

**MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION
„1 DECEMBRIE 1918” UNIVERSITY OF ALBA IULIA
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HISTORY**

ABSTRACT OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

**THE ANTIMONARCHIST COMMUNIST
PROPAGANDA IN ROMANIA (1944-1989)**

PhD Supervisor:

Conf. univ. dr. VALER MOGA

PhD Student:

LUCA ROBERT-SIMION

ALBA IULIA

2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE REIGNS OF KINGS CAROL I AND FERDINAND I – COMMUNIST THEMES OF PROPAGANDA	9
1. The first years of the dynasty and the historiographical conflict created by the regime between Carol I and Alexandru Ioan Cuza	9
2. Carol I and Ferdinand I in the historiography of politics and conflicts. From independence to The Greater Romania.....	23
3. The coronations in the historiography of the communist regime	73
4. From the Uprising of 1907 to the „King of the Peasants”. The agrarian question from the perspective of the communist historiography	92
5. The antidynastic movements and political movements – propaganda instruments in the attitude towards Carol I and Ferdinand I.....	112
II. THE REIGNS OF KINGS CAROL II AND MIHAI I – COMMUNIST THEMES OF PROPAGANDA	142
1. Enthronements and dethronements in the perspective of the communist historiography	142
2. Democracy in crisis. Interwar and postwar political life in communist historical writing.....	189
3. „Under three dictatorships”. Authoritarian regimes in continuous historiographical evolution	222
4. The antidynastic movements and political movements – propaganda instruments in the attitude towards Carol II and Mihai I	273
CONCLUSIONS	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	311
ANNEXES	340

SUMMARY

Keywords: historiography, instrumentalization, national communism, regality, duplicity, historians of the communist regime, manipulation, Nicolae Ceaușescu.

Today it is well known that the collapse of the communist regimes within the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union did not coincide with the restoration of the constitutional monarchies. What is less known is that a simple exercise in logic shows that post-communist countries, especially Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, are in full continuity with their own communism regimes. On August 23rd, 1944, when Ion Antonescu was deposed and arrested, his dictatorship ended by reintroducing the 1923 constitution, and not by drafting a new one. In this case, it was a fundamental act that was 21 years old at the time, which, however, had not been forgotten and was even considered representative of Romanian democracy. By the end of 1989, that constitution had been abolished by force for 42 years, which is exactly the double of its age in 1944¹. Is this the margin within which a royal institution can be forgotten? To answer, it might be much better to estimate what was not forgotten on August 23rd, 1944; namely, normalcy. During three dictatorial regimes and a terrible war, the monarchy continued to represent constitutional continuity and, after the departure of Carol II from the country, the monarchy was considered to be the last instrument through which democracy could be reinstated. Thus, royalty could very easily be associated with normalcy. Then, the question might arise: was it not the same thing sought by the listeners of *Radio Free Europe* during the New Year's messages? After all, those were the same hopes for liberation and democracy, but in a different context. The fundamental difference is that when the decisive moment came in 1989, normalcy was sought without the involvement of royalty, a fact that left room for the old second-rank communists to pose as leaders of the struggle for freedom and, finally, for normalcy. Under such conditions, the 1923 constitution, regardless of how evident its legitimacy should have been at that time (since it was abolished through eminently unconstitutional means), was forgotten. Only thus could a new constitution be drafted, a fundamental act that indirectly justified the forced abdication of December 30th, 1947, and, implicitly, "Stalin's republic" and the communist regime in Romania.

¹ Together with the period in which it was not in use (February 1938-August 1944).

The 1991 constitution ultimately benefited from popular consensus. A society with profoundly monarchical convictions, or at least one that defended legality and historical justice, would never have allowed the post-communist regime to take the form it did. Although there were still some monarchists, as demonstrated by the support King Michael enjoyed in April 1992, they were not sufficient. The legacy of communist propaganda tried and largely succeeded in dissociating the monarchy from normalcy and instead granting it the status of an enemy and then one of a historical relic; an image meant to be associated with the past, and by no means with the present or the future of the country. The result is visible today. There is respect for the historical role of the monarchy, but one that does not precede its reinstatement. Therefore, researching communist propaganda, and especially the historiography of the regime is particularly important for understanding the way the image of the monarchy was manipulated for more than 42 years and the role this reshaping still has on Romanian society, from trivial consequences (simple insults and aggressive stances towards the monarchy) to political ones.

In the specific case of the historiography of anti-monarchist propaganda, there is a pioneering work starting from 2015 by Cornel Jurju: *Tovarășii împotriva Coroanei: Ideologie și propagandă în România comunistă* [*Comrades Against the Crown: Ideology and Propaganda in Communist Romania*]. However, the sources used are deficient. The author views the theme of the monarchy only through the lens of school textbooks and the press after the revolution², which can lead to a set of hasty conclusions, as the subject is much more extensive than it may seem on the surface. In 2017, Cornel Jurju also published in the volume coordinated by Alexandru and Andrei Muraru³, a volume that deals, among other things, with the perspectives of communist historiography regarding the abolition of the monarchy. Although the sources were much more numerous, analyzing the regime's position towards the act of December 30rd, 1947, can be insufficient if viewed in isolation from the other themes regarding the royal institution.

In parallel, the sources presented offer an important perspective on the evolution of the party's perception of the monarchy and history in general over time. School textbooks demonstrate the level of indoctrination desired within the new generations, the press and cinema indicate the general view of events and concepts in a much more flexible way, and

² Cornel Jurju, *Tovarășii împotriva Coroanei: Ideologie și propagandă în România comunistă*, Cluj-Napoca, Argonaut, 2015, p. 5-7.

³ Alexandru Muraru, Andrei Muraru (coord.), *Regele, comuniștii și Coroana*, Iași, Polirom, 2017.

historiography, always compelled by the party to reinterpret history⁴, tries to explain those views scientifically. Therefore, this research proposes a thorough examination of the regime's positioning towards the monarchy through its historical discourse. For this purpose, a thematic analysis was chosen, as it allows both the observation of the evolution of historiographical treatments over time and their comparison, and thus establishing similarities or differences in the regime's methodology of work. Consequently, the first chapter opted to correlate themes regarding Kings Carol I and Ferdinand I, while the second chapter decided to present historical subjects concerning Kings Carol II and Mihai I together.

In the general research of anti-monarchist propaganda, the historiographical field remains the least explored, but also the most extensive one, especially during the period of national communism. When the historical writing was subordinated to Moscow through Mihail Roller's team, it became extremely rigid in fulfilling its objectives and often avoided addressing important but ideologically controversial topics in Romanian history. Later, the cooling of the diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union meant a radical change in approach, as well as a significant increase in the number of historians and publications⁵. Since the monarchy was a fundamental part of Romania's modern and contemporary history, the historiography of Nicolae Ceaușescu's regime was forced to integrate it into its works. After a certain period, perhaps surprisingly and contrary to the general perception in textbooks and the press, it even did so with laudatory tones⁶.

This tends to be an aspect easily overlooked by contemporary historians. Catherine Durandin said in 1998 that Ceaușescu's pedagogy forgot the role of Carol I in gaining state independence⁷. It is only a partial truth, but one almost completely accepted by the Romanian historiography. The reason lies in the still incomplete research of the antimonarchical communist propaganda. It is a partial truth because, indeed, in some stages of the regime, the role of Carol I was completely avoided or criticized. What is less known is that in other stages, it was embraced. A simple example can be found in comparing the 4th grade textbook

⁴ Gabriel Moisa, *History, Ideology and Politics in Communist Romania 1948-1989*, Budapest, Eötvös Lorand Kiadó, 2012, p. 408.

⁵ Between 1944 and 1969, a total of 7,700 works were published, whereas between 1969 and 1989, 43,573 works were released. Idem, *Direcții și tendințe în istoriografia românească: 1989-2006*, p. 63.

⁶ Nichita Adăniloie, „Parlamentul și războiul de independență”, in Paraschiva, Căncea, Mircea Iosa, Apostol Stan (ed.), *Istoria Parlamentului și a vieții parlamentare din România până la 1918*, București, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1983, p. 232.

⁷ Catherine Durandin, *Istoria românilor*, trans. by Liliana Buruiană-Popovici, Iași, Institutul European, 1998, p. 336.

from 1986⁸, in which the role of the prince (from the discussed historical period) is completely avoided, with the 9th grade textbook from 1988, where Carol is not only depicted in images from the military campaign south of the Danube, but his contributions related to gaining independence are also mentioned⁹.

Through extensive research of the regime's historiography and the monarchy's presence in it, there is a high potential for deepening the understanding regarding the party's views related to history, but also for analyzing the decline of historical writing through falsification, censorship, and denigration. All these aspects must be acknowledged as part of Romania's past and utilized to demonstrate to society that history is not always a *magistra vitae*¹⁰. Its quality is directly proportional to the level of freedom in which it is written, the sources used, and the objective analyzation of them. Within the regime, each of these aspects could present problems. Additionally, communist historiography must remain a focus for historians in order to avoid falling into the trap of a subjective presentation of the 1944-1989 period. A historian must always keep in mind Andi Mihalache's assertion that authors addressing the history of the communist regime must resist the temptation to confuse the reconstruction of the period with its disapproval¹¹.

Throughout the research, it was observed that history works, text anthologies, articles from *Revista de Istorie* (or *Studii*), as well as those from *Magazin Istoric*, were strongly interconnected. This was especially true as the articles appearing in the latter were often texts taken from PhD theses or that were to be published in actual historical works. In the case of *Magazin Istoric*, it can be assumed that these were texts gathered from already published works, but they functioned more easily in the spirit of popularizing history. As seen, this magazine was also heavily regimented, adhering to all party directives, whether anti-monarchist, related to the revaluation/instrumentalization of history, or to attacks, supposedly unofficial, against the historical writing of Romania's neighbors. Cinema, and even the press (although to a lesser extent), also aligned with the historiographical trends, but history

⁸ Dumitru Almaş, Eleonora Fotescu, *Istoria Patriei. Manual pentru clasa a IV-a*, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1986, p. 101-104.

⁹ Elisabeta Hurezeanu, Gheorghe Smarandache, Maria Totu, *Istoria modern a României. Manual pentru clasa a IX-a*, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1988, p. 113-115.

¹⁰ Toader Nicoară, *Clio în orizontul mileniului trei*, Cluj-Napoca, Accent, 2002, p. 45.

¹¹ Andi Mihalache, *Istorie şi practici discursive în România „democrat-populară”*, Bucureşti, Albatros, 2003, p. 17.

textbooks proved to be somewhat more chaotic. They sometimes appeared to counter the trends exposed by official historical writing¹², at least in the case of the monarchy.

A chronology of the regime's historical discourse regarding the monarchy was established by bringing together the researched sources. And, as such, it indicates that the period 1944-1947 was duplicitous, 1948-1964 was deeply anti-monarchist, with observable extremes especially at its beginnings, 1965-1966 was a more favorable status quo, 1967-1970 was a period of spontaneous and limited rehabilitation, mostly attentive to Carol I, 1971-1974 was an anti-monarchist period, 1975-1979 was a period of historical recovering regarding Carol I, 1980-1985 was a period of generalized revaluation of the monarchy, and 1986-1989 was a period of profound acceptance of the regality in communist historiography, possibly with the reproachable amendment of textbooks and some anti-monarchist tendencies in 1989, caused by the *wind of change* and, quite likely, even by King Mihai's words on a Hungarian television channel.

The anti-monarchism of the 1971-1974 period corresponded to the historical context. Not only was the liberalism of the 1960s starting to become outdated, but 1972 also marked the 25th anniversary of King Mihai's forced abdication. Both *Scânteia* and the promising *Magazin Istoric*, which until then had hosted relatively objective and interesting articles about the monarchy, followed the party's-imposed direction, dedicating entire pages and issues to denigrating the monarchy. The case of Paraschiva Căncea proved revealing; she was to publish her anti-monarchist work in 1974, only to find herself in the position of having to attack her own ideas during the centenary celebrations of independence.

While there were contradictions among historians during the first revaluation, during the second revaluation period of 1975-1979, they were predominantly found among the previously anti-monarchist historians, who found themselves in the position of having to attack their old positions. They also provide the reason for concluding that the major revaluation of Carol during those years was due to a clear party directive. Historians such as Nicolae Copoiu and Ilie Ceaușescu brought forth unimaginable information compared to the earlier phase of the regime. The legitimacy and importance of constitutional monarchy in Romania's history, Carol's objective role in gaining the independence and consolidating the

¹² Indeed, it's worth noting that in 1988, a history textbook made critical remarks about Carol I while also acknowledging some of his contributions in the context of the War of Independence. Meanwhile, in 1983, a 10th grade textbook revalorized King Mihai I's role in the arrest of Marshal Ion Antonescu. Aron Petric, Gh. I. Ioniță, *Istoria contemporană a României. Manual pentru clasa a X-a*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1983, p. 105.

kingdom, his recognition as a Romanian and head of state; these are just a few examples encountered during the research, examples that foreshadowed the recovery of other monarchs and an even stronger consideration of positive factors regarding the Crown. Additionally, there was an impression that Carol I was being prepared for an integration into Nicolae Ceaușescu's "line of ascension." The period is also notable for the courage of some historians from the Institute of History from Bucharest (but not resumed only to them), such as Nichita Adăniloae and Dan Berindei, who introduced new elements, even approaching the acceptance of May 10th as Independence Day. This concession, however, could only be made in the most indirect possible ways. Even so, according to the evolution of these two historians, there is not even the slightest indication that they wished to present the event correctly. As observed, both Nichita Adăniloae and Dan Berindei were convinced, even after 1989, that independence should be celebrated on May 9th.

By comparing the various subjects indicating that official documents needed to be signed by the sovereign with the courageous information suggesting that a delegation indeed visited the ruler on May 10th, one can conclude that the necessary information was there, but needed to be organized by the readers. This impression of a *puzzle* game persisted quite strongly. In the end, a doctoral-level research effort was required to present the history of the monarchy during the communist regime in a coherent manner. Even Florin Constantiniu highlighted that reading between the lines was a "great art, perfected during the communist regime."¹³ Unfortunately, even today, when access to sources (and pertinent interpretations of them) is completely free, May 10th is not recognized as such by a large part of the population. The reasons can indeed stem from the communist regime's policy of changing the celebration of Independence Day to May 9th, which may have led to a certain collective habituation (possibly fueled also by sheer apathy or a lack of critical spirit), insufficiently countered in public.

Another important aspect of the period is the anthologies of texts. They seem to be works with the highest degree of objectivity but works in which the statements were not endorsed by historians and implicitly by the regime; they merely reproduced the original faithfully. Such anthologies also posed problems for the censorship apparatus, but as observed, most of the time, the texts and documents were not censored. And, very interestingly, censors often left their mark on the works they altered.

¹³ Florin Constantiniu, *De la Răutu și Roller la Mușat și Ardeleanu*, București, Editura Enciclopedică, 2007, p. 362.

In the worst case, it might be believed that some texts from the presented historical period were completely excluded. Thus, anthologies of texts could have been a portal into an intimate history, where the royal family was no longer just a compilation of historical personalities but also real, human beings. This aspect could be observed in the correspondence published by Eugen Teodoru, but especially in the memoirs of Constantin Argetoianu, which were so widely republished. Through an extremely elevated stylistic approach, the reader was suddenly presented with a sense of normalcy; a series of characters no longer characterized merely by tendencies toward enrichment or guided by empty "depravity". One could see that they had both qualities and weaknesses; each had complex personalities, relationships, and ambitions, just like any person in daily life. Although the purpose of publishing Argetoianu's memoirs might have been to showcase the dysfunctionality of the royal house, they could rather serve to normalize its image. Everything was at the reader's discretion, a luxury not always afforded in the historical subjects presented by a regime that generally preferred to "keep the hand" of those who read its books.

What can certainly be stated is that anthologies also functioned against the monarchy. Setting aside the arsenal of anti-monarchic anthologies from the period 1965-1972 (and even from 1979), within the context of the revaluations from the period 1976-1979, the memory of the 1907 peasant uprising seemed to be a means for historians with anti-monarchic tendencies to express themselves. Again, the most courageous messages against the king came through the documents from the historical period in discussion. It was an interesting case, a moment when being against Carol I also seemed to mean being against the party, especially in the 1980s, if generalized to the assumed instrumentalization of the monarchy. Thus, the idea, even present with Florin Constantiniu¹⁴, that the monarchs after 1866 would not have enjoyed the understanding of the Nicolae Ceaușescu regime must be put in question. It is true that they did not have the same popularity as personalities such as Alexandru Ioan Cuza, but the immense progress, especially in the 1980s, cannot be ignored¹⁵.

It is true that most historians of the regime encountered problems in the publication process, but these problems were either artificial, as demonstrated in the case of the

¹⁴ Florin Constantiniu, *De la Răutu și Roller la Mușat și Ardeleanu*, p. 292.

¹⁵ The historian correctly highlighted many other aspects of communist historiography, particularly its paradoxes: a Marxist historiography without Marx, a Soviet-affiliated historiography with an anti-Russian orientation, a historiography controlled by "stupid, ignorant, and profoundly immoral apparatchiks" but still capable of maintaining the essential principles of professionalism in historical research, and a historiography from a country that progressively isolated itself from the outside world, both in spirit and through translations, while remaining in touch with new research directions abroad. *Ibidem*, p. 294.

insufficient glorification of Nicolae Ceaușescu, or political, as seen in the exaggerated fear of some political figures regarding an inevitable Soviet invasion if ostentatious works about the Eastern neighbor were published. However, as it became increasingly evident that an invasion was highly unlikely, especially as Hungarian historiography took bold approaches to subjects such as World War II, Romanian historiography was encouraged in the 1980s to undertake some courageous and revealing treatments regarding the Romanian-Russian (including Romanian-Soviet) relations, as well as some defining issues related to Transylvania and Romanian-Hungarian relations. Thus, it could be observed that the monarchy, which was actively engaged in key events involving these two neighbors, was used as both a shield and a spear. The former internal enemy was rehabilitated in order to attack former historiographical allies. It was the only method by which the Nicolae Ceaușescu regime could attack and defend itself against its neighbors¹⁶, which is why the historiography was, evidently, heavily politicized and controlled by the party. Moreover, as observed, Hungarian historiography always gave the impression of being much less politicized, sometimes showing no indication that the studies belonged to a communist regime. On the other hand, Romanian historiography perpetually gave the impression of being 20 years behind the historical writing of the Western neighbor, a fact also noted by Florin Müller¹⁷ and Florin Constantiniu¹⁸.

As it could be seen, Nicolae Ceaușescu was never concerned that the monarchy might be "over-rehabilitated." In the case of Aurică Simion's "Preliminaries", the issue was based on the Soviet reaction, similar to Marin Preda's situation. Moreover, whenever the issue of publishing or removing overly bold works arose, the position of a single party official could be crucial, and a simple fear of being held accountable could have been enough to halt any progress. However, serious reactions never came from Ceaușescu's leadership, as, quite possibly, a regime so obsessed with the illusion of complete independence had every interest in proving it was not merely a puppet of Moscow. Regarding Nicolae Ceaușescu's approach, he wanted, at least according to his speeches, a history that was as real and scientific as possible, based on objective criteria and not on "momentary political reasons." Clearly, this was a typical propagandistic message, where the truth is presented only partially. However, as

¹⁶ Ioan Scurtu states that Elena Ceaușescu was openly opposed to the recognition of Bessarabia as part of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, it was believed that Nicolae Ceaușescu hoped to raise the issue of unification based on the abolition of all agreements made with Nazi Germany. Ioan Scurtu, *Povestiri adevărate. Memorii*, Iași, Junimea, 2022, p. 587.

¹⁷ Florin Müller, *Politică și istoriografie în România (1948-1964)*, Cluj-Napoca, Nereamia Napocae, 2003, p. 324.

¹⁸ Florin Constantiniu, *De la Răutu și Roller la Mușat și Ardeleanu*, p. 226-227.

admitted not only by Ioan Scurtu, these official messages also served as a shield for historians against the party officials who opposed the publication of certain works. Furthermore, using quotes with historical references from Nicolae Ceaușescu were sufficient to increase the chances of publication. This technique greatly benefited the regime, as the text appeared to be subordinate to the quote; that all explanations not only followed Nicolae Ceaușescu's words but also served to legitimize and explain them¹⁹. Additionally, what historians of the regime did not acknowledge was that their positions in the Romanian Communist Party, as well as their past, weighed heavily in the publication process.

Some historians, such as Nichita Adăniloie, have attempted to distort the image of communist historiography to highlight their own achievements and present themselves as historians with intact integrity, if not as dissidents²⁰. Thus, in his memoirs, Adăniloie noted that the regime falsified the historical perspective, minimizing the role of some major personalities, prohibiting writings about Bessarabia and Bukovina, or any presentations of the positive actions of the monarchy²¹. Based on this research, it can be concluded, with no margin for error, that the historian not only lies and creates an artificial image of communist historiography²², but also refuses to admit that he himself was complicit in the denigration of the monarchy²³. Instead, and perhaps paradoxically, Adăniloie²⁴ claims that the more than 300 studies and articles, including 52 independent volumes, were written "with care and paternal love for historical truth"²⁵. How is it possible to write as such under the same regime described above?

It would be a grave mistake to disregard communist propaganda as one of the factors in determining the form of government Romania has today. Rejecting the stereotype that the

¹⁹ Apostol Stan said that historians had to write according to Nicolae Ceaușescu, in such a way that everything he said was to be correctly demonstrated. Apostol Stan, *Istorie și politică în România comunistă*, București, Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010, p. 327.

²⁰ In a tribute article written upon Dan Berindei's death, there was an emphasis on the suffering caused by the Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej regime, while glossing over the fact that, later, he worked without issues during the Nicolae Ceaușescu regime at the "Nicolae Iorga" Institute of History. Thus, in the comments of the web article, one can find messages such as "Great respect for a soul tormented and destroyed by the communists!". <https://dosaresecrete.ro/dan-berindei-destinul-unui-mare-istoric/> (accesat on-line în 18.04.2024).

²¹ Nichita Adăniloie, *Amintiri*, București, Lumina Tipo, 2013, p. 218.

²² As observed, each of the aspects listed by him were rethought by the historiography of the Nicolae Ceaușescu regime, especially in the 1980s.

²³ And not only that, as the historian is also guilty of recycling articles in *Revista de Istorie* and, more importantly, of the sincere falsification of the significance of May 10th.

²⁴ In the conclusion of his memoirs, Nichita Adăniloie attempts to portray his retirement in the fall of 1989 as an act of dissent. Moreover, he exclusively published the diplomas he received after the revolution, choosing to distance himself from all his accomplishments during the regime, likely to avoid showing how well he coexisted with it.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 317.

party was entirely anti-monarchic and that it wrote exclusively against the Crown is the first step in understanding the methodology the propaganda. The regime, having solidified its position both nationally and internationally while distancing itself in time from historical events involving the monarchy, it had no serious reasons anymore not to instrumentalize the monarchy in Romania's history. By presenting it in an objective manner, showcasing both its positive and negative aspects, the regime gained credibility. Indeed, from the 1970s onward, many works often referred to the objective character of their presentation. By acknowledging the historical role of the monarchy in Romania's history, the party was merely subordinating the subject, presenting itself as a natural successor in the country's historical line. The public was subtly introduced to the idea that there was no alternative, a sentiment that became evident in the 1990s. The history of the monarchy was presented in such a way that it seemed definitively concluded. Thus, the removal of the royal institution from collective memory occurred not through the severe falsifications of the Gheorghiu-Dej regime but through the quasi-objective approaches during the Ceaușescu regime. Therefore, one can speak of anti-monarchic propaganda in this case as well, but not in terms of the form of the messages, but rather in terms of the objectives and results it achieved with such efficiency. As Joseph Goebbels said, effective propaganda does not need to lie but should present the truth in a "suitable" form²⁶. Thus, the most effective propaganda is that in which the individual is presented with a truth that is either distorted or partial; all to make the message seem as credible as possible and to convince that it is truly not propaganda. Perhaps the best example is King Mihai, whose historical image was most strongly altered by this technique. In the end, the anti-monarchic reactions of the 1990s were fueled precisely by the partial truths presented during the regime, which painted the monarch with a false image of a "traitor" who contributed to the establishment of communism in Romania.

Currently, whether due to historical ignorance, preconceived notions, or perhaps even an attempt to mitigate the successes of the communist propaganda, it is observable how a documentary, featuring historians such as Ioan Scurtu and Dennis Deletant, generalizes the regime's stance on the monarchy by claiming that the propaganda was exclusively deceitful, and that King Mihai was entirely removed from the regime's history books²⁷. This assertion is entirely absurd, especially considering that Ioan Scurtu himself included all the monarchs in his works before the revolution. Unfortunately, this superficial presentation is quite

²⁶ Hans Herma, „Goebbels' conception of propaganda”, in *Social Research*, vol. 10, nr. 2, 1943, p. 200.

²⁷ *Regele Mihai: Drumul către casă*, 2021, minutele 5:30, 14-16:00.

widespread and dangerous, to the extent that even the extensive data and information collector that is ChatGPT from OpenAI responded to a simple query about its knowledge of the regime's propaganda regarding the monarchy, stating that it was exclusively denigrating, one-dimensional, and not permissive to new approaches.

The analysis of historiographical subjects has shown that some contemporary gaps not only existed during the communist regime but were most likely created by the historians of that period. To this day, there is no detailed or fully accepted account of the exact number of hectares owned by the royal family through the Crown Domains, nor a clearer understanding of the actual sums held by the royal family, at least in relation to current levels. Additionally, there are some questions regarding the events in Coțofănești, the veracity of the love story between Queen Maria and the sailor Ioan Andrei, or even the legitimacy of the children of the first monarchs of Greater Romania.

The credibility of historiographical treatments was haunted by the arbitrariness of the Romanian Communist Party's leadership. Regardless of the extent of the monarchy's historiographical rehabilitation, it could always be removed and reverted to the antimonarchist level of the 1971-1974 period. Ultimately, this current endeavor can be demonstrated as a rationalization or an organization of the spontaneous or interested chaos of the arbitrariness of a handful of people or even of the relations with the Soviet Union²⁸.

The communist regime fell, and the republic remained, largely under the care of the same party, which simply adapted to the new context. It is therefore not surprising that the antimonarchist propaganda expanded enormously immediately after the revolution. However, the propaganda was embraced by a large part of society, with only a small number of people wanting the restoration of the constitutional monarchy. This was mainly due to the historical finality that communist historiography assigned to the monarchy. By integrating the institution, with both its positives and negatives, into the historical narrative of Romania, there was an underlying message: that it was, indeed, a matter of history, and thus a definitively closed chapter. This message was observable at the conclusion of most historical

²⁸ Ioan Scurtu notes in his memoirs that Andrei Gromyko, a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Foreign Minister, expressed dissatisfaction in 1978 regarding the "dissemination in Romania of materials related to the territorial issue". Paul Niculescu mentioned that in the Soviet Union, there were also materials circulating that falsified Romanian history. Ultimately, the parties agreed that, on the 60th anniversary of the Union of 1918, there would be no reference to Bessarabia and Bukovina, with the Propaganda Section of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party responsible for ensuring the implementation of this decision. Consequently, Ioan Scurtu, who was attempting to publish a study specifically about these two regions in the context of 1918, became a "collateral victim," initially being denied publication. Ioan Scurtu, *Povestiri adevărate*, p. 287-288.

studies, where it was imperative to discuss the continuity of the Romanian Communist Party and the successes of the new regime. Some references could be quite explicit, as noted by Eugen Teodoru, who stated that King Mihai had understood, "as the act of abdication also stated", that the historical mission of the monarchy had come to an end on December 30th, 1947²⁹. And, as observed, this case was not unique; the historiography of Nicolae Ceaușescu's regime was quite content to present the establishment of communism in Romania as a passing of the "torch" from the sovereign, thus ultimately serving to enhance the legitimacy of the republic and to destroy any notion of restoring the monarchy.

The historiography and, ultimately, the propaganda of the 1965-1989 period must serve as a benchmark in dispelling the dangerous stereotypes that the communist regime presented a strictly falsified history, especially considering that it proved more dangerous when it presented the true history. In fact, this demonstrates that the most effective form of propaganda, in the long term, is that done through subtext. This can be seen in the way those who currently adhere to ideas of direct propaganda are criticized. Committed communists, or even those who fully embraced the exaggerated dacopathic views of the period, are considered anachronistic, while those who adhere to the anti-monarchist current are not. Moreover, it is exactly the latter who popularize the "anachronism" of those who support the idea of restoring the constitutional monarchy.

The consequences are visible today. First of all, we have a multitude of historical stereotypes born from the propaganda of the 1948-1965 period, which at a popular level created the impression of insincerity and corruption among the monarchs, and at a historiographical level dangerously oversimplified the thinking of contemporary historians regarding the nature of communist propaganda, with an almost complete deviation from the much more effective propaganda of the 1965-1989 period. This not only succeeded in creating the subtle idea that the history of the monarchy had ended definitively, but also led to a strange superficiality regarding the historical events. We are faced with a dangerous mix of artificial celebrations and politically misrepresented events (such as the centenary of the Union of 1918) with extreme nationalism reminiscent of the 1970s and 1980s, and an unacceptable historical negligence in contemporary times, a simple example being the erroneous celebration of May 9th. Given the consistency with which previously imposed mentalities have persisted to the present day, without being "taken care of" by a communist

²⁹ Eugen Teodoru, *Din scriinurile regilor*, Iași, Junimea, 1979, p. 5.

propaganda, it is evident that the approaches have not changed significantly and, most importantly, that there has been no serious effort to localize and neutralize the root of the problem.

It may seem fascinating how much the Romanian society and historiography are still affected by the propaganda of the communist regime, even more than 35 years after its fall, regardless of whether those affected realize it or not. The demonization of the regime, as well as the refusal to acknowledge its developments and particularities over time, not to mention the complete disregard for its historiography in favor of the "true histories" after the revolution, have constituted serious methodological errors that have prevented a thorough analysis of the issues and influences born during that period.