This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-00164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Volumes pubblished (2006)

I. *Thematic Work Groups*

I. Public Power in Europe: Studies in Historical Transformations
II. Power and Culture: Hegemony, Interaction and Dissent
III. Religion, Ritual and Mythology. Aspects of Identity Formation in Europe
IV. Professions and Social Identity. New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society
V. Frontiers and Identities: Mapping the Research Field
VI. Europe and the World in European Historiography

II. *Transversal Theme*

I. Citizenship in Historical Perspective

III. *Doctoral Dissertations*

I. F. Peyrou, La Comunidad de Ciudadanos. El Discurso Democrático-Republicano en España, 1840-1868

Cover: Venetian glass beads. Photograph by Carla Salvaterra, 2006.

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43
56126 Pisa
Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945
info-plus@edizioniplus.it
www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

ISBN 88-0000-000-0

Manager
Claudia Napolitano

Editing
Francesca Petrucci

Informatic assistance
Michele Gasparello

The Cultural and Political Strategies of Exile: Romanians in the Cold War

LAVINIA S. STAN
UNIVERSITY OF CLUJ NAPOCA

Perioada regimului comunist s-a aflat multa vreme într-un con de umbră, confruntâdu-se cu o așa numită 'amezie colectivă,' puțini cercetători apropiindu-se de această tematică. Mai mult, istoria exilului românesc a fost, până în momentul de față cantonată în zona colecțiilor de documente și a unui număr limitat de lucări de sinteză și/sau analiză. Lucrarea de față își propune să analizeze relațiile dintre exil și puterea politică, fie că este vorba de țara de origine sau cea de adopție. Mai mult, se concentrează pe strategiile utilizate de oamenii de cultură români care au plecat în exil și încercarea lor de a influența puterea politică, precum și reacțiile pe care acesta din urmă le-a avut, acestea din urmă înregistrând o mare varietate, de la răpiri, tentative de asasinat și infiltrare de spioni până la publicare trunchiată a lucrărilor unui autor din exil. Pentru autoritățile comuniste din România, exilul a reprezentat o opoziție constantă și incomodă care lipsea în mare măsură în interior. De aceea, eficiența sau ineficiența exilului ar fost analizată în funcție de reacțiile din partea Securității mai degrabă decât de impactul pe care exilații l-au avut asupra guvernelor din Vest sau atingerea obiectivelor propuse.

WHAT'S A CULTURE?

> "What's a 'culture'? Look it up. 'A group of micro-organisms grown in a nutrient substance under controlled conditions'."
> [Salman Rushdie, *The Ground Beneath Her Feet* (1999)]

A possible reading of Salman Rushdie's definition of 'a culture' could be that it is meant to grow in a favourable, but controlled environment. One might ask, though, what would happen if these conditions change? During the Cold War,

individuals and organisations in exile strove to find the 'nutrient substance' for Romanian culture, not only to survive, but also to spread through its environment, that is, governments and public opinion in both home and host countries. The focus of this paper is on the cultural strategies employed by Romanian communities in exile to influence political power and on the reactions they generated.

The Second World War had already driven many people into exile. Later, according to Suhrke, 'the singular effect of the Cold War was not to politicize the refugee phenomenon, but to globalize this process and connect it to the dominant rivalry between the superpowers. Refugees became instruments of and parties of the Cold War, representing increments of power that were counted in the balance between East and West. In an age of mass politics and under the terms of ideological rivalry during the Cold War, refugees who crossed over to the West represented a political asset […]'[1] Therefore, one cannot speak about exile and its strategies without considering the specificity of the ideological warfare between East and West. The importance of cultural aspects was crucial. They were perceived as an effective weapon instrumentalized by both sides through propaganda. In this paper, 'culture' is employed heuristically in a broad sense to include both cultural producers and their cultural products.

Because Western states soon recognized most of the postwar political regimes in Central and Eastern Europe, there was no possibility of admitting official governments-in-exile. However, the West did assist and subsidise unofficial National Committees, organised by representatives from all central and eastern European countries. Hence, culture remained the only means available to achieve political goals. One of the Romanian exiles, Mircea Eliade expressed his belief that 'culture is the only politics that the exiles can carry out,' and that in the context of the Cold War 'the intellectual is considered the public enemy number one.'[2]

This peculiarity of the cultural Cold War will be addressed by focusing on exile, and by analyzing the continuous action-reaction or initiative-response relationship with both home and host country. One of the crucial features of exile during the Cold War was that exiles made a clear distinction between nation and regime, contesting the communist regime while showing loyalty to the nation. The primary aim of Romanian exiles was "to overpower a native government without challenging the existence of the nation-state"[3] because it was imposed arbitrarily by the Soviets. Of course, this general aim altered in intensity during the near half-century of communist rule, changing from a strong conviction that the goal would be achieved in a short time, to a resignation that communism would not be overthrown in the foreseeable future. The international situation determined the means and the types of actions that were undertaken.

NEXT YEAR IN BUCHAREST!

The history of Romanian exiles struggling to influence political power began in the 19th century, when the 1848 revolutionaries who had escaped to western countries successfully lobbied those powers for support for Romanian national objectives. A century later, the exiles faced a radically different situation, especially in France, where most writers and artists were concentrated, and where the intellectual scene was dominated by the left. During the first decade of the Cold War, "Next year in Bucharest!" was the standard New Year's Eve greeting of Romanians in exile. The 1956 Hungarian revolution and the non-intervention of the West marked the end of hopes that the communist regime in Romania would be overthrown.

It is generally accepted that the activities of Eastern European exiles were ineffective. They failed to achieve their goals because of a lack of unity and the difficulties of organising a unique, relevant voice.[4] Pnina Werbner considers that "diasporas are chaorders, chaotic orders", and that "there is no guiding hand, no command structure, organising the politics, the protests, the philanthropic drives, the commemoration ceremonies or the aesthetics of diasporas."[5] Similarly, according to Yossi Shain, the exiles were "anything but united".[6] Czech, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Romanian, Yugoslav and Polish exile organisations all failed in their effort to maintain unity against the communist regimes at home.[7] For example, Polish exiles after 1945 tried to preserve the prewar status of a government-in-exile. Its members refused to transform into a national committee when the government-in-exile lost its diplomatic recognition in 1945.[8] They split into two main groups – the 'legalists' and the 'idealists' – each claiming that they represented Polish interests. Similarly, the Hungarians had two main competing organisations, the American Hungarian Federation and the Hungarian National Council, that had been established in 1947 by the exiled members of the postwar coalition government.[9]

The first generation of Romanians in exile after the war had a heterogeneous political composition, made up of several important politicians, covering the whole political spectrum. According to a Radio Free Europe (RFE) report, there were four main political groups of Romanians abroad during the first decade of the Cold War. The first group comprised the supporters of the Romanian National Peasant's Party, the second were the National Liberals, the third group were socialists, and the fourth group was composed of the Iron Guard members and sympathisers.[10] Between them, they mirrored the divisions at home and generated competing political organisations, such as the Romanian National

Committee and the League of Free Romanians. None of the political figures in exile succeeded in gathering the exiles together. Cultural organisations were much more collaborative, but they lacked a leading personality to make a coherent cultural action abroad.

After fleeing the country in the first years after 1945, some Romanians chose France and the French occupation zone in Germany, because of the kinship of language and the educational background of most of this first generation. Spain was another preferred destination and gathered in particular former extreme right-wing activists. Generally speaking, politicians concentrated in the USA, while artists remained mostly in Europe.

This first wave of exiles considered the 'Soviet occupation' of Romania to be temporary, pending a military intervention by the Western powers. They communicated regularly with western officials, using personal connections where possible. They also strove to convince public opinion in the host countries about the real situation in Romania. Romanian politicians in exile endeavoured to organise themselves in order to achieve their goal of changing the communist regime. They lobbied western governments and offered support to domestic opposition to the communist government.

Lobbying against Soviet interference in Romanian domestic policy started in Paris at the end of the war. Grigore Gafencu, former foreign minister, and some young Romanian diplomats organised a campaign for Romania. Gafencu was considered by the Romanian secret police, the infamous Securitate, to be "the main representative of the Romanian reactionary movement aboard".[11] In 1947 in the USA, together with other personalities, he tried to set up a government-in-exile, which created difficulties for the American authorities.[12] In 1948 however, it was obvious that even if the abdication of King Michael gave Romanians in exile the possibility of creating a free committee, the possibility of a government-in-exile was ruled out.

Between the cultural and political activities of the exiles one can identify much overlap. The relationship between the general political aim and cultural engagement was stated in the introduction to the first issue of an exile publication in Paris in 1949. It focused on the role of writers who "believe in freedom and have a common ideal for a history of freedom for mankind. In this sense, and only in this, we all feel ourselves to be 'engaged writers'."[13] In spite of political diversity and internal conflicts, the cultural exiles, with some exceptions, were collaborative rather than combative. Within the pages of the same magazine were to be found writers of both strong right-wing and left-wing orientations.[14]

Eva Behring claims that during the entire exile period, there were three levels of cultural identity of Romanian intellectuals in exile. The first comprised those who had a complete lack of confidence in the possibility of integrating into the host

culture. They maintained Romanian as the language of their literary works, and wrote only for a Romanian audience. This was the case with writers such as Paul Goma, who started his opposition to Ceaușescu's regime while in Romania and who arrived in France in 1978. The second level was the acceptance of a double cultural identity, with mastery of both the native language and the language of adoption, thus targeting both home and host country audiences. Most exiles belonged to this category. Thirdly, some writers totally abandoned their first linguistic identity, aiming their work exclusively at the public in their host country.[15] This was the case of Emil Cioran who repudiated the Romanian language, and to a lesser degree, Eugene Ionescu, who occasionally wrote in Romanian.[16]

The need to organise themselves into a coherent entity was emphasized by one of the exiles who argued "that the emigration in itself has no meaning […] only those Romanians or Romanian institutions that identify with other various national or international groupings are of relevance."[17] Likewise, "misunderstandings among the refugees mean the sabotage of our real and democratic position from which we can speak to the West."[18] One of the strategies employed by the exiles was the initiation of literary meetings by Mircea Eliade, who "considered that we needed a literary club."[19] On the 16 March 1954 he founded a literary and artistic Romanian club at the Romanian Catholic Mission in Paris.[20] This club was longlasting, and in the 1970s welcomed writers coming from Romania. This made it vulnerable to infiltration by the Securitate.[21]

Another means of combating the Bucharest regime through culture was the creation of institutions such as the Charles I Foundation, inaugurated in Paris on 8 December 1950 as a re-creation of the former organization established in 1891 by the first Romanian king.[22] According to a French foreign office document, this Foundation engaged in excellent activities, benefiting from the participation of reliable intellectuals.[23] Another important institution was the Romanian Library in Freiburg, south-western Germany. It was created in 1949 and aimed at 'becoming an objective documentary source for all Romanian and foreign researchers'.[24] The Romanian Academic Society was initiated in 1957 by Nicolae Rădescu, the last Romanian prime minister before the communist takeover, because "the Romanian Academy was transformed into a 'simulacrum'."[25] These institutions organised public conferences, lectures, exhibitions, offered financial support for young intellectuals, and regularly published their own journals.

Romanian politicians sponsored the majority of the publications issued by the exiles.[26] The intellectuals themselves were mostly still young, without sources of income other than scholarships or the aid provided by certain foreign institutions, Romanian organisations, or politicians. The editing efforts and struggles were symptomatic of trying to reach a wide audience – mostly, but not only, Romanian – while spending as little money as possible. The initiators had as

their "first objective to create and to support the contacts with free Romanians",[27] because "they speak to the few: to those who try to see the reality, the meaning, and the value of Romanian culture."[28]

Exiles perceived their cultural destiny as to offer an alternative to the censored culture produced in Romania, as well as to preserve Romanian culture and language abroad. They had a crucial responsibility towards Romania, which faced "the most profound crisis […] Today in Romania no integral texts by classic authors are allowed to be read. The purge of our libraries, started years ago, continues with a greater violence. The majority of Romanian writers cannot publish anymore. The few writers who went overseas cannot remedy this rupture of Romanian literature and culture. But these few writers abroad have something that in our country the writers do not have: the freedom of writing and publishing."[29]

Besides literature, science had its own publications, so that researchers could keep up-to-date with the progress of research. This was impossible in Romania because "the scholars and students are not allowed to leave the country and to pursue their scientific activity in the West […] There are only a limited number of favoured persons who succeeded in leaving Romania and finding asylum in the West. Their aim is to fight for the rebirth of liberty, of the spirit, and for the reestablishment of previous scientific links with the West […]."[30] Thus, there was a particular responsibility on the exiles as the only ones able to continue a scientific relationship with the western world.

However, political power in both the home and host countries reacted to activities that were more radical. The most prominent event involving Romanians in exile was the attack on the Romanian legation in Bern in February 1955.[31] Five Romanians in exile occupied the legation by force, declaring that they were seeking documents to prove that the institution was an espionage operation, and to take hostages to exchange them for some Romanian personalities who were in prison. The Romanian communist authorities referred to them as 'traitors abroad', never using the word 'exile', which was associated positively with 1848.[32] The communist daily 'Scânteia' [The Spark] initiated a powerful media campaign against the entire community of 'traitors', against the 'imperialist Americans', and even against the Swiss authorities, who refused to extradite the perpetrators. On this occasion, many Romanians in exile supported the action, but Radio Free Europe took a different point of view, stating that the attackers were criminals. This, of course, corresponded with the communist position. In addition to strong diplomatic and press campaigns, the Romanian government reacted violently in 1958, when the organiser of the action, Oliviu Beldeanu, was captured in West Berlin and brought by special plane to Bucharest. He was tried, condemned to death, and executed in 1960. Other exiles had similar experiences. For example, the representative of the Romanian

National Committee in Turkey, Aurel Decei, who was the former ambassador to that country, was also kidnapped in the early 1960s in West Berlin, taken back to Romania, and imprisoned.[33]

The cultural activities of the exiles had only limited impact on Romania and the host countries. The limited circulation of their publications, the difficulty of reaching an audience in Romania, the lack of a leading intellectual figure in exile, and the closure of the borders of Romania, were some of the explanations for this. Western governments were content that the exiles did not take too much initiative in relationship to Bucharest. They welcomed those institutions which were politically neutral and monitored the activity of those which used culture for more political purposes.[34]

IF IDENTIFIED, TO BE ARRESTED!

After 1956 the exiles faced the reality of a lasting communist regime, which was now better able to take the initiative against the opposition abroad. Both sides needed to elaborate more coherent strategies. In the 1960s the Securitate drew up a list of 'dangerous' exiles who were "if identified, to be arrested!" The tactics of the Bucharest authorities changed, as did the structure and the allegiances of the exile community. From the mid 1960s, when Romania embarked upon the road of 'national communism', the communist authorities' initiatives generated strong reactions amongst the exiles. The communists understood that the exiles' opposition could not be shut down by blatant measures, so they switched to more subtle ones of divide and rule. The Romanian churches abroad and the cultural organisations became the favourite targets. The anti-religious campaign of the communist regime expanded behind the boundaries of Romania itself. It initiated a campaign against the priest Valerian Trifa, head of the free Romanian Orthodox Church in the USA, who was discredited as a former extreme right-wing activist and an anti-Semite. Trifa went into a second exile in Portugal, where he died in 1987. Pierre de Bouffanais, the former French ambassador to Romania, stated that "the Romanian media does not have a habit of informing its readers about the activities of emigrants abroad, so it is probable that he is proving something of a nuisance to the Romanian officials."[35] Similarly situated was the Romanian Orthodox Church in Paris, whose priest, Vasile Boldeanu, was accused of comparable charges. In the confrontation between Boldeanu's supporters and those of the priest appointed by Bucharest the church building was transformed into something of a battlefield.[36] The Romanian Catholic Mission abroad was targeted as well, but with less success due to its connection with the Holy See.

Another tactic employed by the Romanian authorities was the appropriation of cultural exile figures. An attempt was made to repatriate the remains of important personalities who had died abroad. One such was Nicolae Titulescu, a former foreign minister and former president of the League of Nations, but the strong opposition of his widow, who appealed to the French authorities, postponed the process until 1991.[37] In 1969 the heir of George Enescu, the composer, violinist and conductor, was afraid that the communist authorities would try to transfer illegally the remains of Enescu and his wife. A document issued by the French authorities stated that this fear was warranted, as "the Romanian government did not respect the conditions set up when Elena Vacarescu's coffin was transferred to Romania."[38] The Romanian authorities were more successful in Grigore Gafencu's case. In 1969, his widow returned to Bucharest and repatriated the remains of the diplomat, who had died in 1956, "in exchange for the return of the house in Bucharest and for a pension."[39] Romanian intellectuals in exile, fearing that Gafencu's memoirs would be published in a distorted version, sought pieces of his work from various printing houses. Indeed, one means of both cultivating dissension among the exiles and building up national communism was the publishing of heavily-edited parts of works by writers in exile. Of course, there was no reference to their being in exile, and most of the works published were literary pieces. For instance, Mircea Eliade's literary works were partially published, unlike his studies on the history of religions.

Increasingly, the exiles reacted more coherently and specifically to each challenge. However, in the 1970s and 1980s, two successive waves of newcomers to Western countries brought different backgrounds and different expectations and most of them were not involved in any action against the communist regime. The most active group remained the old one, with which some isolated newcomers associated.[40] The closed elite group did open to wider participation, but this increased the general fear that the Securitate would find infiltration easier. This in fact proved later to be justified.[41] However, as long as access to the Securitate's archives remains restricted, it is hard to analyse the effectiveness of its actions against the exiles.

Following the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, the focus switched towards humanitarian initiatives, which in a short time became the most visible actions undertaken by the exiles. They struggled to inform public opinion about the contravention of human rights in Romania, demonstrated and lobbied for legislation in favour of reunifying families, the right to emigration, and other matters. Frequent methods of pressure included protest marches, letters to governments, hearings in different committees (especially in the U.S. Congress when the Most Favoured Nation Status was to be granted or extended to Romania), and hunger strikes. To give one example, the dissident Romanian writer Ben Corlaciu fled to France, where he received political asylum. He was the first to start a public hunger strike

in Paris for the release of his family from Romania. Because the Romanian authorities claimed that he had debts to pay, Mircea Eliade stepped in with the royalties from his works published in Romania to pay them off. Utimately, Ben Corlaciu's family was allowed to join him.

Initially, there was little or no access to the media of the host countries, especially in France. However, when Ceauşescu's regime moved towards a Moscow-independent line, it became more interesting for left-oriented French intellectuals.[42] The exiles, however, continued to inform Western government officials about the true situation in Romania. The newly-formed Union of Free Romanians with its president Ioan Raţiu was refused an audience with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the West German foreign minister. Because of this, Raţiu warned Genscher in a letter that during Ceauşescu's forthcoming visit to the Federal Republic, the Romanian leader would try to 'offer the agricultural products he takes out of the mouths of women and children, whose lives are endangered by severe food shortages.' The letter went on to say that Ceauşescu 'will act as one who seeks independence from Moscow, but within Romania's boundaries he has imposed the most drastic police state.' Raţiu urged that the Bonn government should use this opportunity to pressure the Romanian government to allow the reunification of families, and that no western government should accept agricultural imports from Romania as long as those products were not available at home.[43]

It became usual practice during diplomatic meetings with Romania that a list of people to be granted the right to leave the country was discussed with Romanian officials.[44] These lists were compiled by Romanian organisations in exile and contained the names of people whose life or families were endangered. Even though it was very difficult for an ambassador to intervene in favour of would-be emigrants, this was possible at high-level meetings and often effective.

Probably the most powerful instrument the exiles had for influencing domestic politics and public opinion was Radio Free Europe, founded in December 1949 as a private initiative of refugees from central and eastern Europe.[45] In the following years, given the development of communication devices, the reduction of broadcast jamming from 1962, and the financial support offered by the US government, RFE was a powerful weapon in the ideological struggle between East and West. Its policy was driven largely by exiles from central and eastern European countries, organised in national radio sections. Many of them had been involved since its inception.[46]

Arch Puddington claims that "under its two famous editors, Noel Bernard and Vlad Georgescu (directors of the Romanian section), the Romanian section carried out a relentless polemical offensive against Ceauşescu […] The tone was biting, personal and sarcastic. During Bernard's editorship, the Romanian section was not infrequently cited for violation of the station's strictures against

vituperation and rhetorical excess."[47] Katherine Verdery places this conflict within the more general framework of the nationalist transformation of communism under Ceaușescu and, specifically, in the debate which opposed the so-called "protochronists and other producers of mass culture."[48]

In the early years of RFE broadcasting there was not much reaction in the Romanian media. In the 1970s however, a tussle began between RFE and the weekly *Săptămâna*, as 'everybody knew that if RFE spoke about someone, that person would have a kind of protection.'[49] On the other hand, this did not protect the speakers themselves, as some of them where attacked on the street. Others, who reported at the Madrid conference the human rights violations in Ceaușescu's Romania, were the target of postal bomb attacks.[50] Romanians were not alone in being victims of such deterrent actions. Notoriously, the Bulgarian Gheorgi Markov was wounded with a poisoned umbrella in London and died shortly afterwards. RFE was always "a high priority for Ceaușescu because of its criticism of human rights infringements and general government behaviour."[51] In 1981 a bomb exploded in the RFE headquarters in Munich, having as target the Romanian section.

It is difficult to measure the effects of the radio broadcasts on the exiles and on the Romanian public. However, Puddington argues that the Romanian section's audience "was proportionally the highest of any of the RFE or Radio Liberty services, and quite possibly the highest of any of the Western services that broadcast to the Soviet bloc."[52]

In conclusion, the action-reaction relationship between the Romanian exiles and the seat of political power in Bucharest altered over time during the Cold War. While in the first decade, the initiative belonged to the exiles, after 1956 the Romanian communist authorities had the upper hand. In both periods, exiles continued to be an uncomfortable opposition to a regime that had little or no internal opposition. Claiming to be the true representation of Romanian national interests, the exiles performed a wide range of activities, to which the Romanian communist authorities reacted ruthlessly. Of course, this study is not an exhaustive one; many other aspects, like the influence of ethnic groups such as the Germans and the Jews who left Romania, might be analysed in further research. Likewise, more comprehensive comparisons with other exile national groups during the Cold War might improve our knowledge and understanding of such a phenomenon as growing a 'culture' in an 'exile' environment.

NOTES

[1] A. Suhrke, *Uncertain Globalization: Refugee Movements in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century*, in W. Gungwu (ed.), *Global History and Migrations*, Boulder 1997, pp. 217-239.

[1] A. Suhrke, *Uncertain Globalization: Refugee Movements in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century*, in W. Gungwu (ed.), *Global History and Migrations*, Boulder 1997, pp. 217-239.

[2] Mircea Eliade, *Jurnal*, vol. 1, Bucharest 1993, p. 146. Eliade (1907-1986) was a leading figure of the exile. In the interwar period he was one of the disciples of Nae Ionescu, a professor who stongly supported the extreme right. Initially he went to Paris, but in 1957 he moved to the United States where he taught history of religion at the University of Chicago. Eliade published literary and historical works, founded magazines, and participated in most Romanian cultural organisations.

[3] Y. Shain, *The Frontier of Loyalty. Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*, Middletown 1989, p. 1.

[4] For Hungary, see for example, J. Fai-Podlipnik, *A Decade of Bedlam: Hungarian-American Emigres versus the Muscovites, 1945-1955,* in "East European Quarterly"*,* vol. 37, no. 3, 2003.

[5] P. Werbner, *The Place Which is Diaspora: Citizenship, Religion and Gender in the Making of Chaordic Transnationalism*, in "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies", vol. 28, no. 1, 2002, p. 119.

[6] Y. Shain, *Frontier of Loyalty* cit., p. 38.

[7] P. W. Fagen, *Exiles and Citizens: Spanish Republicans in Mexico,* Austin 1973, p. 35, quoted in Y. Shain, *Frontier of Loyalty* cit., p. 41.

[8] Y. Shain, *Frontier of Loyalty* cit., p. 29.

[9] J. Fai-Podlipnik, *A Decade of Bedlam: Hungarian-American Emigres versus the Muscovites, 1945-1955,* in "East European Quarterly"*,* vol. 37, no. 3, 2003, p. 303.

[10] Radio Free Europe Archives (henceforth RFE), Open Society Archives, Budapest, *Romania/Exile*, 300/60/1/197, Item no. 6684/54.

[11] M. Pelin, *Opisul emigratiei politice. Destine in 1222 de fise alcatuite pe baza dosarelor din arhivele Securității*, Bucharest 2002, p. 136.

[12] French Foreign Office, Diplomatic Archives of the Foreign Office (further DAFO), dos. 182, Europe-Roumanie, 1961-1970, Direction des Affaires Politiques, Europe, 29/3/13, Roumanie, Etat et politique interieure. Emigration politique, 1961-1965, 19 November 1947.

[13] *Luceafărul. Revista scriitorilor români în exil* [Luceafarul. The magazine of Romanian writers in exile], Paris 1949.

[14] One of the main reasons for disagreement amongst the exiles was the so-called 'Cretzianu Fund.' Alexandru Cretzianu and Constantin Vişoianu had administered a fund of six million Swiss francs, and were accussed of not putting it at the disposal of the National Committee. Therefore, General Rădescu left the Committee in 1950, creating another organisation with a wider composition, including Grigore Gafencu, Nicolae Herescu, Dinu Hiott, G. Caranfil, and Mircea Eliade. See RFE, Item no. 06442/53. In 1949 Constantin Virgil Gheorghiu had published his main book, *La Vingt-cinquème heure*, which was a great success at the time. Virgil Ierunca started a campaign against the author, arguing that he was an impostor, who collaborated both with the legionnaires and the communists. In spite of this, the book has continued to have positive critics. M. Popa, *Reîntoarcerea la Ithaca. Scriitori din exil*, Bucharest 1998, pp. 187-99; G. Glodeanu, *Incursiuni în literatura diasporei și a disidenței*, Bucharest 1999, pp. 143-51.

[15] E. Behring, *Scriitori români din exil (1945-1989). O perspectivă istorico-literară*, Bucharest 2001, pp. 74-75.

[16] Emil Cioran (1911-1995) was, in the interwar period, an admirer of the extreme right. When the communists took power in Romania, he decided to remain in France and started to write only in French, becoming one of the most important French philosophers. He occasionally published in exile magazines, participated in conferences, and he continued to have close relations with some of the Romanians in exile. Eugene Ionescu (1909-1994) was the initiator of the so-called theatre of the

absurd. He was one of the few Romanian intellectuals who escaped the influence of extreme right-wing ideology. In his works he attacked any type of totalitarianism. After a period in which he refrained from attacking the Romanian communist regime directly, at the end of the 1960s he became a public figure in France and entered upon an intellectual offensive, together with his daughter Marie-France Ionescu.

[17] R. Boilă, *Timpul clarificărilor* [Clarification time] in "România viitoare", III, no. 9, 1953, pp. 9-14.

[18] T. Cazaban, *Falsele probleme din exil* [False problems of exile] in "România viitoare", I, no. 5, 1951, p. 7.

[19] M. Lovinescu, *La apa Vavilonului*, Bucharest 1999, p. 79.

[20] RFE, Radio Paris Special no. 0042/16 March 1954. See also Item no. 9317/54.

[21] M. Lovinescu, *La apa Vavilonului* cit., p. 80.

[22] The initial purpose of the Charles I Foundation was to preserve and even rebuild Romanian national culture, RFE, Item no. 06541/53.

[23] French Foreign Office, 27 February 1962, Diplomatic Archives of the Foreign Office (further DAFO), dos. 182, Europe-Roumanie, 1961-1970, Direction des Affaires Politiques, Europe, 29/3/13, Roumanie, Etat et politique interieure. Emigration politique, 1961-1965.

[24] F. Manolescu, *Enciclopedia exilului literar romanesc. 1945-1989. Scriitori, reviste, institutii, organizatii*, Bucharest 2003, p. 86.

[25] F. Manolescu, *Enciclopedia* cit., p. 626.

[26] One notable exception was Virgil Ierunca's *Caete de Dor: Metazică și poezie* [Notebooks of pain. Metaphysics and poetry] which were issued without any financial support, apart from the editors' contributions, as well as B.I.R.E., Rene Theo's 'one-man' newspaper.

[27] *General Nicolae Rădescu în corespondența secretă a exilului românesc (martie 1947-mai 1949)*, Bucharest 2000, vol. 1, p. 95.

[28] *Caete de Dor*, no. 1, Paris 1951.

[29] *Luceafărul. Revista scriitorilor români în exil* [Luceafarul. The magazine of Romanian writers in exile] no. 1, Paris, November 1948.

[30] *Bulletin Scientifique Roumain,* tome I, Paris, 1952, p. 3.

[31] For the entire story, see S. Olaru, *Cei cinci care au speriat Estul. Atacul asupra Legației RPR de la Berna (februarie 1955)*, Iași 2003.

[32] L. Stan, *Media Discourses About Romanian Exile Before and After 1989*, in *M.* Koenig - R. Ohliger (eds.), *Enlarging European Memory: Migration Movements in Historical Perspective,* Paris 2005, pp. 107-117.

[33] M. Pelin, *Opisul emigrației politice* cit., p. 34, p. 104.

[34] Note sent by the French Foreign Office, 27 February 1962, Diplomatic Archives of the Foreign Office, dos. 182, Europe-Roumanie, 1961-1970, Direction des Affaires Politique Europe, 29/3/13, Roumanie, Etat et politique interieure. Emigration politique, 1961-1965.

[35] Letter sent by Pierre Bouffanais, French ambassador to Romania, 25 May 1962, Legaţia Franţei în România, Direcţia Europa, nr 477/EU, DAFO.

[36] Romanian Orthodox Curch in Paris, 24 June 1968. Roumanie. Questions administratives et contentieuses. Roumains en France (Biens et personnes), 1966-1970 29/25/3, DAFO.

[37] Transfer of Nicolae Titulescu's body, 29/25/3, DAFO.

[38] OFPRA note, Neuilly, 16 January 1969, 29/3/14. Roumanie. Etat et politique interieure. Emigration Politique. En France. 1966-1970, DAFO.

[39] Return to Bucharest of Mrs Gafencu, OFPRS note, 6 August 1969, 29/3/14, DAFO.

[40] E. Behring, *Scriitori români din exil* cit., pp. 23-45.

[41] M. Pelin, *Culisele spionajului românesc. D.I.E. 1955-1980*, 1997.

[42] "After 1970 the first step was the opening of the French newspapers to the exiles. The second step was that the French journalists started to look and even run for us. Eventually, this was a rebirth of the 1848 exile we had wanted to have since the end of the 1940s." M. Lovinescu, *La apa Vavilonului* cit., p. 161.

[43] Texte Documentare (further T.D.), 2897 *Free Romanians Refused Audience*, 15 October 1984, Romanian Institute in Freiburg.

[44] Europe Roumanie 1961-1970, VOL. 279, Roumanie, EU 29-25-6. Regles de circulation, passeports et visas, 3 April 1967, DAFO.

[45] L. Pudlowski, I. Szekely (eds), *Open Society Archives,* Budapest 1999, p. 39.

[46] *Dossier Roumanie. Corespondența cu minsitrul de Bourbon-Busseli,* Nanterre, Bibliothèque de Documetntation Internationale Contemporaine.

[47] A. Puddington, *Broadcasting freedom. The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty,* Lexington 2000, p. 239.

[48] K. Verdery, *National Ideology Under Socialism. Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania,* Berkley 1991, pp. 170-71.

[49] M. Lovinescu, quoted in F. Manolescu, *Enciclopedia* cit., p. 305.

[50] T.D. 2133.

[51] I. M. Pacepa, quoted in F. Manolescu, *Enciclopedia* cit., p. 305.

[52] A. Puddington, *Broadcasting* cit., p. 240.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bering E., *Scriitori români din exil. 1945-1989. O perspectivă istorico-literară,* [Romanian writers in exile. 1945-1989. A historic and literary perspective], Bucharest 2001.

Boz L., *Scrisori din exil* [Letters from exile], Cluj-Napoca 2001.

Calafeteanu I., *Exilul românesc. Erodarea speranței. Documente (1951-1975)* [Romanian exile. The dissapearance of hope], Bucharest 2003.

Calafeteanu I., *Politică și exil. Din istoria exilului românesc. 1946-1950* [Politics and exile. From the history of Romanian exile], Bucharest 2000.

Dumitrescu V. C., *O istorie a exilului românesc (1944-1989). În eseuri, articole, scrisori, imagini, etc.* [A history of Romanian exile], Bucharest 1997.

Eliade M., *Jurnal* [Diary] vol. 1, Bucharest 1993.

Fai-Podlipnik J., *A Decade of Bedlam: Hungarian-American Emigres versus the Muscovites, 1945-1955,* in "East European Quarterly", vol. 37, no. 3, 2003.

Filip T., *Corăbii dincolo de orizont* [Vessels beyond the horizon], Rome 1985.

General Nicolae Rădescu în corespondența secretă a exilului românesc (martie 1947-mai 1949) [General Nicolae Rădescu in the secret correspondence of Romanian exile: March 1947-May 1949], Bucharest 2000, vol. 1.

Glodeanu G., *Incursiuni în literatura diasporei și a disidenței* [Incursions in the literature of the diaspora and dissidents], Bucharest 1999, pp. 143-151.

Kokot W. - K. Tölölyan C. (eds.), *Diaspora, Identity and Religion. New directions in theory and research,* Routledge, London 2004.

Lovinescu M., *La apa Vavilonului* [By the waters of Babylon], Bucharest 1999.

Manolescu F., *Enciclopedia exilului literar romanesc. 1945-1989. Scriitori, reviste, institutii, organizatii* [The encyclopedia of Romanian literary exile. 1945-1989], Bucharest 2003.

O radiografie a exilului românesc. Corespondența emisă și primită de Grigore Nandriș. 1946-1967 [A radiogram of Romanian exile. The correspondence issued and received by Grigore Nandriș], Bucharest 2000.

Olaru S., *Cei cinci care au speriat Estul. Atacul asupra Legației RPR de la Berna (februarie 1955)* [Five who scared the east. The attack on the Romanian legation in Bern], Iași 2003.

Pelin M., *Culisele spionajului românesc. D.I.E. 1955-1980*, [Behind the scenes of Romanian espionage. The Department of Foreign Information, 1955-1980], 1997.

Pelin M., *Opisul emigrației politice. Destine în 1222 de fișe alcătuite pe baza dosarelor din arhivele Securității* [A collection of political emigration. Destinies in 1222 files from the archives of the Securitate], Bucharest 2002.

Politica externă și exil anticomunist. Anuarul Institutului Român de Istorie Recentă [Foreign policy and anticommunist exile], vol. II, Iași 2003.

Popa M., *Reîntoarcerea la Ithaca. Scriitori din exil.* [The return to Ithaca. Writers in exile], Bucharest 1998.

Puddington A., *Broadcasting freedom. The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty,* Lexington 2000.

Shain Y., *The Frontier of Loyalty. Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*, Middletown 1989.

Stan L., *Media Discourses About Romanian Exile Before and After 1989*, in M. Koenig - R. Ohliger (eds.), *Enlarging European Memory: Migration Movements in Historical Perspective,* Paris 2005, pp. 107-17.

Suhrke A., *Uncertain Globalization: Refugee Movements in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century,* in Gungwu W. (ed.), "Global History and Migrations", 1997. pp. 217-39.

Theodor Cazaban în dialog cu Cristian Bădiliță. Captiv în lumea liberă [Theodor Cazaban in dialogue with Cristian Bădiliță. Captive in the free world], Cluj 2002.

Un martor al istoriei. Emil Ghilezan de vorbă cu Adrian Niculescu [A witness of history. Emil Ghilezan speaking with Adrian Niculescu], Bucharest 1998.

Werbner P., *The place which is diaspora: citizenship, religion and gender in the making of chaordic transnationalism*, in "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies", vol. 28, no. 1, 2002, p. 119-133.