

UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
INSTITUTUL DE ISTORIE ORALĂ



ANUARUL DE ISTORIE ORALĂ

VI

Cluj-Napoca 2005

**UNIVERSITATEA “BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE ȘI FILOSOFIE**

INSTITUTUL DE ISTORIE ORALĂ

AIO

**ANUARUL
INSTITUTULUI DE ISTORIE ORALĂ**

VI

PRESA UNIVERSITARĂ CLUJEANĂ
CLUJ-NAPOCA
2005

AIO

ANUARUL INSTITUTULUI DE ISTORIE ORALĂ

COLEGIUL DE REDACȚIE:

Prof. univ. dr. DORU RADOSAV – coordonator
Lect. univ. dr. MARIA ALDEA
Cercet. drd. COSMIN BUDEANCĂ
Lect. univ. dr. IONUȚ COSTEA
Drd. SIDONIA NEDEIANU GRAMA
Conf. univ. dr. VALENTIN ORGA
Drd. IULIA POP
Drd. ALMIRA ȚENTEA
Drd. DENISA FLORENTINA BODEANU

Coordonatorii numărului: Valentin Orga, Cosmin Budeancă

Responsabilitatea pentru conținutul materialelor aparține autorilor

Traducerea rezumatelor: Alexandra Opriș; Corectură: Iulia POP

INSTITUTUL DE ISTORIE ORALĂ – CLUJ-NAPOCA

Str. Emmanuel de Martonne, nr.1

Tel./Fax: 004-0264-598391

e-mail: iohcluj@yahoo.com; www.iiocluj.ro

Tiparul și distribuția: Editura **ARGONAUT**

Tel./Fax: 004-0264598.391; 0740-139.984, 0740-454916

Coperta: arhitect Tiberiu TRENEA

SUMAR

Doru RADOSAV - <i>Editorial - O „sensibilitate sudică” a memoriei și oralityții</i>	5
--	----------

Studii

Ticu CONSTANTIN - <i>Acuratețea în memoria autobiografică / Accuracy in Autobiographical Memory</i>	19
Sidonia NEDEIANU GRAMA - <i>Imaginar social și mitologie politică. Reperete teoretice (I) / Social Imaginary and Political Mythology: A Theoretical Framework</i>	46
Marius BORZAN - <i>Valea Agrijului în timpul ocupației maghiare (septembrie 1940 – octombrie 1944) (I) / The Agrij Valley during the Hungarian Occupation (September 1940 - October 1944)</i>	83
David A. KIDECKEL - <i>Discourses of resistance: anti-systemic performance on a Romanian collective farm</i>	110
Ionuț ȚENE - <i>Procesul de comunizare a Universității clujene în memoria studentească (1945-1948) / The Imposition of Communism in the Case of the University of Cluj as Portrayed in Student Recollections (1945-1948)</i>	133
Dorin DOBRINCU - <i>Formațiuni din rezistența armată anticomunistă în sudul Moldovei (1945-1958) / Groups of Anti-communist Armed Resistance in Southern Moldavia (1945-1958)</i>	163
Denisa Florentina BODEANU - <i>„Au fost odată...” - Considerații privind exodul etnicilor germani din România după al II-lea război mondial / „Once Upon a Time There Were”... Reflections Regarding the Exodus of the German Ethnics Following the Second World War</i>	193
Maria RIȚIU - <i>Biografii exemplare din perioada rezistenței Bisericii Greco-Catolice în Nord-Vestul Transilvaniei / Exemplary Biographies Dating From The Period of The Greek-Catholic Resistance in North-Western Transylvania</i>	211
Mihai GAVRIȘ - <i>Aspecte privind situația Bisericii Adventiste din România în perioada 1965-1989 / Aspects Concerning the Situation of the Romanian Adventist Church Between 1965-1989</i>	241

Gheorghe GORUN, Hadrian GORUN - <i>Revolta minerilor din Motru (19 octombrie 1981) (I) / The Revolt of Miners From Motru (19 October 1981) (I)</i>	262
Ion XENOFONTOV - <i>Viciile combatanților sovietici în războiul Sovieto-Afghan (1979-1989): droguri, alcool, trafic, prostituție și homosexualitate / The Flaws of Soviet Combatants During the Afghanistan War (1979-1989): Drugs, Alcohol, Traffic, Prostitution and Homosexuality</i>	283
Eduard BOBOC - <i>Aspecte bizare ale războiului de pe Nistru (I) / Peculiarities of the Transnistrian War</i>	311

Discuții

Grațian CORMOȘ - <i>Femei aflate sub incidența represiunii politice în perioada comunistă</i>	341
Maria ALDEA - <i>Le Theatre Arena: histoire d'une enquete</i>	355
Cristian VASILE - <i>Un martor important: Ion Iliescu și istoria României comuniste</i>	383
Recenzii, note de lectură	396
Autori	411

a informațiilor (nu suntem roboți). Când oamenii caută acuratețea, ceea ce evocă ei poate să nu fie exact așa cum s-a întâmplat, în cele mai mici detalii. De cele mai multe ori aceste detalii „false” sunt ne semnificative și avem posibilitatea să ne corectăm prin dialogul cu ceilalți, prin verificarea informațiilor etc. Chiar și atunci când evocările noastre sunt precise, pot apărea interpretări și re semnificări ale acelorăși fapte, dar, din nou, suntem în zona normalului uman, ființa umană având nevoie de această re-interpretare și „personalizare” a informației.

Pentru viața curentă, în conversații și în narațiunile obișnuite, nu contează prea mult detaliile exacte, amănuntele precise referitoare la ceea ce s-a întâmplat în realitate, ci importantă este cronologia și onestitatea relatării faptelor, chiar dacă acuratețea are uneori de suferit. Dacă există situații în care unele amintiri pot fi total eronate, aceasta nu înseamnă că toate amintirile sunt greșite. Avem tot felul de amintiri despre trecutul nostru și ele sunt corecte, fiind certificate atât de starea de fapt (ceea ce suntem acum, ceea ce am făcut ieri etc.), cât și de relatările celorlalți, de mărturiile scrise etc. Narațiunile despre trecut sunt demne de încredere atât timp cât sunt făcute onest și cât suntem atenți la diferitele surse de distorsiune care ar putea interveni în momentul asimilării informațiilor dar și pe parcursul păstrării sau evocării lor ca mărturie personală sau istorică.

ACCURACY IN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MEMORY

Most researchers in the field of memory agree about the fact that our capacity for recollection is far from being infallible, that with the passing of time we tend to forget many details of certain events and even the events as such, that we can integrate false information in our memories, but still report them with the utmost conviction of their authenticity. Memory does not accomplish a „photographical” preservation of all aspects of reality. It is mainly a reconstruction process in which recollections of past events result out of a blending of both the facts concerning the original incident as well as out of fragments of accounts, prior knowledge, beliefs, expectations, etc.

The accuracy of recollections can be influenced both at the time of the assimilation of information as well as during the phases of preservation and recollection of the information stored by the memory. At the very moment of assimilation of the information, the exceptionally intense

experiencing of events can induce the alteration of the cognitive pattern of the event leading to dissociation, the disorganization of the perceptive processes and the deficient, fragmentary imprinting of the information without a coherent narrative structure. During the preservation or the recollection of information phase a series of factors can intervene and alter the quality of the recollections, enabling the possibility of their oblivion (unused information which is not updated is lost in time) as well as the necessary premises for the insertion of false information alongside the information of the original episode stored in our memory. During the phase of recollection of the facts belonging to their personal past, people tend to extract selectively certain information or to interpret this information in a particular manner, in consonance with their current self-image or interests.

The present article takes into account all of these aspects and the final conclusion that can be drawn is that, despite the existence of so many sources of distortion of data, our memory is ultimately trustworthy. This is due to the fact that the distortions of memory do not occur as frequently as one may assume and moreover, they do not but rarely influence important data belonging to our personal past.

Accounts about the past are reliable as long as they are made with honesty and as long as we pay attention to the various sources of distortion that can interfere both at the moment of assimilation of information as well as during their preservation and recollection as personal or historical evidence.

doilea. Fenomenul reprezentărilor sociale, așa cum continuă să fie analizat și azi de cercetătorii sociali, are în primul rând valoare euristică, devenind, în ultimul timp, paradigmatic în științele sociale; ceea ce implică și rafinarea abordărilor metodologice.

Am putea afirma că mentalitățile, ca obiect de studiu al istoriei, au drept conținut efectiv ansamblul reprezentărilor sociale specifice, persistente în durata lungă, cu determinațiile de rigoare ale căror linii definitorii tocmai am încercat să le prezentăm selectiv. De asemenea, între *reprezentările sociale* și *imaginarul social* și *colectiv* există o legătură specială, chiar dacă nu a fost îndeajuns explicitată. Reprezentările sociale se hrănesc și prelucrează fragmente din universul fantasmelor împărțite. Organizate într-un sistem coerent, astfel de reprezentări sociale se pot coagula în *ideologie*, care, după unii autori, constituie „versantul raționalizat al imaginarii social, principiul de ordine al acestuia”.⁸⁸ Mai mult, miturile istorice și miturile politice încorporează și reorganizează cu eficacitate simbolică astfel de reprezentări.

(Figuri clasice ale mitologiei politice, precum salvatori sau șefi charismatici, vor fi discutate în partea a doua a studiului nostru, care va apărea în numărul următor al anuarului).

SOCIAL IMAGINARY AND POLITICAL MYTHOLOGY: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The paper attempts to outline the large area of research on *symbolism*, as focused in social sciences, primarily in history and social psychology, as well. It elicits different meanings and features of this field - which has been lately an attractive, though highly demanding object of study-, pointing out some clarifications on the *fuzzy concepts* it deals with. In what concerns the relevance of this topic for oral history, the implicit assumption of the paper is that collective memories, at the core of the oral history approach, are inextricably mixed with social imaginary. Therefore, a prior comprehension of the vast world of symbols and a peculiar awareness of their complexity and subtleties are needed.

⁸⁸ În articolul „Subiectul în reprezentarea socială”, autoarea Florence Giust-Desprairies face apel la formula lui Cornelius Castoriadis, autorul lucrării *L’Institution imaginaire de la société*, în *Psihologia câmpului social*, p. 175.

The first part of the paper presents a general theory on imaginary, particularly Gilbert Durand's work on *mythodologie*. In the meantime, outlining the world of symbols, with their characteristics and social functions, an emphasis is put on their dual nature, as both benign and malign potentiality, which might carry unexpected effects on human personality and cultures.

The study considers as well the imaginary in the history, and the historical imaginary. Drawing mainly on the work of Jacques Le Goff, it suggests that the approach on mentalities and imaginary - the fruitful, even though rather ambiguous and vaguely defined concepts of the „new history”- could be usefully focused at the level of social representations, a more concrete and nuanced notion borrowed from social psychology.

In the second part of this study, which is to be published in the next issue of the Annual of Oral History, I am going to describe some classic characters of the political mythology, such as the *savior* or the *charismatic leader* in history. As a matter of fact, this recurrent and powerful myth of the Romanian social imaginary played a crucial role in the 1989 Romanian revolution, as it is largely analyzed in a previous article that I published, based on my 1996 BA thesis.

In conclusion, this paper advocates a comprehensive approach on social imaginary, as a constant dimension of humanity and therefore, an important object of social sciences. Since it warns of the symbols' mixed benign and malign effects on both individuals and cultures, the paper finally suggests a balanced attitude in approaching the world of symbols, neither enthusiastically overwhelmed by their power, nor reluctantly neglecting them as mere non-rational forces.

Translated by Sidonia Nedeianu Grama

23. Talos Traian - s-a născut în 1920 și locuiește în Romita. Naționalitatea română, religie ortodoxă, 7 clase, agricultor. Interviu a fost realizat în 24 iulie 2003 de Marius Borzan.

THE AGRIJ VALLEY DURING THE HUNGARIAN OCCUPATION (SEPTEMBER 1940-OCTOBER 1944)

The events that occurred between august and the beginning of September 1940 are renowned and have been comprehensively debated by both the Romanian and the foreign historiography. Facilitated by the development of the international context of that period, they have been the result of the event which took place in Wien on the 30th of August 1940, an incident that has not only had significant consequences for the future unfolding of history, but that has also generated numerous debates and interpretations coming from expert historians in the field of historiography.

The study therefore aims to accomplish a reconstitution from the perspective of oral history of the manner in which the Hungarian occupation (September 1940-october 1944) has conducted itself in some areas from the basin of the Agrij Valley. The topic under discussion can be deemed as justified if we bear in mind the painful reality of the Hungarian occupation (Treznea), reported from man to man, region to region, together with the tradition of the common man's spiritual universe, whose aspirations, dreams and beliefs, as an embodiment of his respect for the departed loved ones, who died for freedom and peace, have always represented essential traits that have ultimately gained an aura of myth or legend. Since then, the tragic tale of the events that took place in some parts of the Agrij Valley during the Hungarian occupation has been passed on from man to man, generation to generation.

The starting point of this research, carried out by means of oral investigation, are these genuine but nevertheless not entirely unravelled historical facts, as well as the already born and spreading legends. These testimonies are essential primarily because they convey another kind of history, one that is explained through examples.

On the other hand, I consider that the frankness of the witnesses can not be questioned even though in some cases their partiality is obvious, in the sense that they blame only the other part. Nevertheless the majority subscribes to the principle stated by Pușcaș Ioan from Treznea: „I tell you, I

ain't joking' cause I'm accountable for what I say". (roughly translated)

Another noticeable aspect is the fact that in most cases the typology of the situations portrayed by the people who were interviewed can be traced down in archive documents and in the published bibliographical references on the subject.

Regarding the contribution of the study, two things are worth mentioning. To start with, it illustrates for the first time a reconstruction of the general aspects of the hungarian occupation, from various spheres, in some of the parts of the Agrij Valley, portrayed by the accounts of the local folk. Subsequently it advocates for a more reflective and detailed research on the causes that have led to the tragic events that took place in the settlement of Treznea, the county of Salaj during its occupation by the Hungarian troops, since a certain biased approach in the historiography dedicated to this subject is noticeable. Even so, although there are numerous examples taken from the testimonies of the people who where interviewed that confirm this fact, we are far from considering that a final solution capable of explicitly revealing the causes of those events has been found, because legends generated by the people will keep on surviving and being passed on to the future generations.

To sum it up one can assert that the acquired verbal information is abundant, the witnesses being able to reconstruct in detail the events related to the period of the Hungarian occupation, basically because this episode stands for one of the most emblematical moments of their lives, a moment that has had a definite impact on their lives.

**DISCOURSES OF RESISTANCE: ANTI-SYSTEMIC
PERFORMANCE ON A ROMANIAN COLLECTIVE FARM**

Socialism and Resistance:

As history suggests, the forty odd years of socialist hegemony in Eastern Europe was characterized by long periods of relative political quiescence interspersed with extreme outpourings of anti-systemic practice. The latter included revolts in 1956 in Hungary, East Germany, and Poland, 1968 riots again in Poland and the flowering of the Prague Spring in then-Czechoslovakia, the rise, banning, and ultimate triumph of Solidarity through the 1980s, and the final *coupes de grâce* of revolution throughout the region at the end of that decade. Supposedly in between these small- and larger-scale rebellions, daily life in socialism went on with relative calm and a seemingly general lack of overt popular resistance. Such quiescence seems to have been particularly the case in Romania. Here there was some early and intense guerilla resistance before the socialist state fully consolidated its power. This was notably so for the Făgăraș region as discussed in the two volume work by Ion Gavrilă Ogoranu.¹ Subsequently, after the consolidation of the Party's hold on power there were few other events of note. There was some resistance to the implementation of collectivization in the late 1950s and early 1960s (of which we will discuss more below) and a few other worker rebellions, such as those of the Jiu Valley miners in 1977², the miners at Motru³, and the Red Star factory workers in Brașov in 1987. But for these albeit out-sized actions Romanian dissent to socialism went on largely outside the country, purveyed by exiled literary figures like Paul Goma and Dorin Tudoran, and behind closed doors of homes and apartments.

Today, reflecting on the fall of the socialist system, this type of analysis and periodization seems to miss the mark. By politically dividing

¹ Ion Gavrilă Ogoranu, *Brazii se frâng, dar nu se îndoiesc: Rezistența anticomunistă în Munții Făgărașului*, vol. I-II, Timișoara, Marineasa, 1995.

² *După 20 de ani sau Lupeni '77 - Lupeni 1997*, Petroșani, Cotidianul Matinal, Imprimeria Grapho Tipex, 1997.

³ Gheorghe Gorun, *Un crâmpei de istorie: Revolta minerilor de la Motru – 1981*, în „Memoria”, 46(1), 2004, pp. 17-27.

socialist society into two distinct types of practice-quiescence and rebellion-and by walling off dissent into kitchens and living rooms or as the practice of a few visible and acclaimed individuals, like Havel, Wałęsa, Michnik, Bahro and others, the relationship between the everyday and the larger sweep of historical events is elided and obscured. Furthermore, such analysis especially covers over the small-scale agencies and moderate acts of defiance of workers and peasants, and even occasionally government officials and economic managers of diverse levels, without which the larger revolutionary moments would have been deprived of fuel, actors, and audiences. Aside from these shortcomings, the failure to consider the nature of everyday, overt, though locally couched, resistance also obscures certain general principles of human practice. In particular, everyday resistance glaringly illustrates how local knowledge and social relationships are essential to frame oppositional stances to states and their policies while simultaneously providing individuals the cover of alleged cooperation.

Certainly, there was private, covert resistance galore throughout the lifespan of the socialist states, from World War II to Christmas 1989. The separation of the socialist experience and personality into distinct public and private spheres is one of the essential principles that scholars accept about socialism. However, such private „resistance,” if it can be called that, in some ways actually enabled the persistence of socialism. For example, one common story told by many in Romania was how, though religion was formally anathema and its practice likely to prevent individual or family upward social mobility, if not threaten one’s political safety outright, when a person had need for religious succor or support they would often make the sign of the cross inside their mouth with their tongue on their palette. This small gesture and others like it are often discussed to illustrate the alleged separation of life in socialist states into clearly demarcated realms of public and private.⁴ However, as I discuss below, and as I have in other venues⁵, such small, private defiance atomized and obscured those who resisted from others of a similar mindset. Instead, necessarily critical to the ultimate dissolution of socialism were public acts which served as

⁴ Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind*, New York, Knopf, 1953; Katherine Verdery, *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1996.

⁵ David Kideckel *Autoethnography as Political Resistance: A Case from Socialist Romania*. în „Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social”, Deborah Reed-Danahay, Ed. London: Berg, 1997, pp. 47-70.

testimony to one's consociates that they were not alone. In fact, only by such public confirmation, were people able to recognize that they retained some small areas of control, not only over their own internal family lives, but over the sphere of public life as well. Thus local, public resistance alone meant that socialism was never fully integrated as a system and encouraged both communities and individuals to envision a day for the practice of an open and public politics.

We have ways of making you (not) talk: Punishing overt resistance

Despite the necessity of public affirmations if resistance is to have any effect or meaning, such acts were not easy to carry off in socialist societies. In fact, some types of public behavior were certain to bring down the most severe sort of punishment and prevent future resistance as well. Organized political opposition and speech intended to purposefully incite anti-systemic behavior were particularly singled out for harsh treatment, but there were many checks on other sorts of political expression that operated in socialist communities as well. Most egregiously, almost any kind of public behavior was interpreted as political and subject to sanction. And sanctions worked especially well as they were many and integrated. That is, were one to be considered a trouble-maker in the village, then your factory superiors heard of your inappropriate behavior. If you caused trouble at the factory, your community leaders were informed. One's children's teachers were informed if those kids' parents were implicated in political acts, and community leaders also knew if school children made an inopportune slip of the tongue in speaking of society's leaders. Such integrated attempts to stifle dissent worked fairly well, though occasionally there were slips. However, when this happened the socialist apparatus went into high gear to bring potential malefactors quickly into line to ensure political conformity and control.

Such was the case when a group of local men tried to go around the decision of the mayor of Hîrseni Commune to not devote any funds from the local budget to refurbish the Copăcel village assembly hall (*Căminul cultural*). The building was completely run-down and the men, acting out of a spirit of volunteerism, asked the party leaders in Braşov for permission to rebuild the hall using their own labor and their own funds. Though there was to be no cost to the commune budget itself, the mayor was furious at what he felt was an act of insubordination.

Not only did he complain to the Party central authorities about the men, but he also talked to their supervisors at their factory workplaces (most were employed at the Făgăraș Chemical Combine) about possibly fining them for their breach of socialist principles of hierarchy. Furthermore, he upbraided them in a meeting in a loud and very public way and threatened them with all manner of fines and sanctions. Their voluntarism quickly ceased.

On Discourse as Resistance:

Given the ferocity with which the socialist state went after even the most insignificant of public acts or statements, was any sort of persistent resistance possible and, if so, what forms could it potentially take? One of the most common types of resistance in socialist communities and work places was theft or sabotage of state property. However, these acts were not public and, as everyone engaged in them from time to time, did not stand out as essentially anti-systemic. Other forms of resistance that could be similarly understood included disregarding socialist labor demands, like participation in voluntary labor campaigns (*muncă voluntară*), attempting to avoid contracting for and delivering specified amounts of agricultural production, or agricultural sabotage like poisoning a calf to avoid the expense and labor of raising it, only to be forced to sell it at low cost to the state at a later date. But as with theft of property, active avoidance of labor was sound economic strategy, practiced by all, generally private, and hence not a particularly telling nor effective form of resistance.

More significant as a clear marker of political resistance was public discourse and communication, including speech and other forms like body language and the controlled use of social space, i.e. proxemics. The use of local idiomatic speech or physical practices in public venues were critical for a variety of reasons. First and foremost such resistance was expressed in locally relevant ways and thus consequently and consciously created a shared and bounded experience amongst a knowing audience. In Habermas' terms such acts of discursive resistance were forms of „communicative action”⁶ whereby, through speech and other forms of communication, people are able to establish common agendas which they may carry out even in private and even when actual social circumstances

⁶ Jurgen Habermas, *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1979; idem, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1997.

conspire against agency. As Habermas suggests.⁷ „The universal validity claims (truth, rightness, truthfulness), which participants at least implicitly raise and reciprocally recognize, make possible the consensus that carries action in common.” In other words, though private acts are powerful in their own way, it is public discourse that shapes and enlivens the possibility of common agency and is thus the most effective resistant strategy.

Furthermore, public discursive acts are also set within and shape the nature of political contexts and areas. As political such phenomena act as performances that serve both as expressions of and means for attracting symbolic capital.⁸ Individuals and groups use such capital to both express statements of their own affinities as well as to induce desired states of mind and potential action among others. Thus, observing performative acts and events - who speaks, for how long, in what physical orientation to others, with what type and magnitude of audience - we gain a better sense of political structures and relationships. As political acts public performances, help focus agency in a way that the theft of hundreds of bags of oats could never approximate.

Observing most public venues in socialist society, it was clear that people could rarely speak overt truth to power and so typically masked their attitudes and sentiments in public situations.

Despite this widespread sensibility people nonetheless found means for expression of their deepest feelings toward the socialist state and its operative institutions, such as the socialist collective farm. Such means, in fact, were public declarations and affirmations of people’s resistance to, if not rejection of, collectivization. Their diverse community discourses served as a kind of claim of the „truth and rightness” of their former way of life and the appropriateness of considering socialism and the socialist collective farm with only the greatest of skepticism and suspicion. Prior to my considering these forms of discourse a brief recapitulation of the history of Romanian collectivization can help set the stage for the context of the discursive resistance of Făgăraș region villagers. Thus opposition to socialist practice was publicly signaled by a wide range of individuals and, through such signals, forced socialist practice to moderate and in some instances to even

⁷ *Ibidem.*

⁸ William O. Beeman, *Performance Theory in an Anthropology Program*. <http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Anthropology/publications/PerformanceTheory.htm>. Brown University, 1997; Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977, p. 179.

withdraw certain extreme policy options. Certainly such resistance did not keep the worst of Ceaușescu's extreme policy depredations of the 1980s from being implemented. However, even in those hard times discursive resistance kept alive a flame of opposition and of public knowledge of the existence of (few) others with oppositional political orientations. In fact, a quick review of Romanian collectivization shows an uneven process where farms were often kept at psychological arm's length by community members, a stance furthered, I argue, by discursive forms.

A Brief History of Romanian Collectivization:

The collectivization of Romanian agriculture began in the mid-1950s with calls by the then Soviet-oriented leadership triumvirate of Ana Pauker, Teohari Georgescu and Vasile Luca to model the country on the structure of its Soviet patron. Among other programs, the „Muscovites” sought to shape the Romanian economy to provide agricultural products to the countries of the developing Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA, or Comecon), the socialist „Common Market.” Despite the change of leadership of the then Romanian Workers Party to the nationalist leader, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej in the late 1950s, the latter continued the commitment agricultural collectivization. This process thus began in earnest in 1957 and lasted until the full collectivization of the country was declared in 1962.⁹

Having learned a bit from the Soviet experience, the Romanian leadership opted for slightly less compulsive collectivization policies. The operative slogan with which they sought to convince the peasantry to join the collectives emphasized how collectivization was to be „voluntary and not forced by anyone” (*de bună voie și ne silit de nimeni*). Furthermore, Romanian state authorities adopted a policy of collectivization via explanation (*muncă de lămurire*) in which local Party cadres fanned out to convince the leading members of rural communities to enroll in the collectives, thereby hoping their influence would be sufficient to encourage other rural community members to follow suit. Despite the overtly more benign practices of the Romanian party and its cadres, resistance to the initial drive to collectivize was common throughout the country and more intense in some areas than others.

One of the most resistant areas was that of Transylvania and within Transylvania the villagers of the Făgăraș region took pride of place in their

⁹ Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, *Cuvântarea rostită la încheierea consfătuirii pe țară a țăranilor colectiviști*, București, Editura Politică, 1962, pp. 671-714.

attempts to keep the commissars at arm's length. Thus Făgăraș villages were, for the most part, not collectivized until the last part of the campaign in 1962. Furthermore, until that time, they also resisted other attempts to move in staged fashion on a path toward socialist production initiated by the socialist state. For example the movement to create collective-like organizations, such as the *întovărășire*, caused more anger, antipathy, and resistance to collectivization than it did facilitate the development of collective principles. People's resistance was marshaled despite diverse policies which alternately threatened or bribed their participation. These included the notorious agricultural quotas that required people to submit certain amounts of their production to the state depending on how much land they possessed; the larger the amount of land the much greater requirements of the quota. Other threats included the loss of employment in state enterprises, the dismissal of one's children from state schools or preventing their receiving stipends for university study. In fact, any way that individuals had tangents with the state, its agents, or institutions was potentially used as a way of breaking resistance.¹⁰ Consequently, given that extreme and organized overt political resistance was all but impossible and, for taciturn Făgărașeni not desirable in any case, more subtle discursive practices were developed in fine form to express continued resistance to state practice and to collectivization.

Certainly such resistance did not ultimately bring down collectivization. In fact, my earlier research suggests that local communities and collective farms ultimately adapted to each other as a way of each ensuring their own survival. More important, other policies of socialism actually produced great rifts in social relations such that individuals and families became considerably atomized throughout the socialist period. Such atomization particularly limited the effectiveness of resistant action. Nonetheless, individualized discursive resistance still functioned throughout the socialist period to provide alternative mental and social models. These practices further shaped a sense of alterity and subordinate status even as they shined harsh light on the principles and practices that underpinned the socialist agricultural collective.

What follows then is not so much an oral history of resistance to collective farming as it is a history of orality as this played out in resistance in the fields, meeting rooms, tractor parks, and on village streets in the rural

¹⁰ David Kideckel, *The Solitude of Collectivism: Romanian Villagers to the Revolution and Beyond*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1993.

communes around the city of Făgăraș. Romanian Transylvanians are renowned throughout the country for their taciturnity and slow, measured, thoughtful ways, and highly private lives. They are not given to public outbursts nor even much to oration. Thus, when public utterances were made or public stances expressed they carried even more weight than would be likely in regions where volubility was expected, common, and out-sized. It was thus the small acts... nods, winks, tonality, emphasis, choice of words, stance... that collectively encoded a resistant discourse and that preserved a sense of the „private” public that had been stripped away in the consolidation of socialist power and collectivization of the local economy.

Discursive Resistance on the „Peony of the Carpathians” CAP

In the roughly eighteen months that I lived in Hîrseni commune and researched the process of collectivization, the socialist state and collective farm operated as if it were a long-standing and permanent fixture on the village scene. The farm was deep in debt to the state, barely if ever made its production targets, and afforded its members only a modicum of resources and income. Nonetheless there was a stolidity about the organization and an over-bearing quality to its leaders. Power was theirs, and that’s all there was to it. Thus, the mid-1970s was not a time to overtly challenge socialist practice, as had happened in the region in the 1950s. Still, though the farm gave the impression of being thoroughly dominant within the community, field notes from that period roughly thirty years ago shows numerous examples of resistant activities, most expressed in verbal, kinesthetic, or proxemic practices. Furthermore such discursive resistant occurred across the board and was expressed by people of all social categories: older and younger, men and women, those with some official farm capacities and those without, people from formerly wealthy, middle, and poor peasant social strata, people who worked mainly for the farm and those with other occupations.

More than just the actual expression of resistance was important. Such activities, after all, were themselves performances that went on in public places for the benefit of the local audience. As public statements or actions, they were testimony to an individual’s attitude and stance toward the farm and even toward socialism and by their enactment gave other individuals space and spine to do the same. Furthermore, no place or event was immune for carrying out these performances; the local bar, at church; in the fields, animal barns, or at the offices of the CAP; at the tractor park;

during community political or cultural assemblies. Their ubiquity and diversity (both in place and form) thus also was evidence of the widespread resistance to the farm, the farm's tangents with and effects on a broad range of community social institutions and practices.

Resistant language and other discursive practices fall into eight general categories of behavior and stance. However, there is considerable overlap, hence mutual reinforcement, among the categories. This mutuality means their power as clear, hard-biting, and systematic resistance to local collective practices, histories, and leaders was embellished. In an earlier article Steven Sampson and I¹¹ warned Western researchers of the time about taking complaints about the socialist system as affirming the failure of that system. We called this quality the „Verdict Mentality” and thought it characteristic of many Westerners researching in the socialist world during the Cold War. To avoid a „verdict mentality,” however, is not to avoid a verdict. When viewed individually or collectively none of these eight „discourses of resistance” indicate the failure or ultimate rejection of socialist collectivism by members of the local community. People still had to make their peace with the organization if only to ensure themselves and their families a modicum of income from it and some surcease of political oppression. Instead of rejection and verdict, however, such discourses framed a set of attitudes and strategies that kept the relationship of community and farm off-balance and ultimately contestory, thereby depriving the farm of the legitimacy necessary for its effective integration and extension in people's lives.

The eight categories of discursive resistance and related performances include: 1) outright complaint; 2) rhetorically contrasting socialism with earlier and/or different forms of political economy; 3) telling jokes and stories to demean socialist political and/or farm leaders; 4) using sublimation, where overtly non-socialist negative events and phenomena were used as critique of the socialist system; 5) utilizing open assent and affirmation to imply critique of the socialist system; 6) public avoidance of official capacities in socialist institutions; 7) actively disregarding socialist injunctions and engaging in slothful behavior; and 8) using particular appellations when speaking of farm phenomena and officials. Considered collectively, most of these behaviors were small acts, indeed; some barely

¹¹ Sampson, Steven L and David A. Kideckel 1989 *Anthropology Going into the Cold: Research in the Age of Mutually Assured Destruction*, in „The Anthropology of War and Peace: Perspectives on the Nuclear Age”, P. Turner and D. Pitt, Eds. South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey. pp. 160-73.

registering in the consciousness of those responsible for institutional control in the socialist village. Nonetheless, as almost ritualized responses to certain state demands and activities, they clearly made impressions on the minds and activities of „just plain folks” in the socialist village and were one of the critical things that people continued to share as their social lives were walled off throughout the socialist years. Below I examine each of these practices in some detail so as to illustrate their cumulative influence over behavior and resistance to socialist collectivization.

1) *Outright complaint*: Despite the threat held over people’s heads if they were to engage in public criticism of the farm and its leaders, many people still braved such sanctions and engaged in obvious and public airings of their grievances with socialism and collective farming. Many of these practices were, of course, sheer folly and brought on great harm to those vocal few. Consequently, those who engaged successfully in such complaint did so behind cover of one characteristic or another or due to their general lack of concern as to consequences. One of the most celebrated cases of complaint and retribution was that of „Johnny Communist,” an unqualified worker whose wife worked for the farm and who was so nicknamed because of his heavy drinking and his willingness to criticize state and farm while in an inebriated state. However, his vocal complaints brought about his untimely end. After a particularly bitter denunciation of the socialist state that occurred, unknown to him, in the presence of a visiting and highly-place Communist Party official, when he found out who had overheard him, he hung himself due to his fear and distress. Most cases of complaint, however, were not so graphic nor so tragic. As I suggest above, they were enabled as individual complainants could operate with some cover or protection, as from old age or from the presence of the visiting American anthropologist.

One such example (but there are a number of others) relates to bitter community denunciations of the farm regarding its policies of use plot/personal plot conservation and distribution. Collective farms distributed small plots of land (*loturi personale* or *loturi în folosință*) to members fulfilling minimum work norms annually for members’ own needs. In Hîrseni Commune, however, the plots were not distributed until large-scale CAP field labor projects were finished. Even then plot land tended to be the poorest quality and least well-maintained of commune parcels. In Spring 1976 people in the commune were in an uproar about the late date that the CAP was distributing plots. The spring had been wet and

cold and cultivating and planting on CAP lands was delayed. All wanted to know when they would receive their use plot allotment. With each day the plots remained undistributed there was a growing undercurrent of anger and bitterness in the commune toward to the farm and its leaders. This anger played one evening in mid-May as I sat in the local bar with a number of village men. Two tables over the farm president and chief agronomist were also sitting and drinking. Though my conversation with the village men was largely decorous, when the topic turned to farm use plots one of the men became visibly angry and vocal. He loudly criticized the farm and its leaders for being unconcerned about the community and for a general level of incompetence. I was mortified and feared for my own position in the village as he laid out his critique. However, reflecting about this event, I understand in hindsight that the man was using my presence as cover in order to develop his public critique of the farm. By virtue of my presence, he was able to get away with stating publicly to the farm leaders what so many others were thinking privately. And as far as I was able to find out, he suffered no repercussions.

2) *Rhetorical contrasts of socialism and earlier and/or different forms of political economy*: Another common, if not most common, resistant discourse, was the open contrast of collective farming with the type of agricultural production and village social system as had existed in the past. By posing such contrast in the space of a single sentence or speech act, the criticism of collectivization was obvious and powerful. For example, when talking about collectivization and its practices people often interrupted the flow of the discussion to contrast and/or emphasize the point about collectivization with a brief discourse about village life in the past. Invariably, that mention of the past began with the statement or declaration „When we were private farmers...” (*Când eram noi particulari...*) where emphasis was placed on the last two words, „we/us” and „private.” The speaker would then go on to note various aspects of the past that were highly differentiated from current collective farm practices. Though the particular utterance could also bring up collective farm practices or remain silent about them, the meaning of the particular phrases and discussions were clear; collective farming fell short by comparison to people’s past practices and, in fact, had caused harm to the local community and its agricultural base.

Some of the most elaborate comparisons of socialist and private farming practices in this genre of vocalized resistance concerned the

differential treatment of manure in days past or during the collective farm's ascendancy. I often mention to students and colleagues in the U.S. about how someday I really want to write an essay about shit, because that was one thing that was truly on people's minds. My students laugh when I tell them this. However, I am deadly serious. The importance of manure in Făgăraș villages can not be over-stated. Given the „cold” (a local characterization), clayey, soils, local peasants felt (and still feel) that natural fertilizers were far better for nourishing the soil than any type of chemical fertilizer. However, motivated by socialist ideological principles of modernization, rationalization, and industrialization of production, the national and local collective farm bureaucracies were committed to mainly using chemical preparations, and as a consequence were relatively unconcerned about the treatment, storage, and use of *bălegar de grajd*. Thus, the manure pile at the CAP barns was one of the first things that people pointed out to me as they brought up the differences between how they had stored and kept manure as private farmers and how CAP practices differed. They showed me how the CAP manure pile was left uncovered and how much manure was lying about, uncollected, and thus wasted, and complained extensively about these practices. Though they did not complain about collectivization itself, the meaning of their discourse was unmistakable.

Another related circumstance concerned people's memories of the land they had given up „of their free will and unforced by anyone”. I would often go in the fields with people as they carted manure out to work sites, or weeded or spread manure with farm work teams, or participated in family groups that had contracts with the CAP under the *Acord Global* contract payment system, in effect from the early 1970s until the ends of collectivization on the heels of the socialist revolution. These trips were especially instructive as people were often remarkably talkative as we passed one or another parcel that had been held by their family or another relative. Some fifteen to twenty years after the fact people still had great detailed knowledge about the land they had owned, which families or individuals occupied contiguous pieces, how the land was acquired or sold, and under what circumstances.

More important, however, than their sharing their knowledge with me was their sharing their knowledge and reminiscing amongst themselves. This was done at a variety of events and occasions that either brought people out to the fields together in collective work teams or had them focus on the land for one particular reason or another. During field labor on the

farm, for example, people often spoke about the particular parcel of land on which they were working and contrasted its quality then with that which obtained before collectivization. This was especially so when they worked on their farm use plots or in family and neighborhood contract payment (*acord global*) groups. One interesting related event occurred during an assembly of speeches sponsored by the local Committee on Socialist Social and Political Education. At this time one of the teachers gave a talk on local toponymy, and the history of various place names in the commune and surrounding region. His talk was historically interesting, but even more than that prompted many individuals to reflect on land parcels, histories, and ownership in those areas about which the teacher talked. Though the ostensible purpose of the assembly and his speech was to educate and improve people to become more effective socialist citizens, in fact, the day mainly served to create a medium for rhetoric contrasting the socialist present with the private past and thereby making that past an object of Proustian reminiscence and loss.

3) *Jokes, impersonations, and stories demeaning socialist and farm leader*: Political jokes in socialism were an important genre of communication, and one that has sadly atrophied since the movement toward democracy. Romanians, in particular, were widely known for the biting quality and incisive explication of society through their jokes. Romanians, so they say, laugh at their troubles. They make „*haz de necaz*.” Jokes and stories, using the state and local officials as butt, were a primary and political form of this. These elements were especially told from local perspectives and pertained to actual events and circumstances of collectivization in the local community. This phenomenon had contrary significance for the integration of socialist collectivism. Some of the affectations utilized created benign or comical images of the farm and its leaders and thus provided a sense of articulation of farm and community. However, tales that implied, if not demanded, rejection of the farm as a legitimate social organization were by far more prevalent and of powerful meaning. In using local idioms, resistance was further given the imprimatur some of the most affective organizations in people's lives including the socialist village, commune, and collective labor organization.

One of the funnier stories acknowledged by a number of people in Hîrseni village, and repeated over again by older individuals in particular, as if by repetition they might have prevented the community's collectivization, was the story of the beginnings of collectivization in the village. Thus many

older folks, men and women both, but mainly men, spoke about the first collectivization campaign and how party leaders from the regional capital Braşov (then Oraşul Stalin) came to the village in droves to convince people to join the new collective. As villagers told it, they were quite respectful of these outsiders and listened to their explanations of the bright future that awaited them if only they would enroll in the collective. Typically, after hearing the comrades' spiels, villagers would tell them how interesting it all sounded but that before they would enroll in the collective they would first enroll in „Toderan.” With that the comrades typically went away happy, convinced that the villagers would soon sign up for the collective. However, their pleasure quickly turned when they learned that „Toderan” was actually the village nickname for the communal cemetery and that the „wily” peasants had again out-smarted them.

Along with tales that juxtaposed the local community to the outsiders seeking to do away with their time honored way of life, people in the community also told jokes about and mimicked the mannerisms of the president and other farm officials, about the tractor park and its flawed equipment, and about farming practices themselves. They also spread rumors, especially about the sexual and political intrigues of farm leaders, like the scandalous story of the hot affair between a male farm leader and one of his female subordinates or of the love triangle and bitter falling out between a former CAP blacksmith, a brigadier, and the larger-than-life woman who was a permanent fixture on the farm's Board of Directors (*Cosiliul de Conducere*). These stories were not particularly vicious, but mainly poked mild fun at these individuals. However, their main function, it seems, was to act as a rhetorical leveling mechanism and to bring those who had been „artificially” elevated above their former friends and neighbors by the actions of the illegitimate collective farming system, back into line if only via discourse and image. Thus, by the rhetorical recreation of village equality (as fictional as that always was), and by the highlighting of the failings of the recently „high and mighty,” such stories and jokes discredited the collective system more than the particular individuals who served as the source of humor.

4) *Sublimated discursive practice*: Yet another interesting, perhaps even unconscious, discursive resistant practice was the sublimation of critique of the farm onto other phenomena. which then replaced the farm as the source of discontent, but nonetheless served as symbolic placeholder for the critique of collectivization. Thus village peoples, unable to speak

openly about their dislike, distrust, and disaffection with collectivization, focused their attention instead on cataclysmic natural phenomena like weather and pest infestations, or unexplained illnesses and untimely deaths, all of which allegedly had increased in the years since collectivization had been implemented. The list of natural cataclysms coincidental to collectivization were endless. The most common complaint concerned the regular potato beetle (*gândaci de Colorado*) infestations which were not only a gloss on failed collective agriculture, but also a veiled criticism of the United States and the West for allowing socialism and collectivism to develop in Eastern Europe in the first place. Thus people indicated that their potato fields never suffered from such infestations in the past and had only succumbed since collectivization had begun. The insect's name („Colorado”) formally referred to its multi-colored hue. However, Romanian agriculturalists indicated that the name came from the American state of Colorado, which they implied was the source of the beetle. Thus, collective farmers were able to suggest the failings of the farm and the betrayal of the Americans in one single, efficient metaphor.

Aside from the regular potato beetle infestations, concern about other weather and natural and man-made phenomena also served to sublimate critique of collectivization and shape resistance to its practices. Thus, for example, a late summer storm that dumped considerable snow on mountain pastures in the near-by Carpathians and killed a number of sheep in the process, was explained by many as resulting from a fouled-up transhumance process, itself resulting from the late hiring of shepherds by the collective farm. Similarly, people generally felt that their health had suffered since the advent of collectivization, though not due to the farm itself, but rather to their use of pesticides, fungicides, and chemical fertilizers that the farm enforced as well as in the massive electrification of the community that took place essentially simultaneous to the development of the collective. Each such statement of concern about health and well-being thus prompted people to look askance at the farm and to resist and/or avoid practices that it recommended.

As I discuss in my earlier book¹² sublimation could quickly turn to active complaint and resistance. This was particularly and painfully obvious one evening when the farm chief agronomist called together a group of village men to instruct them on new techniques for pruning fruit trees. The

¹² David Kideckel, *The Solitude of Collectivism...* p. 133.

meeting was held at the local school and it was incongruous and highly symbolic of farm hierarchies to see the older, grizzled men sitting in small desks while they were lectured to by the farm agronomist at „the head of the class,” in sport coat and slacks. The agronomist was well-prepared with a slide show and clear remarks on the new recommended practices. When he finished his presentation and called for comments, and after the obligatory two minute long (endless, in fact) pause when people do not speak at Romanian presentations, the discussion began slowly but quickly built to a feverish list of complaint and critique. One man genuinely lauded the lecture and the agronomist, agreed with the new pruning practices, but then mentioned potential skin and other problems related to the spraying of fruit trees, a topic not on the agenda. The agronomist sought to return discussion to the subject at-hand, but the men would have none of it and launched into an endless series of direct complaints on farm production practices, remuneration, and administration, none related to the pruning of fruit trees. Their public airing fed on itself as one comment led to another and the emotive and theatric quality of the event built to a crescendo. In retrospect, it was as if each man needed to rhetorically document their own and support their co-villagers’ resistance to farm practices and structures, even if the following day they would mainly respect them, if only in word or partially in deed. The partiality of participation, as enunciated in public, performative ways through spoken language and kinesthetic practice also served as a major form of farm resistance.

5) *Using Public Assent and Affirmation to Signal Resistance:* One of the most prevalent types of discursive resistance was that which, on the surface, offered public support for the socialist collective farm, its leaders and principles though, in fact, were designed to send the opposite meanings. These kinds of discourses were constant and often humorous. They particularly were evident during those times when people were called on to express their fealty to the socialist system by participation in one or another public gathering of the farm. Such practices again were often seen at farm General Assemblies. The General Assembly was essentially a „set piece” with almost all of its activities and decisions made ahead of time by the critical body of the farm, the *Consiliul de Conducere*, led by the Communist Party functionaries who controlled it. Nonetheless, there were a number of small-scale decisions made at particular assemblies, including selecting a presiding committee, that called for public affirmation and participation.

Similarly elections and other decisions at the meeting also confirmed the distances between villagers and the farm. The villager delegates, for example, were wise to the non-election elections and simply voted „yes” on every question put to them by the meeting presidium, even issues that had been discussed at length among themselves before the elections and on which they were certainly neutral if not opposed. In this way, their fervent assent very readily signified a negative response, as humorously pointed out by philosophy professor Sidney Morganbesser in another context.¹³ However, the way they voted also was a clear statement of resistance. Thus, for example, at one general assembly when a new farm budget was approved that required the farm to contract heavily with the state collection agency to provide outsized deliveries of potatoes, and even though people discussion on the street both before and after the meeting showed them very much opposed to these deliveries, needing resources in kind as opposed to money, they nonetheless all shouted loud and in unison „*bun, bun*” (good, good) when the issue came up. Typically, when the vote was taken, those sitting next to me would knowingly raise their eyebrows, wink, or one time even elbowed me to make sure that I wouldn’t miss their opposite intent. However, this would have been near impossible to do. Their expressions of assent (at least of those who voted, because many did not raise their voice or their hands) were so perfunctory, formalistic, and lacking in sincerity that it was a wonder that the farm administration didn’t arrest the entire lot of delegates right then and there.

6) *Rejecting responsibility*: Another common theatrical or performative device was the public rejecting of positions of responsibility on the farm. This was literally acted out at every single collective farm general assembly of delegates that I attended.¹⁴ For example, each General Assembly was run by a Presidium of individuals that was named by the leadership and approved by the delegates for this very visible position. Presidium members sat on the stage at the head of the Culture Hall and were responsible for verifying the activities that took place at the assemblies. Most Presidium members came from the ranks of the farm’s elite; president, chief agronomist, and the like. However, at every meeting, as a sop to socialist democracy one individual, almost always a woman, was named by the farm

¹³ James Ryerson, Sidney Morganbesser (b.1921), *Sidewalk Socrates. The Lives They Lived*, New York, Times Sunday Magazine, December 26, 2004, p. 35.

¹⁴ David A. Kideckel, *Secular Ritual and Social Change: A Romanian Case*, in „Anthropological Quarterly”, 56(2), 1983, pp. 69-75.

leadership and asked to come up to the stage to serve as a member. In all these instances, when the woman's name was called, whomever it was, she immediately demurred and protested that she would prefer to not play such a role. There was generally laughter from the audience at that time, as the president or whomever was naming the Presidium, was adamant that the individual so named should come up to the stage to serve. The president, of course, always prevailed and the dumb-struck woman would leave her seat amongst her friends and neighbors to walk sullenly up to the stage to take her seat generally at the end of the row of Presidium members. As if to reinforce her displeasure at being singled out, the woman Presidium member sat silently and frowning throughout the meeting.

An analogous type of non-participation also pertained to the other women delegates to the farm assemblies. The assemblies were always notoriously late in starting. The typical two o'clock meeting would generally not get under way until three or later as the president and his coterie were rather cavalier about showing on time. Furthermore, meetings would often last three to four hours such that toward the end of the meeting women delegates in particular began to be concerned about the time and that they were needed at home for cooking and other domestic pursuits. Consequently, the longer the assemblies dragged on, the louder was the noise from the rear of the Culture Hall which was generally occupied by women delegates. Until the meeting approached the dinner hour, the women sat quietly and knitted or crocheted, with their work often tied on to the back of the chair in front of them. The later the hour became, however, the louder was the clicking of needles that were interspersed with occasional admonitions to hurry up since there were important things to be done. The women's message was obvious. They were there because they had to be and not because they wanted to be. They suffered the meeting in silence since this was expected of them. However, at the slightest disruption of their household schedules due to collective farming, they were firm in their public denunciation.

Beyond such theatrical displays, obvious slothful behavior during farm work itself served as the vehicle for people to public express their rejection of the collective organization. Thus many people spoke of how they would often purposefully, publicly and visibly work in the most minimal of manners while hoeing or spreading manure for the farm, to illustrate their disdain for farm procedures. Though many came in for criticism of this type of behavior by some of their farm colleagues, and

though such behavior was clearly not in their own economic interests, it continued up until the end of socialism and collectivization in 1989.

7) *Disregard and omission*: Related to the rejection of responsibility on the farm were a number of very obvious acts of omission and/or de-emphasis that also publicly and clearly signaled people's disdain for the organization and its practices. Most notable, was the active disregard and disdain that people showed for socialist public propaganda. For example, they either laughed outright or made scatological and irreverent comments about large commune or CAP graphic signs announcing one or another holiday celebration (May Day and the August 23rd National Day, in particular). Such comments mentioned the lack of vacation time, the cost of the parades, and the demands on their children and themselves to show up as participants. Even as they sneered at these holiday announcements, people were studious in their disregard for diverse announcements posted by the farm leadership on the bulletin board outside farm headquarters. In fact, one had to work to avoid looking at these announcements, since they were prominently placed near the bus stop for the community.

8) *Forms of Address and Naming*: The last form of rhetorical device I see as developing distance if not outright resistance of the farm from community, was the use of particular forms of address and other appellations. Thus, the manner and contexts in which forms of address were used regularly emphasized the otherness of the farm and its essentially marginal, other quality to village social life and relationships. Nominalization thus acted subconsciously to counterpose the farm to community and thus provide a conceptual rationale for resistance to socialist and collective farm practices and dominance. Thus the farm president was typically referred to by farm members as „Our Nixon.” Though the bulk of my fieldwork took place after Nixon's resignation and through the term of Gerald Ford, the nickname persisted since people conflated the corruption of Watergate, of which they were readily familiar if in name only, with the small-scale corruption of their own home-grown leaders.

Via nominalization, I truly realized the extent to which the CAP was held at arm's length by my informants during the time I job-shadowed the Hirseni brigadier as he made his rounds through the village, in the fields and, and at the CAP offices. One day I had occasion to be at the CAP offices with the brigadier when one of his neighbors arrived seeking permission from him to get a horse and cart from the CAP barns in order to

bring some firewood into his courtyard. Seeing the brigadier in the CAP office, the man addressed him in the hyper-formal, „*dumneavoastră*” and stood respectfully holding his hat in hands and partially staring down at the floor. Later that day as I walked up the street with the brigadier and we prepared to take our leave of each other, we saw his neighbor sitting on his bench outside his home. „Hey, Ghiță” (Georgie) the neighbor called out, „*Ce faci, mă?*”...the equivalent of „what’s happening, buddy?”

My interpretation of the event, both when it happened and even to this day, focuses on the distinction between „normal” village life and the artificiality of collectivization as expressed in such forms of address. In village practice neighbors, at least those not fighting with each other, were on a first name and highly informal basis. Such relationships also manifested when neighbors saw each other in other contexts throughout normal daily life. However, collective farming changed all that by interposing a level of bureaucracy and bureaucratic relationships between those typical within local communities. Thus, farm officers were perceived as distanced and even somewhat threatening, as indicated not only by the language of the supplicant at the CAP offices, but also his body language that showed him as fearful, distanced, and skeptical of the farm and its artificially imposed relationships. That the brigadier was greeted informally later in the day on the street by his home further suggested that the subordinated neighbor was, in fact, rejecting the new types of relationships that socialism had imported into the village. Furthermore, he was challenging the brigadier to also reject socialist hierarchy and reaffirm his (i.e. the brigadier’s) commitment to village relationships by responding appropriately. Most interestingly, the brigadier’s response was politically neutral: „*Salut, Neiu.*”...Greetings, Johnny.

Discourses of Resistance: To What Ends?

The foregoing, I hope, clearly indicates the diversity and prevalence of discursive resistance on the Agricultural Production Cooperatives of Hîrseni Commune. However, the larger question that we need ask is to what extent such practices actually shaped behavior and whether or not they played any role in the ultimate demise of socialism in the „revolutions” of the late 1980s? This question, of course, is impossible to answer. In fact, in Hîrseni village during the first agricultural season after the revolutionary events of 1989-1990, there were a number of individuals who continued to support a degree of collectivized production (if not ownership) and sought to maintain a formal cooperative organization even

in the midst of the mad rush to decollectivize in the early 1990s. At the same time, an even larger number of individuals sought to disestablish the collective, distribute its property, and divide the land as quickly as possible¹⁵ and it was this group that ultimately carried the day.

Though it is not possible to state with precision the extent to which these open, public performative acts made a difference in the functioning of the local CAP, there is no question but that the organization was never fully integrated into peoples' lives and discourse played a role in that. But more than in keeping people's disenchantment with collectivism front and center, the carrying out of such public discourses served a wide variety of other functions. Certainly public discursive resistant performance forced the CAP to be as cognizant of and attendant to political issues as to economic and social ones. This diversion of attention probably played a role in the continuing difficulties of this organization and so many of other collective farms. However, more than the actual effects on collective agriculture, such public performances played role in the social and personal lives of people in the community.

Thus, they helped many individuals resolve their own personal, political and psychological contradictions of participating in collective farming while simultaneously rejecting the socialist system. People's statements enabled them to claim the mantle of resistance despite their daily capitulation, and this was no small thing. In almost every household and during every interview about collectivism, people attempted to inform me about one or another act of resistance on their or their family's part. Sometimes this took the form of stories of Toderan, or of how they resisted the structure of work teams that the original CAP sought to impose on them, or how they never joined the *întovărășire*. The most common (almost universal) claim was that „our family was one of the last to enroll in the CAP.” Thus, via discursive performance, such sentiments were able to be expressed to one's community and thus embellish one's own sense of political identity as non-capitulating.

Finally, the practice of resistant political performance, as mild in form and critique as they often were, helped people maintain a sense of unity and

¹⁵ Idem, *Two Incidents on the Plains of Southern Transylvania: Pitfalls of Privatization in a Romanian Community*, in David A. Kideckel, ed. „East European Communities: Seeking Balance in Turbulent Times”, Boulder, Westview Press, 1995, pp. 47-64.

community in their daily lives. This was particularly important given the growth of other phenomena that worked to break down their relationships with each other including new divisions of labor, socialist-inspired social mobility, and the frustrations of the economy of shortage and the moral compromises of the „second economy, among others. Thus, these discursive acts were probably less important for the results they achieved than they were just for being carried out. True to the nature of performance, through linguistic convention, they created a boundary around the audience of village spectators and reinforced the „us” character of the „us and them” distinction that was so broadly characteristic of socialist society.



The Brigade



↑ Complaint to General Meeting

To Stall ↓



13. Popa Valeriu - s-a născut în 18.07.1926, creștin-ortodox, Facultatea de Drept și Facultatea de Litere, profesor. Interviuul a fost realizat în noiembrie 2002 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

14. Poruțiu Vasile - s-a născut în 06.05.1927, ortodox, Facultatea de Drept, jurist. Interviuul a fost realizat în 25.03.2003 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

15. Protase Dumitru - s-a născut în 01.02.1926, greco-catolic, Facultatea de Istorie, profesor. Interviuul a fost realizat în aprilie 2002 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

16. Radu Ioan - s-a născut în 15.08.1925, ortodox, Facultatea de Psihologie, profesor. Interviuul a fost realizat în 15.10.2002 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

17. Sălăjan Iulian - s-a născut în 06.05.1930, greco-catolic, Facultatea de Drept, jurist. Interviuul a fost realizat în mai 2002 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

18. Șerban Alexandru - s-a născut în 24.09.1922, ortodox, Facultatea de Agronomie și Construcții, profesor. Interviuul a fost realizat în 27.02.2003 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

19. Șorban Raoul - s-a născut în 21.09.1912, greco-catolic, Facultatea de Litere, profesor. Interviuul a fost realizat de Ionuț Țene în aprilie 2002. Interviuul a fost realizat în aprilie 2002 de Ionuț Țene.

20. Viehman Iosif - născut în data de 1.09.1925. Facultatea de Științe Naturale, geolog-cercetător. Interviuul a fost realizat în 12.02.2003 în Cluj-Napoca de Ionuț Țene.

THE IMPOSITION OF COMMUNISM IN THE CASE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CLUJ AS PORTRAYED IN STUDENT RECOLLECTIONS (1945-1948)

Employing the testimonies of those who were experiencing back then their student years, the study aims at drawing attention to the so called moment of short circuit in the history of the University of Cluj, a moment which ultimately led to the definite imposition of communism within this institution.

The study focuses on the actions and reactions of the students to political pressure, especially the one coming from the communist side, but primarily on the resistance act of 1946, an action that culminated with the strike initiated by the „Avram Iancu” student hostel.

The crush of the student resistance was followed by a voluntary submission on behalf of many of the members of the teaching staff, who consented to their implication in romanian-soviet „amity” associations and societies, which were in fact the creation of the Communist Party.

anticomuniste. Fenomenul s-a manifestat și în partea de sud a Moldovei. A fost vorba, în general, de formațiuni de mici dimensiuni, cu doar câțiva membri (grupurile Ioan Milian, Ioan Lupeș, Constantin Dan etc.), dar au existat și unele mai mari („Centrul de Rezistență de la Uturea”, „Legiunea Vulturul Carpatic”, „Tânăra Gardă”/”Scutul Patriei”, „Salvatorii Patriei”, organizația condusă de Dumitru Oprîșan, „Grupul clandestin anticomunist”, „Șoimii din Cruciada Libertății”, „Mișcarea Oamenilor Dreptății din România”, „Organizația deblocaților din Focșani” etc.).

Dacă unele dintre formațiunile amintite au avut un program de acțiune, altele nu au reprezentat decât reunirea de conjunctură a unor fugari din fața comunismului. Din punct de vedere politic, membrii acestor grupuri și organizații erau legionari, țărăniști, liberali, unii chiar fuseseră înscrși temporar în Partidul Comunist ori în Uniunea Tineretului Comunist, în vreme ce alții nu făcuseră parte din nici un partid politic. Cei mai mulți erau tineri, unii aflați la vârsta liceului, dar se înregistrau și oameni mai în vârstă. Rezistența anticomunistă din zonă nu a reprezentat un mare pericol pentru regimul comunist, dar a produs probleme autorităților locale, care nu puteau clama controlarea deplină a populației. Toate aceste nuclee anticomuniste au fost anihilate în primul deceniu de existență a regimului totalitar. Membrii lor au fost uciși în lupte sau de către plutoanele de execuție, cei capturați fiind judecați de tribunalele militare și aruncați în sistemul penitenciar din România.

GROUPS OF ANTI-COMMUNIST ARMED RESISTANCE IN SOUTHERN MOLDAVIA (1945-1958)

Following the Second World War, the constraint of Soviet pattern in Romania was doubled by punitive measures against political enemies and, generally speaking, against everyone seen, by the communist regime, as intruder. Those who managed to escape from being imprisoned tried to hide, part of them arming themselves, constituting anticommunist groups and organizations. The phenomenon was to be noticed even in Southern Moldavia. Usually there were small formations, consisting in few members (such as the groups led by Ioan Milian, Ioan Lupeș, Constantin Dan etc.); beside those there were larger groups („The Resistance Centre from Uturea”, „The Carpathian Eagle Legion”, „The Young Guard”/”Home’s Shield”, „The State’s Rescuers”, the group led by Dumitru Oprisan,

„The Anticomunist Surreptitious Group”, „The Falcons from Crusade of Freedom”, „The Movement of People of Justice from Romania”, „The Organization of Relievers from Focsani” etc.)

While some of these organizations had a program of their own, other groups were nothing but a concourse of events union of few fugitives away from the communist regime. From a political point of view the members of these groups and organizations were Iron Guardists, Peasants, Liberals, former members of Communist Party or Young Communists Union, or pure citizens, members of no party at all. Most of them were young, enrolled in high schools, but there were also older ones. Anticomunist resistance from Southern Moldavia meant no great danger for the communist regime, but exposed the local authorities to some difficulties; thus, the latter couldn't pretend total control over the population. All these anticommunist nucleuses were cut down during the first decade of existence of the totalitarian regime. Their members were assassinated during fighting, or were simply executed by special platoons, while those captured were tried by military instances and thrown away in Romanian prisons.

Translated by Dorin Dobrinu

17. Sas Hilda - s-a născut în 14 aprilie 1960, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii școala profesională, muncitoare. Interviuul a fost realizat de Oana Părvulescu în Orăștie, județul Hunedoara la 13 decembrie 2003.

18. Schmidt Gunter - s-a născut în 22 iulie 1943, naționalitate germană, religie lutherană, studii liceul, fermier. Interviuul a fost realizat de Cosmin Budeancă în Orăștie, județul Hunedoara la 20 decembrie 2003.

19. Sommer Ilse - s-a născut în 1 mai 1929, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii 7 clase, țesătoare/pensionară. Interviuul a fost realizat de Cristina Grigore în Csnădie, județul Sibiu la 20 martie 2004.

20. Tauber Richard - s-a născut în 23 ianuarie 1954, naționalitate germană, religie romano-catolică, studii liceul, director. Interviuul a fost realizat de Florentina Denisa Bodeanu în Orăștie, județul Hunedoara la 28 decembrie 2003.

21. Todea Erdna - s-a născut în 27 martie 1942, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii școala profesională, croitoreasă/pensionară. Interviuul a fost realizat de Florentina Denisa Bodeanu în Orăștie, județul Hunedoara la 28 decembrie 2003.

22. Unti Frantz Jozsef - s-a născut în 29 ianuarie 1930, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii școala profesională, mecanic/pensionar. Interviuul a fost realizat de Cosmin Budeancă în satul Batiz, județul Hunedoara la 22 iulie 2003.

23. Wagner Catarina - s-a născut în 18 octombrie 1926, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii 7 clase, muncitoare/pensionară. Interviuul a fost realizat de Cosmina Paul în Bistrița-Năsăud, județul Bistrița la 20 martie 2004.

24. Wagner Trude - s-a născut în 1928, naționalitate germană, religie evanghelică, studii liceul, pensionară. Interviuul a fost realizat de Cosmin Budeancă în Orăștie, județul Hunedoara la 13 iunie 2002.

„ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WERE”... REFLECTIONS REGARDING THE EXODUS OF THE GERMAN ETHNICS FOLLOWING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The study investigates on the basis of verbal testimonies the causes, phases and consequences of the departure of the German ethnics from Romania. The subject is of great interest to both the Romanian and foreign historians and it attempts to explain the way in which the number of German ethnics from Romania has decreased over a relatively short period of time (1940-1990).

Three phases can be noted in the process of emigration of the German ethnics:

- The first phase- refers to those who left during the Second World War and during the years that immediately followed, either by joining the army, or by way of imprisonment, refuge, desertion, deportation and repatriation.

- The second phase covers those who emigrated between 1950-1989 as a result of the normalization of international relations, the institution, consolidation and collapse of the communist regime in Romania.

- The third phase includes those who left Romania after the 1989 Revolution.

The main destination of the German ethnics was the Federal Republic of Germany. The economic development of this state, the great consideration the German ethnics originating from communist countries benefited from (in the form of substantial financial aids), and not to mention the language and spiritual union, account for the great appeal posed by this state.

As for the causes that determined the German ethnics to leave Romania during the communist period, an analysis of the verbal testimonies and of the reference documents on this topic reveals the fact that although the main reasons for the departure of the German ethnics were the measures taken by the Romanian authorities against the German population (deportation, the agrarian law, nationalization) in the years that immediately followed the second world war and the desire to reunite with their families, starting with the '70 and up to 1989 it was the economic motivation that prevailed. The change of the political regime led to the continuation of the mass departure that ultimately reached incredible proportions.

Nowadays, the continuation of the emigration process, the loss and estrangement that occurred in the relations between the German ethnics that remained in Romania and those who departed, the assimilation tendencies and the largely aged population of German ethnics are but a few of the problems the German minority in Romania has to face.

To solve them, the joint efforts of both the Romanian state and of the ethnic German emigrants originating from Romania, without which the presence of Germans on Romanian grounds will remain only a memory, are rendered crucial.

2. Ioan Barbul - s-a născut la 5 octombrie 1923, agricultor, pensionar. Interviu a fost realizat în 19 august 2004 de Maria Rițiu în Pomi, Maramureș.

3. Mărioara Ionescu - s-a născut la 14 februarie 1926, Școala Normală din Gherla, învățătoare, pensionară. Interviu a fost realizat în iulie 2002 de Maria Rițiu în Dragomirești, Maramureș.

4. Simion Mesaroș - s-a născut la 1 februarie 1942 la Ferneziu, Institutul Politehnic București, preot-inginer, pensionar. Interviu a fost realizat în august 2003 de Maria Rițiu în Baia Mare.

5. Valerica Nicoară - s-a născut la 4 martie 1916 la Necopoi (Satu Mare). A studiat la *Aliance Française*, profesoară de limba franceză, călugăriță. Interviu a fost realizat în iulie-august 2004 de Maria Rițiu în Satu-Mare.

6. Cornelia Turda - profesoară. Interviu a fost realizat în august 2003 de Maria Rițiu în Baia Mare.

EXEMPLARY BIOGRAPHIES DATING FROM THE PERIOD OF THE GREEK-CATHOLIC RESISTANCE IN NORTH-WESTERN TRANSYLVANIA

The present study sets out to highlight some exemplary biographies, which have endured the same adversities as the Romanian United Church, facing the hardships of time, but still managing to re-encounter themselves after 1989 and continue their existence legally.

Although the portrayed biographies are quite distinctive and pertain to various fields, they all have something in common: the struggle in defence of the identity of the Romanian Greek-Catholic Uniate Church and its „underground” struggle for survival.

The research focuses on professor **Grigore Balea** and on engineer **Simion Mesaroș**, two people who have accepted the risks and have been ordained as priests surreptitiously, with the aid of Bishop Ioan Dragomir. Attention was drawn also to the women of „resistance” who come from the lines of nuns as well as from those of the common folk, but who have distinguished themselves by an unyielding attitude, just deeds, strong faith and the struggle for the survival of the Romanian Greek-Catholic United Church. Two examples have been highlighted: **Valerica Nicoară** and **Marioara Ionescu**. A similar attachment to the Greek-Catholic faith in spite of the fifty years of prohibition can be also noted in the case of part of the common folk, who has followed its prelates and priests and have suffered in the name of their faith. From Among them we have chosen to

portray **Ioan Barbul**, a courageous, trustful and dignified man, who has attempted by his struggle to uphold the Greek-Catholic traditions within the Orthodox Church.

The basis of our research have been the verbal testimonies, but reference was also made to specific literature and the press of the period, both of them have offered data concerning the topic, as well as the required reference points needed to place it in time and space.

We consider the persons depicted in this study to be „row models of christian life” due to the strong and unalterable faith, modesty, humbleness and the spiritual strength they have displayed during their entire lives. By presenting the five biographies dating from the period of their clandestine existence, we have attempted to partially recreate the atmosphere of the period, in hope of rounding off the image of the „underground” activity the Greek Catholics were compelled to perform for more than fifty years.

2. Buciuman Simeon - s-a născut în 9 iulie 1961; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: Institutul Teologic Adventist; profesia: pastor. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 30 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

3. Delea Maria - s-a născut în 23 octombrie 1927; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: Liceul Pedagogic; profesia: învățătoare. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 30 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

4. Fărcaș Doina - s-a născut în 8 aprilie 1953; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: ciclul gimnazial; profesia: bucătăreasă. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 22 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

5. Orban Ioan - s-a născut în mai 1961; naționalitatea: maghiară; religia: adventistă; studii: Institutul Teologic Adventist; profesia: pastor. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 24 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

6. Potocian Livia - s-a născut în 2 august 1954; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: Liceul de industrie ușoară; profesia: croitoreasă. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 24 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

7. Potocian Cristina - s-a născut în 27 iulie 1974; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: Colegiul de Medicină Generală; profesia: asistentă medicală. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 22 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

8. Szasz Laura - s-a născut în 1976; naționalitatea: maghiară; religia: adventistă; studii: liceu; profesia: secretară. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 29 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

9. Timiș Alexandru - s-a născut în 29 mai 1933; naționalitatea: maghiară; religia: adventistă; studii: Facultatea de Drept, Institutul Teologic Adventist; profesia: pastor, profesor de teologie. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 25 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

10. Țapu Ioan - s-a născut în 11 iunie 1926; naționalitatea: română; religia: adventistă; studii: 7 clase elementare, 4 clase de aviație la Școala Tehnică de Aviație; profesia: muncitor. Interviuul a fost realizat de autor în 21 martie 2004 în Cluj-Napoca.

ASPECTS CONCERNING THE SITUATION OF THE ROMANIAN ADVENTIST CHURCH BETWEEN 1965-1989

Although they have been present on the scene of the Romanian religious life for over a century, the minority neoprotestant religious cults continue to be out shadowed by the mainstream Churches, a fact that is confirmed by the diminished number of reference materials on the subject.

In spite of the rights and liberties laid down on paper or overtly acknowledged, the communist regime fiercely encouraged a policy of atheism within the Romanian society, not necessarily because it did not believe in God but because it sought to craft a *new man*, who would

entirely obey the communist leaders. For this purpose they have undertaken various measures such as: the prohibition of the teaching of religion in schools, a drastic limitation of the number of positions for the religious seminars, the restraint posed on the activities with a missionary purpose, as well as many other measures meant to diminish as much as possible the influence of religion and of the church over society.

Although for the duration of the communist regime the Adventist Church did not endure the religious persecution specific for the '50, it did however have to deal with the inability to freely and unimpeded exercise its rights.

Carried out on the basis of documents and interviews from the field of oral history, the present study is meant to be no more than an introduction in the study of the Seventh-day Adventist Church due to the complexity of the subject which requires a thoroughgoing research. Given the circumstances, the study portrays a short history of the establishment of the Adventist Church in the United States, as well as in Europe and in Romania respectively, the legal statute under which it operated starting with the end of the nineteenth century and up to December 1989, the perspective of the state on the Seventh-day Adventist Church, as well as the relation of the Adventist members with the state authorities and an inner perspective on the cult under various aspects (moments of recreation and entertainment during spare time).

4. Brânzan, Nicolae, născut la 11 iunie 1938, Peștișani-Gorj; studii: Facultatea de Filologie; în 1981, șeful secției propagandă la Comitetul Județean PCR; în prezent, conferențiar universitar, Decanul Facultății de Științe Juridice și Administrative, Universitatea „Constantin Brâncuși” Tg. Jiu; interviuat în 24 noiembrie 2003.

5. Ciurez, Gheorghe, născut în 1938, studii: Facultatea de Științe Economice; în 1981, președintele Consiliului Județean al Sindicatelor Gorj; în prezent, economist la S.C. „Amorim” SA; interviuat în iunie 2003;

6. Drăghescu, Ion, născut la 26 iunie 1936; studii: medii; în 1981, lucrător comercial la Centrul de librării, șef unitate Motru; în prezent pensionar; interviuat în 12 august 2003.

7. Drulă, Valeriu, născut la 26 septembrie 1951, Broșteni, Mehedinți; ortodox; studii Facultatea de matematică-mecanică; în 1981, profesor la Grupul Școlar Minier Motru; în prezent, profesor la Colegiul Național „G. Coșbuc” Motru; interviuat la 10 octombrie 2003.

8. Fețeanu, Ion, născut la 15 aprilie 1948, Bolboși; ortodox; studii: 7 clase; în 1981, miner la mina Leurda, în prezent pensionar; interviuat în 15 mai 2003.

9. Florică, Maria, născută la 15 februarie 1938, Văleni, Gorj; ortodoxă; studii: Facultatea de Mine Petroșani; în 1981, inginer Grupul Școlar Motru; în prezent, pensionară; interviuată în 12 iunie 2003.

10. Iorga, Ion, născut la 28 mai 1944, Insurăței, Gorj; studii: Facultatea de Științe Economice; în 1981, maistru la I. M. Horăști; în prezent, primar al municipiului Motru; interviuat în 5 octombrie 2003.

11. Lupu, Vasile, născut la 1 ianuarie 1942, Strehaia, Mehedinți, studii: Facultatea de Istorie, Iași; în 1981, profesor la Grupul Școlar Minier Motru, în prezent, profesor la Colegiul Național „G. Coșbuc” Motru; interviuat la 10 octombrie 2003.

12. Nișulescu, Viorel, născut la 18 ianuarie 1959, ortodox, absolvent de liceu (doi ani de facultate după 1990); în 1981 miner la mina Roșiuța; în prezent, miner la mina Dragotești; divorțat, un copil în grija sa; domiciliul: satul Roșiuța, municipiul Motru; interviuat în 24 august 2003.

THE REVOLT OF MINERS FROM MOTRU (19 OCTOBER 1981) (I)

There are not many collective revolts during the dictatorship of Nicolae Ceaușescu. Unfortunately, the uprisings which took place are not thoroughly known. Romanian scholars wrote about the strike of Lupeni (August, 1977), about the revolt of the workers of Brașov (November, 1987). But no word was spoken about the events which had taken place in

Motru. A short length in time of this political and social revolt could be a reason of the silence.

The revolt of the miners took place in Motru in 19th October 1981.

From the beginning, we must underline the anticommunist nature of this uprising. On the other hand, this movement had a social nature, but the political nature is more important. This nature of the revolt is preponderant. The favorite slogans of the miners express undoubtedly this reality. Among the most meaningful slogans were: „Down Ceaușescu”, „Down the dictator”, and even „Down the communism”. Other slogans, as „We want bread”, also prove the social nature of the revolt.

The „spark” of the uprising was the decree number 313 of 17th October 1981. That decree introduced the ration books of the bread into the miner towns.

The communist authorities denied any political nature of the revolt. They judged and condemned the leaders as ordinary prisoners. The leaders were not condemned for their political activity. Some miners were thrown into prison.

The revolt of the miners of Motru represents the most important moment of the collective resistance against the late communism. There was a real blow for the communist regime. It also proved the weakness and the incompetence of the regime. It was the consequence of the cold, of the fear, of the hunger of Romanian people. A strong reason of the revolt was the low living standard in the communist Romania.

Translated by authors

Autorul cărții: *Smerti v Rassrociu* (despre războiul din Afghanistan) (vezi: http://artofwar.ru/scipnic/index_tale_scripnic.html). Interviu a fost realizat în 19 mai 2003.

28. Sergheevici Nicolae - născut în anul 1939, în Ucraina, regiunea Zaparojesk. Stagiul militar în Germania. În Afghanistan: (1981-), plutonier, comandant de regiment. Pensionar. Interviu a fost realizat în 23 noiembrie 2002.

29. Slănină Valeriu - născut în anul 1965, în orașul Strășeni. Serviciul militar: 1984-1986. În Afghanistan a fost șofer. Interviu a fost realizat în 17 mai 2003.

30. Slutu Marcu - născut în anul 1967, în satul Chiștelnița, raionul Telenești. Serviciul militar: 1985-1987. În Afghanistan a fost șofer. La data interviului era constructor. Interviu a fost realizat în 23 noiembrie 2002.

31. Șveț Valerii - născut în anul 1967, în satul Petrești, raionul Ungheni. Serviciul militar: 1985-1987. În Afghanistan a fost țințaș-operator. Interviu a fost realizat în 25 noiembrie 2002.

32. Vălean Oleg - născut în anul 1964, în raionul Ocnița, satul Umbra. Serviciul militar: 1981-1982. În Afghanistan a fost plutonier în serviciul de cercetare. La data interviului era invalid de război. Interviu a fost realizat în 13 noiembrie 2002.

33. Vrabie Valerie - născut în anul 1969, în satul Echimăuți, raionul Rezina. Serviciu militar: 1987-1989. În Afghanistan a fost șofer. La data interviului era constructor. Interviu a fost realizat în 28 aprilie 2003.

THE FLAWS OF SOVIET COMBATANTS DURING THE AFGHANISTAN WAR (1979-1989): DRUGS, ALCOHOL, TRAFFIC, PROSTITUTION AND HOMOSEXUALITY

The present article focuses on investigating some aspects concerning the personal lives of the Russian combatants during the Afghanistan war (1979-1989). A series of flaws of the ex soviet combatants have been outlined: drugs, alcohol, traffic, prostitution and homosexuality.

On the basis of comprehensive presentations the following conclusions can be drawn:

Embezzled out of an area of intimacy, “the history of confidentiality” has marked one of the dimensions of the impact of military conflicts on the spectrum of moral and disciplinary flaws of the Russian militaries during the Afghanistan war. It symbolizes the final boundary of emotions and feelings, burst out in a context of violence and infamy. Some of the crazes were the result of the context (such as drugs), others were based on habit (alcohol), cupidity (traffic) and lewdness (prostitution and homosexuality)

26. Solovei Alexei - colonel de poliție, comisar de poliție, participant la război. AP, caseta nr. 5/II.
27. Șova Vasile - Ministrul Reintegrării al Republicii Moldova. AP, caseta nr. 6/II.
28. Știrbu Iurie - maior de poliție, participant la război. AP, caseta nr. 3/IV.
29. Troenco Valeriu - în timpul războiului, în grad de maior de poliție, a deținut funcția de comisar de poliție al raionului Călărași, participant la lupte; Cavaler al Ordinului „Ștefan cel Mare”; fost viceministru al Afacerilor Interne și fost viceministru al Justiției din Republica Moldova; actualmente general de justiție în rezervă, președintele „Ligii ofițerilor din Republica Moldova”. AP, caseta nr. 1/III.
30. Țăranu Anatol - doctor în istorie, colaborator științific-coordonator la Institutul de Istorie al Academiei de Științe din Republica Moldova, director al Institutului de Politologie și Istorie Politică a USUM, autorul unor lucrări științifice și apariții editoriale referitoare la conflictul de pe Nistru și la problema trupelor ruse dislocate pe teritoriul Republicii Moldova. AP, caseta nr. 5/IV.
31. Țău Nicolae - Ministru de Externe al Republicii Moldova în perioada războiului. AP, caseta nr. 9/I.
32. Urātu Ștefan - Președintele Comitetului „Helsinki” pentru Drepturile Omului din Republica Moldova. AP, caseta nr. 10/I.
33. Varta Valentin – ofițer de poliție în rezervă, participant la războiurile de pe Nistru și din Afghanistan, Cavaler al Ordinului „Ștefan cel Mare”. AP, caseta nr. 9/III.
34. Vieru Viorel - maior de justiție, șef-adjunct al Școlii de Administrare Penitenciară din cadrul Ministerului Justiției al Republicii Moldova, participant la războiul de pe Nistru având grad de ofițer de poliție. AP, caseta nr. 4/III.
35. X - conducătorul Burunducilor, participant la război. AP, caseta nr. 11/II.
36. Zaiăț Vasile - participant la război. AP, caseta nr. 9/IV.

PECULIARITIES OF THE TRANSNISTRIAN WAR

The „white stains” of the „bizarre transnistrian war” represent a less transparent aspect for both the press of that period and for reference documents. It is even more controversial and difficult to comprehend for anyone who wants to gain an insight into the essence of the events that took place in the spring and summer of 1992, as well as a significant challenge for resolute researchers that aim to get to the bottom of the investigated issues, to the very core of the entire transnistrian conflict, a conflict that spans a decade without having been clarified in spite of the international dimension it took. The illustrated material questions the statements made by the leaders of the separatist nistrian enclave and as well as those made

by the heads of state of the Moldavian Republic, who are sometimes involuntarily portrayed as string-puppets in the hands of a third party, a party whose implication during the entire conflict has become more and more obvious. Due to the valour, commitment, patriotism and bravery demonstrated during the military actions, the moldavian police officers and combatants have triumphed in the war of positions that took place on the banks of the Nistru River, but the interference of the military incompetent politicians has had an ill-fated effect on the final outcome. Even the so called common diplomacy has often had a more feasible and efficient impact than the actions undertaken by the platoon commanders.

The crimes committed during the war call for an ample investigation on behalf of the international organizations, and those guilty of acts of genocide against the people of the Moldavian Republic must be handed over to justice and convicted according to the legislation in effect.

The author would therefore like to express his appreciation to all those who have contributed to the publication of the material and especially to those who have had the fortitude to acknowledge some „peculiar” features related to the transnistrian war.