose of IICCMER is to investigate and identify abuses and violations of human rights during the communist regime in Romania and to notify the official bodies to take action in these cases and to preserve the memory of the Romanian exile through the archiving, researching and publishing of documents related to the Romanian exile community from 1940 to 1989. IICCMER hosts more than 30 archival units with a historical-documentary character, coming from personal donations and acquisitions made by the institute. Some of these fonds have been part of a digitization process, which facilitates the access of researchers and public interested in the phenomenon of the post-war Romanian exile community.

Among the other institutions that operate more than one collection is the Lucian Blaga Central University Library in Cluj-Napoca (BCU Cluj-Napoca), which is also one of the most important university libraries in Romania; it is financed by and subordinated to the Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research. BCU Cluj-Napoca has a collection of almost 4,000,000 books and periodicals. During the communist regime, BCU Cluj-Napoca underwent a process of staff purging, and public access to many books was forbidden, as they were placed in the so-called Special Collection. After the collapse of communism, BCU Cluj-Napoca managed to attract quite a number of collections which were preserved in private ownership before 1989, so today it hosts many collections which reflect various forms of cultural opposition against the communist regime, such as the collections of Adrian Marino, Mircea Carp, Éva Cseke-Gyimesi, or the Rațiu–Tilea Archive and the Rațiu-Tilea Library. Between 1999 and 2018 the library implemented an ample digitization program, with the result that that many documents of heritage value and old periodicals have become accessible online, but the collections of cultural opposition are not yet digitized.

The ASTRA National Museum Complex (ASTRA Museum) in Sibiu is one of the largest ethnographic museums in Europe. Its open-air exhibition includes over 400 monuments of peasant architecture and technology covering a surface of approximately 40 hectares. The origins of the museum can be found in the ethnographic collections assembled by the Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People (Asociațiunea Transilvană pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român or in short ASTRA), an institution that played a major role in the cultural emancipation of Transylvanian Romanians after its establishment in 1861. In 1950, two years after the establishment of the communist regime, the ASTRA Museum was closed because the ASTRA Association was

perceived as a cultural institution of the Romanian bourgeoisie in Transylvania, while its collections transferred to the Brukenthal Museum. In 1963, on Cornel Irimie's initiative, the open-air Museum of Folk Technics (Muzeul Tehnicii Populare) was established on the outskirts of Sibiu. In the frame of this newly established museum, researchers and museologists conducted ethnographic field research on the religious beliefs of the rural population, as well as on rural settlements across the country. The collections gathered illustrate how ethnographers managed to negotiate the autonomy of their research activity with the communist state institutions and conduct research in contradiction with some of the official cultural policies. These collections include more than 300 files of personal documents, student notes, field research notes and reports, drafts of academic works, acquisition reports, and exhibition drafts, as well as a unique collection of windmills, dismantled from Dobrogea and moved to Sibiu in order to be rescued from the destruction to which the communist modernization condemned these items of the cultural rural heritage. The ASTRA Museum, which was reestablished after the collapse of communism, overtook all these collections, which apart from the CNSAS ad-hoc collections represent the only types of collections of cultural opposition preserved in a Romanian state institution from before 1989.

The above-presented state-run operators of collections are far from exhausting the list of the researched operators. They are only particular examples of creating and preserving collections of cultural opposition before 1989 or attracting such collections from private ownership after 1989. Otherwise, the largest majority of the operators are private, as the list in the appendix illustrates. In fact, the particularity of COURAGE research in Romania is that most of the collections discovered and described in the COURAGE registry were previously unknown for they are still in private ownership and visited only by appointment. Thus, the most important achievement of the COURAGE research in Romania is the identification of these collections which are part of the common European cultural heritage, while the researched persons represent some of those silent agents of change who were instrumental in re-Europeanizing Romania. These previously unknown collections of material or digital items bear witness today to the diverse forms of critical thinking and independent action 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 as the communist regimes imposed, because they let themselves 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. As the Romanian communist regime adopted an increasingly nationalist rhetoric and policies in the 1970s and the 1980s, those who used to think and act independently were implicitly anti-nationalists and pro-Europeans. Sometimes without realizing this, they turned after 1989 into the social segment which actively contributed to Romania's transformation into a feeble, yet uncontested democracy willing to integrate into the European Union. In short, the unforeseen long-term

legacy of cultural opposition to Ceaușescu's national-communist regime was its profound Europeanism. This legacy must be preserved. Yet, its preservation is endangered, so action must be taken for their rescue.

4. Concluding Remarks and Policy Recommendations

The endemic lack of financial resources allocated to culture in one of the poorest countries of the European Union is no surprise. There is little to be done in this respect. What could be done though in order to (A) safeguard the preservation of these collections and (B) enhance their national and transnational visibility is to: (1) better access the private and external sources of funding, (2) better use of the existing financial and human resources, and, last but not least, (3) better educate the next generation to whom this heritage must be transmitted. Some examples of best practices reveal how some of these goals could be achieved and highlight what are the problems still to overcome. It was from discussions with the stakeholders approached in the frame of the project that possible legal and practical solutions to these problems have been suggested.

In terms of archiving and collecting, one example of best practice is the Sighet Memorial, which represents today a major site of European remembrance, recipient of European Heritage Label. The museum collection was established by the Civic Academy Foundation, which made skillful use of private donations and grants offered by private foundations to set up a unique museum collection on communism in Romania. Minimal state funding was assured by a special law, which thus guarantees the continuity in the functioning of the museum. In short, it is an example of good mobilization of public and private resources following a private initiative. Also remarkable is the capacity of the operating foundation to inspire the trust of the private collectors: all items displayed in the museum collection were the result of public collects of objects, all items originate from private collections. The museum is one of the most visited in Romania with more than 100,000 visitors every year, so it is a place where these private collections achieved the highest possible visibility. This particular achievement illustrates how private operators can make better use of private financial resources to safeguard the preservation of private collections in the frame of a museum. However, this type of museum, which is dedicated to the victims of, and the armed resistance to, the communist regime, mostly covers the late 1940s and the 1950s, while it represents the entire pre-1989 past by emphasizing the state violence against citizens and the citizens' response to these violent acts. Thus, in this museum there is practically no place for the largest part of the collections discovered by COURAGE research, which refer to a different period in time, mostly the 1970s and the 1980s, and speak mostly about non-confrontational tactics, about ways of by-passing

the system or developing parallel worlds. In this purpose, new permanent exhibitions on the communist past need to be established, either in the frame of an existing museum, like the National Museum of History, or by establishing a new institution able to absorb and rescue all these private collections of items of the past which cannot be preserved in digital copies in an electronic repository. This is a direction in which powerful lobbying is needed.

This also brings into discussion the question of trust in public institutions, as many of the private collectors clearly expressed the idea that they would like to donate what they collected in order to make them available, but they cannot decide what is the best place. This dilemma is the result of significant differences between central and local archives, libraries or museums, large and small repositories of collections, traditional and new operating institutions. There is no general solution to this dilemma. Often, the central institutions function better, because they had more and better trained personnel, capable of inventorying the new collections and make them available in shorter time. For instance, the National Archives in Bucharest received as donation the Lovinescu-Ierunca Collection created by two prominent members of the Romanian exile community in 2012 and made it available for research in 2015, while the Iași branch of the National Archives received a similar donation, the Mihnea Berindei Collection, in 2013 and it is not yet available for research; practically, the UB team made a pioneering work when describing this collection. The newly established and specialized institution in the collections created by the exile community, the Institute for the Investigation of the Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Exile (IICCMER) managed to attract many collections created by the diaspora. However, the institute lacks adequate storage space and it is short of professionally trained staff, so most of the collections in its custody are hardly available for research. In other cases, local institutions, large or small, but with well-established tradition in the local community, inspire trust and individuals from that community prefer to donate their collections to such local repository. That is the case of Central University Library (BCU) Cluj-Napoca or Teutsch Haus Sibiu, both housing more than one collection of cultural opposition. At the same time, the visibility of these collections is much lower in a provincial repository than in a central one, as the case of the Eginald Schlattner Collection at Teutsch Haus illustrates: although the founder is a best-selling international author, his archive was visited by one single individual. A good practice of a local operating institution which was able to make visible efforts not only to build a museum collection by public collect of items in private ownership, but also to increase the visibility of its collections is the Memorial of the Revolution 16-22 December 1989 in Timișoara. Mostly with private funding, the association which operates the museum has erected 12 commemorative monuments in the urban perimeter of the city, while building partnerships with local schools and promoting educational programs tremendously increased the visibility of the museum collection at local level. Yet, this collection which refers to a major and tragic event of recent history has only limited societal impact at national level. The inclusion in the COURAGE registry definitely increases the national and transnational visibility of

this collection, yet the question is to also attract offline visitors to a collection which cannot be digitized. One possible way of encouraging visitors to the museum is to include such places in the state funded tourist schemes available for state employees in the form of free vouchers to be used in designated places.

Finally, many other collections of cultural opposition consist of documents that can be digitized and made worldwide available online. Although governmental funding for institutional investments is severely limited since the economic crisis of 2008, several institutions initiated such programs by applying for special grants, among which the National Archives in Bucharest, where special and expensive equipment able to digitize rare and precious documents now operates slowly but steadily. The difference between old and fragile manuscripts and the documents related to the recent past is that the former category includes fewer items but all requiring special handling, while the latter consists of numerous items but these can be scanned faster and even using less costly equipment. An example of good practice in digitizing and disseminating documents is CNSAS, which in a period of 8 years made available in digital format more than 10 million pages, including documents from several fonds in its custody. Those documents not requiring anonymization, especially those from the documentary fonds, are now available online. These resources were integrated in university curricula, while students were attracted to stages of internship. The project of digitization was possible with few human resources (three employees), ingenious low-cost technical solutions and a special partnership with an external institution, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, which was co-interested in supporting this process with new equipment. However, the digitization of an archive of 25 linear meters will require many years at this speed. Besides, the emerging digital archive requires the creation of metadata standards for easier management of these electronic resources and easier identification of the relevant digital material. This is a general problem with Romanian collections, which cannot be solved without adequate programs of personal training. In short, such ample programs of digitization need more funding, more and better trained personnel and better knowledge to create metadata on the newly established digital repositories. A solution can only come by changing the legal frame as to allow the use of the turnover from the photocopies released to researchers, which now goes entirely to the state budget, for purchasing digitizing equipment, and permit the transformation of the successful students' internships into limited-time and conditioned work contracts and then into permanent employment with clear missions. These provisions allow a state-run non-profit institution to use the financial resources it actually produces, and motivate prospective employees to train themselves for a position that triggers changes instead of perpetuating the status quo. Of course, these are policy recommendations which require further lobbying for their implementation.

Appendix

Collections in Romania in the COURAGE Registry

(67 researched and uploaded by UB as of 1 November 2018)

Adrian Marino Collection at BCU Cluj-Napoca

Aktionsgruppe Banat Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Alexandru Barnea Photograph Private Collection

Alexandru Călinescu Private Collection

Andrei Pandele Photograph Private Collection

Andrei Partoş – Radio Vacanţa-Costineşti Private Collection

Anonymous Mountaineer Private Collection

Áron Márton Memorial Collection in Alba Iulia

Aurel and Emil Cioran Collection at ASTRA Library

Bethlen Foundation Collection

Black Church Restoration Ad Hoc Collection in Braşov

Braşov - Oraşul Memorabil Collection

Censored Theatre and Cinema Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Club A - Mirel Leventer Private Collection

CNSAS Online Collection

Confiscated Manuscripts Collection at CNSAS

Cornel Chiriac and Fans of Alternative Music Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Cornel Irimie Collection at ASTRA Museum Sibiu

Culianu & Petrescu Private Library

Doina Cornea Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Doina Cornea Private Collection

Eginald Schlattner Collection at Deutsch Haus Sibiu

Ellenpontok Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Ellenpontok–Tóth Private Collection

Ethnographic Research in Dobrogea Ad-Hoc Collection at ASTRA Museum Sibiu

Éva Cseke-Gyimesi Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

Éva Cseke-Gyimesi Collection at BCU Cluj-Napoca

Gheorghe Leahu Private Collection

Goma Movement Ad-Hoc Collection at CNSAS

Hans Mattis–Teutsch Collection at Braşov Art Museum

Hans Otto Roth Collection at Black Church Archives Braşov

Herta Müller Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS

High Consistory Collection at Teutsch Haus Sibiu

Ion Dumitru Collection at IICCMER

Ion Monoran Private Collection

Irina Margareta Nistor Private Collection

Kiáltó Szó – Sándor Balázs Private Collection

Lovinescu–Ierunca Collection at Central National Historical Archives (ANIC) Bucharest

Lovinescu–Ierunca Collection at Oradea University Library

Marian Zulean Private Collection

Memorial to the Revolution of 16–22 December 1989 in Timișoara

Michael Shafir Collection at BJC Cluj-Napoca

Mihai Manea Private Poster Collection

Mihai Stănescu Caricature Collection

Mihnea Berindei Collection at the A. D. Xenopol Institute of History in Iași

Mihnea Berindei Collection at the Romanian National Archives - Iași Branch

Mircea Carp Collection at BCU Cluj-Napoca

Nelu Stratone Private Musical Records Collection

Oral History Collection at CNSAS

Paul Goma Private Archive

Rațiu–Tilea Archives of the Romanian Exile Collection at BCU Cluj–Napoca

Rațiu–Tilea Personal Library Collection at BCU Cluj–Napoca
Revolution of 1989 in Timișoara – Private Photograph Collection
Romanian Greek Catholic Church Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS
Sanda Budiș Collection at IICCMER
Sanda Stolojan Collection at IICCMER
Sighet Memorial - Museum Collection
Sighet Memorial - Oral History Collection
Sorin Costina Art Private Collection
Ștefan Gane Collection at IICCMER
Transnational Roma Networks Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS
Varieties of Religious Dissent Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS
Victor Frunză Collection at IICCMER
William Totok Private Collection
Youth Subcultures Ad-hoc Collection at CNSAS
Zoltán Kallós Ethnographic Private Collection
Zoltán Rostás Oral History Private Collection

Operators, Owners

A. D. Xenopol Institute of History in Iași
ASTRA Library Sibiu
ASTRA Museum Sibiu
Association Memorial to the Revolution of 16–22 December 1989
Alexandru Barnea
Alexandru Călinescu
Andrei Pandele
Andrei Partoș
Antal Károly Tóth and Ilona Tóth
Áron Márton

BCU Cluj-Napoca (Central University Library Cluj-Napoca)

Bethlen Foundation

Black Church Library and Archive

Braşov Art Museum

BJ Cluj (Cluj County Library)

Central National Historical Archives (ANIC) Bucharest

Civic Academy Foundation

CNSAS (National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archives)

Dan Petrescu and Thérèse Culianu-Petrescu

Dragoş Petrescu

Gheorghe Leahu

ICUB (Research Institute of the University of Bucharest)

IICCMER (Institute for the Investigation of the Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile)

Ion Monoran

Irina Margareta Nistor

Leontin Juhas

Marian Zulean

Mihai Stănescu

Lucian Ionică

Memorial to the Revolution of 16–22 December 1989 in Timișoara Association

Mihai Manea

Mirel Leventer

Nelu Stratone

Oradea University Library

Paul Goma

Romanian National Archives - Iași Branch

Romanian Order of Architects–Braşov, Covasna, and Harghita Branch

Sándor Balázs

Sorin Costina

Teutsch Haus Sibiu

William Totok

Zoltán Kallós Foundation

Zoltán Rostás

Map of Collections in Romania

