

# The Institute of Philosophy in Communist Romania Under Gheorghiu-Dej Regime, 1949-65

Cristian Vasile<sup>1</sup>

“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Romanian Academy

---

**Abstract:** This paper examines some aspects of the institutional history of post-war Romanian philosophy, with a special focus on the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of People’s Republic of Romania. The aim of this article is to shed more light on the main aspects of philosophical research during cultural Stalinism, and to underline the inflexion points within Romanian “philosophical” writings between 1948 and 1965. I examined the lack of human resources and its impact on the emergence of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, as well as the main research topics studied at the Philosophy Section of the Institute of History and Philosophy and Institute of Philosophy especially in the 1950s. I focused also on the context of unmasking and purging of the “philosophical” front mainly in late 1950s, underlining the *Agitprop* fight against Revisionism and “bourgeois” influence in social sciences. The avatars of the philosophical field are analysed through the lens of professor’s Constantin Ionescu Gulian’s destiny as an important manager of the institutions producing philosophy during the aforementioned period.

**Keywords:** Philosophy, Institute of Philosophy, propaganda, Romania

## *Lack of human resources in the field of philosophical research*

In 1948 the lack of human resources trained in Marxism-Leninism in the field of philosophical research was obvious. This was one of the reasons why in 1948-49 the communist decision-makers did not support the

---

<sup>1</sup> “Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History of the Romanian Academy, Aviatorilor Bd. no. 1, District 1, Bucharest; cristivasile2002@yahoo.com

establishment of a separate Institute of Philosophy under the aegis of Romanian Academy (Academia RPR – Academy of People’s Republic of Romania). In this case a very influential person was Mihail Roller (1908-1958), Deputy Chief of the Propaganda and Agitation Department until 1954, also an influential member of the Academy’s leadership as vice-president, *de facto* president.<sup>1</sup>

Consequently, Romanian *Agitprop*<sup>2</sup> preferred – probably following Mihail Roller’s proposal – to establish just a Philosophy Department (Section) within the Institute of History (renamed accordingly in early 1949<sup>3</sup>: The Institute of History and Philosophy). One can also presume that the ideological couple Iosif Chişinevschi–Leonte Răutu<sup>4</sup> did not find an ideologically adequate director for the new Institute of Philosophy. Therefore, an entire discipline was attached to History, where Romanian communists seemed to control both the institutional structures and the branch of knowledge, through the agency of a veteran of the interwar illegal movement (Petre Constantinescu-Iaşi).

By 1956-1957 in the context of a political reevaluation process triggered by the new Khrushchevite course, Pavel Țugui (1921 - )<sup>5</sup> and other party intellectuals accused Mihail Roller that he unduly privileged historiography to the detriment of other academic areas, including philosophy<sup>6</sup> (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 9/1958, 75). One can assume that Țugui referred also to the 1948-1949 period, when M. Roller did not support the idea of establishing a separate Institute of philosophical research.

Let us examine some hypotheses in order to understand Roller’s presumed reticence towards philosophy. In this field of philosophical studies, the issue of personnel recruitment and its institutional dimension was sensitive, since the establishment of the future institute and the way in which it functioned depended on the official ideology. In communist Romania, the ideological bases of philosophy were in fact those of Marxism-Leninism. Philosophy was historical and dialectical materialism, embodying the cultural ideological foundation of the Soviet-type communist system. It was an area in which (almost) everything had to be changed and taken from scratch. Therefore, the entire pre-communist philosophy was ideologically useless and was supposed to be violently rejected. Perhaps this idea was best expressed by Gheorghe Vasilichi (1902-1974), State Secretary at the Ministry of Education in 1947 (and future Minister of Education), when launching the new ideological textbooks in autumn 1947:

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we have two kinds of textbooks. Lighter textbooks, which by the way and through the materialist method, are handbooks with which all can work, even teachers of lower levels than university professors. But we have some textbooks with very difficult and new themes. I refer to the philosophy and biology textbooks. In our country and in

other countries, unfortunately, a false philosophy was taught and it caused confusion in the minds of the people, the students, and the teachers in particular. They will not be able to handle this academic matter. We come up with a new type of course and discipline: the materialist philosophy. For people who have not specifically studied it, it will be difficult to handle, even with these textbooks of ours. That's why I think the communist teachers have a very demanding task (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 22/1947, 30).

However, neither in the fall of 1947, nor in 1948 did the communists encourage the recruitment of a large number of students to the University of Bucharest's Faculty of Philosophy. This reality is illustrated by several documents. On October 15, 1948 the same Gheorghe Vasilichi presented in front of his colleagues from the Groza government the number of students allocated to the University of Bucharest: 200 students for the Faculty of Philology; 130 for History and Geography; 100 for Psychology and Pedagogy and only 50 for Philosophy. The minister of Education felt the need to justify such an allocation: "the number of students allotted to the Faculty of Philosophy is small. (...) We do not want many philosophers. We want just a few, but good." (ANIC, PCM-S, 1944-1959, 10/1947, 9-10).

Probably the communist authorities simply did not trust the Faculty of Philosophy professorial staff (even the one recruited after summer 1948) and the new generation of students' ability to assimilate the latest changes in the cultural ideological approach. The Communist Party leaders and the *Agitprop* representatives were thus looking for veterans of the Communist Party with both revolutionary practice and Marxist-Leninist theoretical ideological expertise. The interwar communist veterans would become professors of the new faculties of philosophy and would model the students, i.e. future researchers of the new Institute of Philosophy under the aegis of the Romanian Academy. Therefore, among the first generation of professors at the newly created Bucharest Faculty of Philosophy were well known interwar party activists such as Leonte Răutu (1910-1993), Sorin Toma (1914-2016), Constanța Crăciun (1914-2002), Paul Niculescu-Mizil (1923-2008).

The communists' deep distrust in both the old cadres of the bourgeois Faculty of Philosophy, and the "fellow travellers" was obvious. Among such fellow travellers were progressive intellectuals such as Tudor Vianu (1898-1964), a well-known university professor of Aesthetics and Philosophy in the interwar period who was used after 1945 by the Groza government as a pro-communist diplomat, and Mihai Ralea (1896-1964), former minister of Culture in the first pro-communist government, an influential intellectual and politician who tried to protect Vianu, one of his best friends. However, in 1948 Vianu was rejected by the communist decision-makers responsible for the recruitment process of the future Faculty of Philosophy's professors.

Instead, he was allowed to function as a scientific researcher at the newly created Institute of History and Philosophy, after March 1949. However, even without having any contacts with Philosophy students, Vianu was marginalized and removed from the Philosophy Section of the Institute in 1950. At that time Vianu was working on a Romanian philosophical vocabulary (Zavarache 16, 2017, 41; AIINI, FSF, 6/1949-1952, 12-16), but his scientific research was stopped by M. Roller and his ideological team, which controlled the Institute of History and Philosophy. Vianu's academic project was abandoned and his successors at the Institute had to elaborate a political philosophical dictionary inspired by the Soviet lexicons, instead.

Some remarks must be made regarding both the historical context of 1948 and the position of two of the most prominent party intellectuals, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu (1900-1954) and Miron Constantinescu (1917-1974), who had a good theoretical and ideological education. Although a lawyer, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu authored a few books which analysed modern Romania's politics, culture, and economy from a Marxist perspective. He was an old member of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) but after 1946 he was marginalized by Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej (1901-1965), secretary general of RCP, who perceived him as a political threat. Finally, Gheorghiu-Dej decided in 1948 to remove Pătrășcanu from the government and party apparatus. Moreover, the latter was arrested and therefore he and his entourage (inclined towards Marxist philosophical thinking) were ignored when the party leadership together with *Agitprop* discussed the establishment of an Institute of Philosophy.

The second important party intellectual, Miron Constantinescu, trained as a sociologist, chose in 1948 to stay away from the recruitment process for the Marxist philosophical field. He preferred to get involved in economic matters instead (Bosomitu 2014, 154-155), choosing the position of president of the State Committee for Economic Planning. Consequently, the ideological bodies responsible for recruiting cadres for the Institute of Philosophy had to explore other options; the selection base narrowed considerably, with both L. Pătrășcanu's entourage fallen into disgrace, and Constantinescu's non-involvement.

Being aware of RCP/RWP's weakness in the field of philosophical research and Marxist thinking, the communist decision-makers became very cautious when approving political and cultural discussions over the nature of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, in mid - 1948. For example, in his speech delivered in front of the Direction for Propaganda and Agitation, on May 26, 1948, Iosif Chișinevschi (b. 1905 - d. 1963; secretary of Political Bureau of RWP, responsible with propaganda and ideology) responded to some inquiries of the party activists as follows: "[I was asked] whether it is allowed for every RWP county organization to prepare theses and conferences [on ideological topics]. In any case, we do not recommend [any discussions on] Marxist-Leninist theory and philosophy" (ANIC, CC PCR – SPA, 9/1948, 121).

The new Romanian communist philosophy was built in antithesis to the old schools of philosophy. Therefore, prominent bourgeois professors of Philosophy and philosophers such as Constantin Rădulescu-Motru (1868-1957), Mircea Florian (1888-1960), Lucian Blaga (1895-1961) were removed from their professorial offices and tenures. However, they were hired and accepted as researchers within the newly created Institutes of Philosophy (in Bucharest and Cluj). It seems, however, that C. Rădulescu-Motru, although a virulent anti-communist already in 1948, considered the idea to reconcile with the new communist power by trying to survive among his Philosophy students. In his daily diary he invoked Lenin on a positive note on March 28, 1948 (Rădulescu-Motru VI 2000, 91). If it existed, such an attempt to collaborate with the new power was doomed to failure. C. Rădulescu-Motru did not resist either the purges of the university or the communist restructuring of the Romanian Academy, being eliminated and left without sources of subsistence for at least a while. However, we know that in 1952 Motru was integrated at the Institute of History and Philosophy, due to his friend and former disciple Mihail Ralea, as external collaborator/researcher (Zavarache 2017, 61). The other important professor of philosophy in Bucharest, Mircea Florian, was “exiled” to the same Institute of History and Philosophy as a simple collaborator. A similar faith was shared, in Cluj, by renowned poet and philosopher Lucian Blaga (Crohmalniceanu 2004, 542).

*Constantin Ionescu-Gulian and the Philosophy section of the Institute of History and Philosophy*

It is equally important to see what happened to the other party intellectuals or sympathizers of RCP/RWP who were inclined towards the theoretical, philosophical Marxist reflection. One of those persons was Constantin Ionescu-Gulian (1914-2011), Romanian scholar of Jewish origins, who immediately after August 23, 1944 published several texts in various pro-Soviet and pro-communist magazines and newspapers (such as *Lumea*, *Veac nou*). Gulian was associated with several cultural ideological structures under the coordination of the RCP (ARLUS – the Association for Strengthening the Relations with Soviet Union, State Publishing House, party schools). In 1945 he was appointed secretary of the most important workers’ party school of the RCP (rector was Barbu Lăzăreanu – b. 1881 - d. 1957). The ideological leaders of the Communist Party invested much in Gulian, but he did not fully confirm the confidence granted in these early years. He was too young (34 years old) to be appointed in the ranks of the Academy, which was reconstructed by emulating the Soviet model in 1948. Moreover, C. Ionescu-Gulian was harshly attacked by Leonte Răutu in his ideological text *par excellence* entitled

*Against Cosmopolitanism and Bourgeois Objectivity in Social Sciences* (1949), the essential political document of the Romanian Zhdanovite period (Răutu 2008, 248-250). C. Ionescu-Gulian graduated both the Faculty of Philosophy and the *Conservatoire* (Music Academy in Bucharest); in 1945-1946 he was a contributor at *Lumea* magazine (chief editor: G. Călinescu, a renowned historian and literary critic) and after a year he defended his Ph.D. in Philosophy (1947). In the meantime, Gulian published two academically honourable books written from a Marxist perspective, but using a bibliography that was ideologically diverse (Arthur Schopenhauer, Alfred Adler, Max Scheler, Nikolai Berdiaev were only a few names cited in his volumes) (Gulian 1946, 264).

In fact, particularly this diverse perspective of the books was criticized during the Zhdanovist-like campaign in Romania, that had anti-Western, anti-cosmopolitan and anti-bourgeois accents. Moreover, in 1948 the *Agitprop* department of the RWP Central Committee burst of defamatory materials, mainly informative notes issued by the Cadres Department of the Communist Party (probably fuelled by information provided by the political police). One of those notes focused on Petre Năvodaru (Fischer) (b. 1913), member of RCP from the interwar period, former director of the State Publishing House [Editura de Stat] (after 1945), with whom C.I. Gulian collaborated. Some information could endanger Gulian's position within the cultural ideological bureaucratic apparatus. The document suggested that numerous authors published by the State Publishing House had had strong connections with Herbert Belu Zilber (1901-1978), a communist intellectual, acquaintance of Pătrășcanu, who was a pariah in 1948. Zilber headed the Institute for Economic Studies after 1945 and he was arrested in 1947. The informative note from 1948 mentioned that:

Ever since the beginning [until 1948], [Petre Năvodaru Fischer] surrounded himself with dubious elements, and most of them were from Zilber's clique, and they received functions at the State Publishing House. There were employed: Vera Călin, Iosifescu Silviu, [Constantin] Ionescu-Gulian, Schileru Eugen, Ricu Vald [Henri Wald], Fridman Barbu Cămpina (...), all admirers of Zilber (ANIC, CC PCR – CCP, N/13, 16).

After all, none of those mentioned as Belu Zilber's entourage (or his sympathizers) suffered serious persecution, being admitted as university professors or as researchers in the social sciences' institutes of the Academy.

The main problem was the content of the writings of those listed, particularly what C.I. Gulian wrote in the early post-war years. The ideas conveyed by Gulian in his two works (*Introduction to New Ethics* and *Introduction to Sociology of Culture*) were no longer desirable after 1948. In the volume about the new ethics, Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin were quoted as authors amongst

others, not in the foreground (Stalin was ignored); the desirable ethics invoked by Gulian was not necessarily the proletarian one, which was specific to late Stalinism. Consequently, when the Romanian cultural milieu collided with the forced ideological alignment embodied by Socialist realism and anti-cosmopolitanism, L. Răutu cynically accused Gulian of both “vegetarian objectivity” (meaning that he did not attack/„bite” Western ideology) and the omission of quoting “the representatives of Marxist-Leninist theory” (Răutu 2008, 248-250). Besides this criticism, C.I. Gulian was appointed deputy director of the Philosophy Section of the Institute of History and Philosophy of the Romanian Academy (director of the Section was Mihai Ralea) in 1949. The Communist Party leadership decided that Petre Constantinescu-Iasi, an interwar RCP veteran, was fit to lead an institute that included both historiographical and philosophical research. It was believed that Constantinescu-Iasi could politically supervise the Marxist-Leninist materialist ideological purity of the two academic fields with the help of the ideologue Mihail Roller. On the other hand, it must be said that the Philosophy Section enjoyed quite a large autonomy between 1949 and 1953 and some authors (diarists) who knew very well the institutional structures of the Academy mentioned it. For example, C. Rădulescu-Motru wrote about the Institute of Philosophy in his journal (Rădulescu-Motru VII 2001, 230); likewise, Zigu Ornea (1930-2001), a 1950s Philosophy student, made it clear that such an Institute existed immediately after 1948 (Ornea 1997, 263).

The year 1949 was a decisive year for the Romanian philosophical writings, mainly due to several ideological texts that set directives impossible to ignore. Besides Leonte Răutu’s canonical text (*Against Cosmopolitanism and Bourgeois Objectivity in Social Sciences*) there were some articles published with the same purpose in the communist daily *Scântea* [Sparkle] and the ideological monthly *Lupta de clasă* [Class Struggle], the theoretical journal of RWP. There was another text identified recently by historians in the archives of RCP, unsigned and entitled *Western Influences on Romanian Philosophy*, which was an ideological document aiming at rewriting the history of the local philosophy, establishing a sort of censorship, an *index librorum prohibitorum*, and targeting “reactionary” and “idealistic” Romanian authors (i.e. almost all important authors from the pre-communist period could be accused of such orientations: Titu Maiorescu [1840-1917], Ioan Petrovici [1882-1972], C. Rădulescu-Motru, Mircea Djuvara [1886-1945], Lucian Blaga, Tudor Vianu, Camil Petrescu [1894-1957], Mircea Florian, Petre P. Negulescu [1870-1951], Nae Ionescu [1890-1940], Constantin Noica [1909-1987], Emil Cioran [1911-1995]) (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 72/1949, 12-13). The document was registered at the Direction for Propaganda and Agitation (which probably also commissioned it). Finally, the document noted that

the bourgeois philosophy professors (...) continued, almost unhindered, the activity of propagating idealism, and infecting new cohorts of students [even after 1945]. During this period idealistic, agnostic, anti-Marxist works were published, signed by C.R. Motru, Mircea Florian (allegedly Marxist, Reformist, author of a misleading work on Dialectics, member of the executive committee of the Socialist Independent Party), Florian Nicolau. M. Florian tried to use 'Marxist' language for his reactionary views. After the reorganization of the higher education sector this year (1948-1949) most of the professors of philosophy trained in the schools of idealism, agnosticism etc. were removed from their tenures (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 72/1949, 12-13).

The document contained critiques as it was considered unacceptable for a researcher in a socialist pro-Soviet country to quote in a positive context an author like Nikolai Berdyaev – perhaps a direct warning for C.I. Gulian, due to the fact that Berdyaev was allegedly dominated by the specific mysticism of many “white Russians.” However, it is certain that Gulian understood and assumed such criticism and renounced his old preoccupations of studying and using Western secondary literature.

In 1954 the Institute of History and Philosophy was split, and the Philosophy Section was transformed into an Institute of Philosophy, another research centre of the Romanian Academy. C.I. Gulian – and not Mihai Ralea – was appointed its director. During this period of almost five years (1949-1954), C.I. Gulian proved his loyalty to the party line by renouncing the Western academic references and practicing scientific flimsiness. He signed both forewords and introductory studies, instrumentalizing and distorting Ancient, Medieval, and Modern philosophers (Epicurus, Aristotle, Francis Bacon, John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, René Descartes, etc.)<sup>7</sup>, as well as evocative texts that falsified various philosophical and literary phenomena. In fact, he refuted his pre-1948 academic profile and accepted to be part of a local variant of a precarious Soviet-type philosophical thinking, even though he seemed to observe academic objectivity and to judge without partiality, until 1947.

An excellent historical source that can help us follow Gulian's academic transformation is the recently published diary of his good friend Maria Banuș (1914-1999), well-known Jewish Romanian poetess. In Banuș's diary, Gulian appears as “R.” and “Richi” (Banuș I 2014, 53). According to this source, there were preconditions to his post-1940s transformation. Although Gulian seemed in 1930s and 1940s an open-minded intellectual, Maria Banuș observed tendencies that could have been paralleled to soft Socialist realism. During some discussions with her in the late 1930s, Gulian challenged the idea of aesthetic autonomy. In 1936, he wrote to Banuș telling her that in the future the world literature would have to be connected to social events and economic transformations, and the artistic value would be less important. “But that means removing literature from art” – concluded Maria Banuș (Banuș I 2014, 76).

The communist blueprint for establishing an Institute of Philosophy was not abandoned after 1948. It was reaffirmed especially in 1951-1952 (in the fall of 1951 two of the Faculties of Philosophy in Jassy and Cluj were closed and their students transferred to Bucharest; we do not know if the founding of a separate institute of philosophy had any connection with this transfer). We do know for sure that the idea of splitting History and Philosophy was disseminated in the same time with the plan of creating an Institute of Economic Studies under the aegis of the Romanian Academy. The latter institute was established at the end of 1952, but in the case of the Institute of Philosophy the delay was obvious. Such a delay of two years indicated the complexity of this institutional problem and marginalized the local philosophical research. In 1952, the split of history and philosophy seemed imminent; even *Agitprop* representatives discussed the publishing of the first issue of a periodical for the future Institute, called the *Buletinul de Științe Filosofice* [Bulletin of Philosophical Sciences] (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 11/1952, 33). For various reasons, the plan of splitting History from Philosophy failed in 1952.

But what was the academic profile of the philosophical studies produced by the Philosophy Section between 1948 and 1953? In this period, it is difficult to speak of philosophical research in the true meaning of the word. Numerous studies and articles published as philosophical research contained mainly slogans, references to proletarian internationalism, and the USSR's assistance. They were full of clichés, and political references dedicated to Lenin and Stalin. In parallel, the Romanian cultural philosophical field was enriched by many Soviet philosophical works translated from Russian, which ultimately led even party ideologists to notice the precariousness of internal philosophical production. For example, in 1955 some party functionaries of the Department for Culture and Arts within Agitprop agreed with the contents of a report mentioning that during 1948 and 1953 any materialist or Marxist oriented philosophical research which did not comply *ad litteram* to some dogmatic clichés was forbidden. „The entire Marxist-Leninist teaching and doctrine became a sort of Medieval Biblical Hermeneutics which judged only the formal conformity of the research works ignoring the true spirit and meaning of the ideology” – concluded the aforementioned report (Cătănuș 2006, 113).

#### *The Institute of Philosophy (1954)*

Finally, the separation of the Institute of History from that of Philosophy took place at the end of 1953. As already mentioned, C.I. Gulian became director of the Institute of Philosophy. His academic flimsiness and political obedience contributed to his promotion; moreover, starting July 1955 C.I. Gulian served also as a member of the Romanian Academy (Rusu 2003, 408).

The first issue of the Institute's journal (*Cercetări filozofice* [Philosophical Research]) was an academic failure even in the eyes of some party ideologists and bureaucrats; probably due to such disappointment they preferred to call it *a collection of texts*. One can presume that the editor-in-chief was Gulian although his name was not listed as such. Party activist Al. Molnar authored an ideological text on proletarian internationalism, which had nothing to do with philosophical research or even Marxist theory, as it was nothing more than a series of slogans and praises to the USSR, the Red Army, etc., having as bibliographic references authors such as I.V. Stalin, V.I. Lenin, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, G.M. Malenkov, V.M. Molotov, Iosif Chișinevschi. The same line was observed by other texts (i.e. Al. Nichita, *The Struggle against Bourgeois Cosmopolitanism, as Part of the Struggle for Peace and Socialism*). Gulian published a study on Dr. Gheorghe Marinescu's materialistic philosophical considerations, one of the reputed Romanian physicians specialized in neurology.

One of the political philosophical directives of the party leadership regarding the "philosophical front" immediately after 1948 was to identify and disseminate the cases of Romanian intellectuals from the nineteenth century and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century who were precursors or promoters of materialist philosophy. The approach was supposed to engage in polemics with bourgeois and Western philosophy, so it was not surprising that many academic titles contained the expression "struggle against idealism."

In order to achieve this objective, the team of the Institute of Philosophy gathered scholars who, after 1954 were assigned specific topics: Simion Ghiță (*The Thought of Ștefan Michăilescu, Grigore Ștefănescu, N. Leon*), Crizantema Totoescu-Joja (*The Materialistic Orientation of Thinkers such as Dimitrie Voinov, Ion Athanasiu and Ion Cantacuzino*), Mircea Florian (*Victor Babeș's Philosophical Conception*), Năstase Bolboacă (*The Ideological Development of the Romanian Principalities in the 19th Century; The Romanian Bourgeois Philosophy in the Interwar Period*), Nicolae Gogoneață (*Vasile Conta's Materialistic Orientation*), Radu Pantazi (*George Barițiu's Thought; The Spreading of the Marxist Ideas in Romania at the Beginning of the 20th Century*), I.S. Firu (*Humanist Joannes Sommerus' Concepts*), Liubomira Miroș (*The Philosophical and Social Political Ideas of Dr. Iuliu Baraș*); many of those themes were published few years later in three collective volumes entitled *Pagini din istoria filozofiei* [Pages from the History of Philosophy].

In order to understand the unmasking and purges of the "philosophical" front from the late 1950s we must mention the social and ethnic composition of the Institute's research fellows. Romanian Jews had an important role, even occupying leadership positions. Soon after 1954 the party officials faced a series of complaints about interethnic tensions, including anti-Semitism. In a report issued by the Ideological Sector for Social Sciences within the Section for Science and Culture of the RWP Central Committee on some aspects of

intellectual work among intellectuals, probably drafted at the end of 1956, Jewish “overrepresentation” was mentioned. The document stated that

there was no sustained concern in ensuring a social and national proportionate composition of young researchers. The direction of the Institute of Philosophy completely neglected the assurance of a fair national composition. Apart from the fact that the researchers’ team was formed since its beginning only from Jewish comrades, there was no special focus on ensuring a fair composition amongst youth. Of the four heads of sections, three are Jewish, and among the young staff employed in the institute there are many Jews. We believe this situation also generated a certain anti-Semitic spirit that was present in the manifestations of some scholars from the institute ([Năstase] Bolboasă, [I.] Verdeș, Oprea Lucian) (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 9/1958, 82).

A national homogenization campaign aiming at building the Socialist nation followed in late 1950s and early 1960, directed by the party leadership and *Agitprop*, targeting the Institute of Philosophy as well. Its consequence was the diminishing of the number of non-Romanian researchers (Kuller 2010, 176-177). However, Gulian proved again to be a survivor.

#### *Main research topics*

As newly confirmed director of the Institute in 1954, C.I. Gulian undertook the work of coordinating a synthesis of the history of philosophy in Romania and began documenting a new theme: Titu Maiorescu’s ill-fated role in Romanian culture, with a special focus on Maiorescu’s philosophical writings.<sup>8</sup> In less than a year the text was published in the above-mentioned monograph (*Pages from the History of Philosophy in Romania*) under the title *Titu Maiorescu – a Representative of the Bourgeois Regime*. The literary historian Marin Nițescu considered it “the most revengeful indictment of all times, of a fanatical Zhdanovite type, against Maiorescu”; an indictment full of irrational rage, in which Gulian did not quote the phrases that would incriminate Maiorescu (Nițescu 1995, 155). It is interesting to mention some information regarding the editing of Maiorescu’s writings during the cultural détente. In the late 1950s, due to a lighter ideological censorship, the virulence against Titu Maiorescu eased; literary historian Marian Popa stated that “Titu Maiorescu’s name could have appeared in 1958 with a selection of articles, but C. Ionescu-Gulian pulled out from the Central State Library one of the first Romanian speeches against the communist ideology delivered by Maiorescu and sent it to the RWP Central Committee. Due to this event the re-editing of Maiorescu’s works was blocked, [and] those who suggested it were criticized.” (Popa I, 2009, 1108)

However, Marian Popa did not provide any documentary source to support his information and, in general, many of his allegations may be questioned. But in the case of Maiorescu one can indeed document other unfortunate interferences of C.I. Gulian, even in times of greater “liberalization” (the second half of the 1960s). Between 1968 and 1969, Gulian proved to be a careful communist *vigilante* defending the ideological purity of Romanian culture and literature, who repeatedly alerted the party leadership with regard to the publishing of idealistic articles in the literary journals, criticizing their devotion to – what he considered to be – idealistic and irrational philosophy (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 5/1969, 21; Vasile 2014, 149).

The research topics were deeply ideologized at least until 1956, and the field of philosophy was put under closer surveillance than other humanistic sciences. The content of *Cercetări filozofice* [Philosophical Research] was subject to repeated censorship. In a review report from October 7, 1955, assumed by the leadership of the Institute of Philosophy, the regular quarterly appearance of the journal and the expansion of each number by 60-80% were presented as „great successes” (AAR, SSEFJ, K/2/1955/1958, 5). The other two successes announced by Gulian’s team were: the printing of two volumes out of three of the book entitled *Pages from the history of philosophy in Romania*, as well as a collection of studies on historical materialism. The main objectives of the 1956 research plan in C.I. Gulian’s perspective were: 1. Establishing collaborative links with various institutes and researchers in the field of natural sciences, according to the Decision of the General Session of the Academy of July 1955, in order to deepen the analysis of some theoretical problems of the natural sciences; 2. Studying the issue of dialectical categories; 3. Studying issues related to the history of materialistic thinking in the history of science in Romania; 4. Continuing the research on historical materialism on the issue of the people’s revolution and the establishment of the new socialist base and superstructure in socialist Romania; 5. The development of logical studies necessary for the enrichment of philosophical culture. 6. Continuing the work of translating and publishing important texts from the works of Marxian classical philosophers, necessary to study the history of world’s philosophy. 7. Continuation of the “Anthology of Texts of Progressive Thought in Romania.” In the end, C.I. Gulian mentioned that “in order to achieve the objectives proposed in the plan, the Institute of Philosophy needs the research personnel and technical staff currently missing” (AAR, SSEFJ, K/2/1955/1958, 6).

As I mentioned, the collection entitled *Pages from the history of philosophy in Romania* came out in three volumes (the first one was printed in 1955, the second in 1957, the last in 1960), bearing marks of ideological pressure. The volumes have in fact prepared the publication of the great synthesis, “the first synthesis written from Marxist-Leninist perspective,” a sort of a treaty on the history of social and philosophical thought in Romania which appeared at the

end of 1964 (Gulian and others, 1964). Twenty years after the “liberation” of August 1944 almost every academic, scientific and artistic field had to celebrate by publishing such syntheses.

### *Hegelian themes*

In the 1950s the topics approached by the researchers specialized in philosophy were correlated to “political moments” and anniversaries / commemorations. For example, on November 15, 1956, the RPR Academy celebrated the 125<sup>th</sup> commemoration of G.W.F. Hegel’s death. Predictable, C.I. Gulian delivered various presentations with this occasion. In a very short time, he also published his research work on Hegel, apparently in full official approval.

In 1957, Gulian approached a more complex theme related to Hegel’s personality and work. It was an attempt to interpret Hegelian philosophical thought, but Gulian did it in strident polemic terms, almost like a pamphlet against Western philosophical literature: “around Hegel’s work, as well as around the work of other great philosophers like Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, etc.” two interpretations have collided: the *scientific* Marxist interpretation, and the *non-scientific*, idealistic or metaphysical interpretation, having a reactionary substratum” (Gulian I, 1957, 11). Compared to his studies from 1946-1947, Gulian proved now to be capable not only of ideological flimsiness, but also of stylistic mistakes. Moreover, Gulian joined the virulent official propaganda against the Romanian exile. He accused the western bourgeois philosophers of being incapable of understanding the revolutionary core of Hegelian dialectics. He continued his series of attacks:

It is very significant that the so-called ‘philosophical research centre’ of some Romanian exiled, anti-communist refugees located in Paris strives to create a ‘new logic’ aiming at ‘Overcoming’ dialectical logic – as announced in August 1956 by the *Voice of America* radio station (Gulian I, 1957, 5).

Probably Gulian referred to the Romanian Research Centre / Centre Roumain de Recherches at the Department of Philosophy, Philosophy of History and Culture, which functioned starting 1950 under the aegis of the French Academy. The group was composed of important intellectuals in exile such as: Mircea Eliade (1907-1986), E.M. Cioran, Octavian Viaia (1914-1989), Leon Negruzzi (1840-1890), Leontin Constantinescu, Paul Miron (1926-2008), Virgil Veniamin (1906-1984), Horia Stamatu (1912-1989) and others (Manolescu 2003, 149).

However, it seems that there were some significant differences between the manuscript of the book on Hegel and the published version. It is possible that due to censorship suggestions, C.I. Gulian thought that it was mandatory to

include anti-Western criticisms. I will return to this issue when I address the question of “fighting against revisionism in philosophy.” Gulian kept his polemic tone in the second volume of his monograph on G.W.F. Hegel (the publication of which was delayed to 1963). He persisted in his anti-bourgeois attitude and continued to criticize the capitalist order of which he considered that it had received “major blows” in the twentieth century (Gulian II 1963, 544). Gulian claimed that ideological weakness, which is specific to the capitalist West, would be one of the reasons why Western doctrinaires and ideologues had given up academic calmness and courtesy when writing on dialectics and other Hegelian themes.

*Nietzsche and the “taboo” subjects in the history of philosophy*

There are some indications that C.I. Gulian did not fully followed all the ideological directives, although he officially acted as an ultra-conformist intellectual, especially in fear of fatal consequences. L. Răutu launched several virulent attacks against Gulian in 1957 and 1958, accusing him, among other things, of tolerating inappropriate content in the case of the journal *Cercetări filozofice (Philosophical Research)* (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 6/1957, 28). Maria Banuș noted on December 30, 1960, a discussion with her friend, Gulian:

I tell Richi [Gulian]: ‘Why do we not read Nietzsche and other philosophers anymore? Why did we give up on critical reflections, comments, dreams?’ ‘It would hurt us,’ he says. ‘We have stronger limits. We are living in an era dominated by obsession. We have our specific tasks. We do not even understand Nietzsche et comp., we are indifferent to their major topics.’ ‘I think he [Gulian] is somehow too narrow minded. I am convinced that we can integrate much more of the old [cultural] patrimony, without renouncing to our themes’ (Banuș II, 2014, 75).

It was an era in which it was dangerous to mention Friedrich Nietzsche in a positive tone, without violently accusing him of anti-humanism and so on. It must be said that during cultural Stalinism, between 1949 and 1955, Maria Banuș didn’t record anything in her diary, fearing of unpleasant consequences. According to the ideological directives, Nietzsche could not be edited / translated as an independent author. It was only in the late 1970s that his writings could be published, but without direct references, with his name in an abbreviated form, and only alongside other philosophers, all of them published in thematic anthologies. (Masek 1978). This form of conformism was also assumed by C.I. Gulian, who in his published studies was much more vehement against Nietzsche than in his private conversations with his old friend Maria Banuș.

*The Titu Maiorescu case*

Titu Maiorescu was a philosopher and one of the most prominent Romanian literary critics in the late nineteenth century. He defended the autonomy of aesthetics. After 1948-1949 Romanian communist ideologues picked him as a main ideological target and Gulian assumed the role of Maiorescu's main critic. Gulian was consistent with his 1948 position regarding Maiorescu: he was director of one of the Academy's institutes, a professor of history of philosophy at the University of Bucharest, and he contributed to the cultural magazines, so he was one of the last dogmatists in the 1960s. Gulian remained reluctant and hostile to Titu Maiorescu's rehabilitation even in 1964, in a general context of détente initiated by the political power. Gulian made small concessions to the idea of Titu Maiorescu's rehabilitation: "he [Maiorescu] has merits in cultural matters and literary criticism, being also a philosopher, an idealist aesthetician and a conservative ideologist" (Gulian, and others 1964, 232). After this phrase, Gulian immediately launched accusations unrelated to Maiorescu's academic work: he advocated an imperialist policy (directed against Romania's neighbours); defended the Prussian monarchy and the penetration of German capital (with the subjugation of the local economy); was against the progressive, socialist claims, etc., approved the suppression of the 1888 Romanian peasants uprising etc. (Gulian and others 1964, 232-233).

This ideological tone was suppressed at the end of the 1960s and the 1970s since even the new nationalistic communist leadership became embarrassed by such type of ideological outburst against important Romanian authors from the past. Moreover, some close collaborators of Gulian from the Institute of Philosophy, such as Simion Ghiță, took on the work of reconsidering/rehabilitating Titu Maiorescu in the following decades and introducing him in the canonical authorship for the philosophical-literary area (Ghiță 1974); it was an act of *volte-face*, considering that Ghiță used to identify Maiorescu – like Gulian – as the main representative of the reactionary national culture (alongside Ion Petrovici, Octavian Goga [1881-1938], Nae Ionescu) in opposition to the progressive culture (Nicolae Bălcescu [1819-1852], Victor Babeș [1854-1926], Gheorghe Marinescu [1863-1938], Mihai Eminescu [1850-1889], etc.) (Ghiță 1954, 135).

*The philosophical front and the struggle with revisionism (1958)*

In the spring of 1958, the Direction of Propaganda and Culture (the supreme ideological institution that also included *Agitprop*) headed by L. Răutu launched vehement ideological criticisms against the leadership of the Institute of Philosophy (an acme was on May 30-31) (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA,

13/1958, 1-83). This attack could seem nonsensical due to Gulian's apparent and notorious docility and to the seemingly conformist content of the Institute's publication. It is true that the composition of the journal's editorial board *Cercetări filozofice* was changed. From 1956 it included Mihai Ralea, D.D. Roșca (1895-1980), Henri Wald (1920-2002) (*Cercetări filozofice* III 1956), and in the context of détente (Geneva spirit) even its content changed to a small extent, including less ideological studies (with contributions signed by Imre Toth [1921-2010], D.D. Roșca, Athanase Joja [1904-1972], Andrei Roth etc., having a different approach, disbanded by clichés and invectives towards the West). However, this was true only for a small section of the magazine and one can hardly talk about a radical change in the editorial profile.

In 1956 something else happened: C.I. Gulian, probably considered that the direction inaugurated by Khrushchev at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU (against the cult of personality and dogmatism) would be mandatory and long lasting in Romania as well, and so he delivered a speech vaguely deploring the dogmatism of the recent past.

The virulence of the attack targeting Gulian in 1958 launched by the leading ideological staff of *Agitprop* and RWP Central Committee among others should be understood in international context. The struggle against revisionism was launched in the entire Soviet bloc, beginning November 1957, after the Moscow Declaration of the meeting of the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, a document that considered revisionism to be the main danger to the Soviet bloc, i.e. "right opportunism as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology" (Kolakowski III 1978, 456-473). Revisionism was a term used by the Communist Party leadership throughout Central and Eastern Europe to stigmatize those who, even if party members or Marxists, defied or did not follow the official dogma, and involved in disseminating works with subversive potential.

Romanian *Agitprop* complied with the general trend in the USSR and Eastern Europe by putting under fire Revisionism and bourgeois influence in art and social sciences. The hysterical struggle against Revisionism cast in the shade the Khrushchev's model of fighting against dogmatism. Moreover, those who still dared to criticize dogmatism were mercilessly incriminated.

In this context, C.I. Gulian was again subjected to ideological criticism, but without losing his position as director of the Institute of Philosophy. On May 30, 1958 C.I. Gulian was forced to practice self-criticism at the aforementioned party meeting, gathering almost all cultural ideological bureaucracy of the Romanian social sciences institutions. However, L. Răutu was profoundly dissatisfied by Gulian's self-criticism and brutally interrupted him and summed up the main lines of the indictment directed against the research activity of the Institute of Philosophy. Răutu accused Gulian of failing to understand that "Marxist-Leninist philosophy around the world is fighting

against revisionism, a class struggle on the ideological realm”; and that formal and deflecting self-criticism, focused on shortage of researchers and other nonessential issues, “degraded” the level of political debate and avoided fighting the class enemy; Răutu concluded that the management of the Institute of Philosophy had not addressed scientifically the main issues of the fight against bourgeois ideology and revisionism (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 13/1958, 80).

Isolated, C.I. Gulian pursued a more concrete form of self-criticism, exemplifying his main ideological “faults” which he shared with his colleagues at the Institute:

I think that I made a mistake by permitting young researchers to be attracted to specialized bourgeois literature. This led us to maintain a continuous struggle with these comrades, to show them that the Marxist-Leninist adequate response to philosophical matters is not to quote bourgeois academic works on three or four pages in footnotes. This attraction to bourgeois literature led to objectivism, insufficient combativeness. (...) There are manifestations of insufficient vigilance regarding, for example, the discussions on the issues of the people’s power in our country. There were futile scholastic tendencies, assumed by some of our researchers, which sometimes were ideologically incorrect and harmful. I did wrong because I did not show enough ideological vigilance. As far as the struggle against revisionism is concerned, we did not notice the importance of this issue in due course, but I must say that we are preparing a volume of studies against Revisionism within our institute. There is also a special session planned to be hold at the Academy. Personally, in recent months, I have been working on a book, *Marxism and Humanism*, angled against bourgeois and revisionist conceptions of humanism (ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 13/1958, 83).

But Gulian was harshly attacked for other grave political mistakes and his lack of ideological vigilance, too. Some passages of his manuscript on Hegel raised serious questions about his loyalty to the party line on the philosophical front. After analysing his manuscript, the *Agitprop* came to the conclusion that Gulian, instead of fighting the ideological roots of this type of revisionism, spared it, suggesting that this would be harmful. It was an extremely sensitive matter, as the fight against Marxist revisionism became a priority set by L. Răutu especially after the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of October–November 1956. Why? Because some Eastern European revisionists found their inspiration in Hegelian writings (Kolakowski III 1978, 456–473); or Gulian, who embodied the Romanian Marxist productions on philosophy, seemed to diminish the importance of such ideological subversion.

Moreover, it appears that in the original text of the aforementioned book on Hegel, Gulian - under the influence of the “new course” of the Khrushchev Secret Report of February 1956 - wrote that during Stalinist dogmatism there

had been no possibility of discussing Hegel openly. At the meeting of May 30, 1958, Gulian was additionally criticized in connection with this fragment (otherwise censored and unpublished).

Paul Niculescu-Mizil, L. Răutu's deputy and head of the Propaganda and Agitation Section, expressed most clearly this reproach against Gulian:

How do you explain such formulations on dogmatism? It was not a mere formulation, but a dangerous perspective that you spread. It is said [in the original text of the manuscript on Hegel] that during the years of dogmatism there had been no possibility of writing about Hegel and that a new era of anti-dogmatism began (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 13/1958, 84).

Immediately after P. Niculescu-Mizil, another party activist, Paul Radovanu aggravated the accusations with an interesting recollection referring to 1956 and a somewhat related, albeit diffuse position of writer Alexandru Jar (b. 1911- d. 1988; former communist interwar veteran who in May 1956 criticized Gheorghiu-Dej and Răutu's dogmatism) in his anti-Stalinist discourse:

Comrade Gulian must answer whether this passage about anti-dogmatism has anything to do with the opinion he expressed about two years ago, in this room. He said that after the twentieth Congress [of the CPSU, February 14-25, 1956] due to the new line in the ideological activity of the party he felt that real creative work in philosophical research could emerge (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 13/1958, 84).

There were grave accusations, but the Presidium of the meeting did not intend to tamper with the Institute of Philosophy's director, but merely to harshly rebuke him (perhaps because it did not have an alternative solution to replace Gulian). Gulian defended himself and the ideological talks ended with his self-criticism; he shyly suggested that in 1956 he had been consistent with the line of the party at the time (which had in the meantime changed):

I have referred to our professional work. It is a visible fact, that during this period [1948-1953/1956] no philosophical works were published. Practically, in the philosophical works published after the twentieth Congress, this idea was further elaborated, that we did not develop a creative and innovative Marxist line. I myself followed this line, I assumed such an idea. I have no other opinions on this issue (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 13/1958, 84).

Gulian was right; he had not been against the party line. Then, in 1956, under the impact of Khrushchev's secret report, the Party sent the intellectuals in the Science and Culture Section the following message:

the influence of the cult of personality, the non-critical appropriation of all Stalin's theses, the criticism targeting some scholars and university professors whose works did not correspond exactly to these theses 'pushed social sciences on the path of dogmatism' (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 9/1958, 75).

C. Ionescu-Gulian survived as head of the Institute until 1965. He further faced only benign complaints, generally formal, that occurred during the general meetings of researchers analysing the yearly activity of the Institute of Philosophy. One remark persisted among the criticisms formulated at his address in the fall of 1962. Summarizing the data received, the *Agitprop* instructors concluded that: "At the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy the delay in organizing theoretical debates, a task drawn by the Second and Third RWP Congresses, had been harshly criticized" (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 8/1963, 68).

*1960s: the difficult path towards ideological relaxation*

The cultural and ideological relaxation was delayed in the case of philosophical research. Philosophy was probably the last cultural domain of the humanities in which liberalization occurred. Such a delay was triggered by the important status given to philosophy by the regime, as its purpose was to best express the political orientation. Gabriel Liiceanu (1952 - ), a fresh graduate of philosophy, became a researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in 1965. In 2013 Liiceanu recalled that context of uncertainty in the philosophical field in his letters to one of his informants ("Cristian," a.k.a. Octavian Chețan, editor-in-chief of *Revista de filozofie* [Philosophical Review], the successor of *Cercetări filozofice*, who later became editor-in-chief at the Political Publishing House). Liiceanu wrote to Chețan:

Do you remember that period [mid-1960s] (I was just hired at the Institute of Philosophy) when our colleagues did not know what to write, from one day to another, once the old ideological canon was abolished? Poor them, who were only taught 'to criticize the bourgeois philosophy' from Marxist-Leninist perspectives. Overnight, the Marxist-Leninist philosophy almost disappeared, but a new philosophical canon did not emerge. I suspect that you, too, after being appointed the head of *Revista de filozofie* magazine in the mid 1960s, did not understand for a while what you have to do (Liiceanu 2013, 57).

However, a relaxation was visible in comparison to the 1950s. The name of *Cercetări filozofice* (*Philosophical Research*) magazine was changed into *Revista de filozofie* (*The Philosophy Magazine*), recalling the title of the main philosophical publication before 1948. From Gabriel Liiceanu's perspective the change was not so substantial. In another letter addressed to the same

informant “Cristian” / Chețan, Liiceanu depicted the image of a détente strictly controlled through surveillance and networks of informants:

as a ‘specialist in scientific atheism’ and ‘editor-in-chief’ of the local successor of the Soviet philosophical magazine *Voprosy filosofii* [Philosophical problems], you have authority, you have a ‘wide range’ academic authority. In a future lawsuit against a new ‘Constantin Noica’ group<sup>10</sup> (...) your expertise would be decisive. I must add that the real villains are those who have the appearance of ‘honourable men.’ You were full of it. In comparison to other agents of the political police who roamed at the institute [Institute of Philosophy] around me and who were transparent due to their behaviour before opening their mouth – what else could you expect from ‘Marian’<sup>11</sup> (...) than notes written on paper with a repetitive, lingering, vulgar and aggressive writing? – you were a reasonable and decent man, a [Romanian] ‘Transylvanian’<sup>12</sup> who could not be suspected of knaveries and monkey business (Liiceanu 2013, 82).

The ideological vacuum was felt even later, in the philosophical studies area as well. The détente meant another way of writing (about) philosophy and this reality was easily observable mainly in literary journals and less in *Revista de filozofie*.

*Romanian philosophy and the rebirth of a closely related discipline: Sociology (1964-1965)*

Another factor influencing philosophical writing (or writing about philosophy) was the re-emergence of sociology, after a ban of more than a decade (Bosomitu 2011, 185). With the decline in intensity of ideological attacks against sociology and sociological research (after 1958/1960, following a Soviet pattern), several scholars or collaborators of the Institute of Philosophy were gradually moving towards this (new) field. In 1964, the *sociological research* syntagma was fully rehabilitated and integrated into the national Marxist-Leninist framework (Cazacu and others, 1964). In terms of re-profiling, Mihail Cernea – a researcher at the Institute of Philosophy – is perhaps the best-known case. Subsequently, the above-mentioned researchers found their place on this academic field, re-profiled and published important papers, considered to be sociological works (Cernea 1967). But the Institute of Philosophy as such was not part of the process of institutional transformation that would facilitate the re-emergence of an academic centre of sociological research. In the years 1964-1965 there were hesitations at the level of the party decision-makers regarding the revitalization of sociological research. These hesitations were related to the future institutional structures (within the

Academy or universities) in which the rediscovered discipline, sociology, was to function. Some people tended to associate sociology with psychology (with the Institute of Psychology), perhaps under the influence of Mihai Ralea's lobby, others with philosophy (with the Institute of Philosophy).

But in August 1964, M. Ralea died, and the issue of setting up a sociology centre under the aegis of the Institute of Psychology of the Academy was blocked. In a draft work plan of the Science and Art Section of the *Agitprop* issued on November 2, 1964, a material concerning scientific research in the field of *philosophy and sociology* was mentioned (ANIC, CC PCR-SPA, 2/1964, 177). The association of the two disciplines continued, but without establishing a centre or an institute of sociology in the true sense of the word.

Finally, a Department of Sociology was established within the Faculty of Philosophy. There was also a proposal to establish an Institute of Concrete Sociological Knowledge, an idea spread and supported by Marxist Philosophy professor Tudor Bugnariu (1909-1988), Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy (1958-1965), and Traian Herseni (b. 1907- d. 1980; a researcher at the Institute of Psychology). But this proposal failed, being hijacked by Manea Mănescu (b. 1916 – d. 2009; head of the Science Section of the RCP Central Committee in 1965) (Blaga 2012, 247). There is also an important document issued by the secret police mentioning such an institute:

Bugnariu - a Securitate note mentioned this - saw this institute as a scientific research body, while others' perspective [political decision makers] was that of a propaganda institute. These two functions should have been linked. As profiled, the institute is not scientifically interesting. He [Tudor Bugnariu] tried to convince [such decision makers] to keep its scientific profile, but without success (Blaga 2012, 248).

T. Bugnariu failed and moreover, in 1965, he became a target of the Communist Party leadership and Securitate. His best students were interrogated by the secret police and in October 1965 they were unmasked in a Stalinist manner and expelled from university. Bugnariu was dismissed as Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy.

### *Conclusion*

After 1989 the general perception of scholars regarding C.I. Gulian also transferred to historiography. He was labelled as former Communist Party philosopher, as one of the main collaborators of the communist regime, who destroyed Romanian philosophy. In this study, I tried to establish Gulian's involvement in the philosophical front and his connections with the ideological supervisors and Communist Party leadership by using recently

declassified archival sources issued by the *Agitprop*, political police or Romanian Academy's structures. Although Gulian's responsibility for the flimsiness in the 1950s Romanian philosophical research is indisputable, I emphasized also his ideological clashes with the representatives of the department for Agitation and Propaganda, especially during 1956-1958.

For Leonte Răutu and his *Agitprop* lieutenants the Marxist-Leninist theoretical ideological expertise was in fact the new name for philosophy. Initially, in 1949 Constantin Ionescu-Gulian's designation as deputy director of the Philosophy Section of the Institute of History and Philosophy was the *Agitprop* response to the lack of human resources in the field of philosophical research. In 1953-1954, after some hesitations, the *Agitprop* leaders chose again C.I. Gulian as director of the newly-created Institute of Philosophy. However, Khrushchev's New Course seemed to endanger the political stability of Gheorghiu-Dej regime. L. Răutu, as ideological trainer of Gheorghiu-Dej, received also the task of fighting against all real and imaginary plots or intellectual subversions. Exploiting Gulian's apparent anti-dogmatic stances in 1958, in the context of the struggle against Revisionism, the head of *Agitprop* included the director of the Institute of Philosophy on the list of intellectuals condemned to harsh self-criticism. Furthermore, by such periodical ideological harassment directed against Gulian, *Agitprop* succeeded also to control the philosophical research.

C.I. Gulian was also professor and head of department at the University of Bucharest's Faculty of Philosophy. The curriculum was copied after that of the faculties of the Soviet universities (Flonta 2016, 26), so the activity of the Romanian Institute of Philosophy emulated the type of research carried out by the Institute of Philosophy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. In the USSR, teaching philosophy as an intellectual discipline, in its true meaning, beyond ideological clichés, had practically ceased starting the 1930s; the authentic philosophical research survived in the USSR during the 1950s under harsh conditions, being impregnated by Marxism-Leninism. Such a pattern of development was imposed also on Romania in the case of the Philosophy Section of the Institute of History and Philosophy and later on in 1954 in that of the newly created Institute of Philosophy. In 1955-1957 there was an inflexion point, when ideological control was not so tight. However, the détente stopped soon and party authorities focused on virulent criticism, purges, and Stalinist-like show trials.

## References

- AAR, SSEFJ, K/2/1955/1958, 5. Arhiva Academiei Române/AAR, fond Secția de Științe Economice, Filozofice și Juridice, dosar nr. K-2/1955-1958 [Archives of the Romanian Academy, fund Section of Juridical, Philosophical and Economical Sciences, file no. K-2/1955-1958].

- AIINI, FSF, 6/1949-1952, 12-16. Arhiva Institutului de Istorie "Nicolae Iorga," fond Secția de Filosofie, dosar nr. 6/1949-1952 [Archive of "Nicolae Iorga" History Institute, Fund Philosophy Section, file no. 6/1949-1952].
- ANIC, CC PCR – CCP, N/13. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Colegiul Central de Partid, dosar nr. N/13 [Central Historical National Archives, Fund Central Council of the Party, file no. N/13].
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 22/1947. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 22/1947 [Central Historical National Archive, Fund Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party – Propaganda and Agitation Section, File no. 22/1947].
- ANIC, CC PCR – SPA, 9/1948. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație [Agitation and Propaganda], dosar nr. 9/1948.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 72/1949. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 72/1949.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 11/1952. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 11/1952.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 6/1957. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 6/1957.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 9/1958. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 9/1958.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 13/1958. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 13/1958.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 8/1963. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 8/1963.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 2/1964. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 2/1964.
- ANIC, CC PCR–SPA, 5/1969. ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția de Propagandă și Agitație, dosar nr. 5/1969.
- ANIC, PCM–S, 1944-1959, 10/1947, 9-10. ANIC, fond Președinția Consiliului de Miniștri – Stenograme, 1944-1959, dosar nr. 10/1947 [Central Historical National Archives, Fund Presidency of the Romanian Council of Ministers – Minutes, File no. 10/1947].
- Banuș, Maria. 2014. *Însemnările mele, 1927-1944* [My Records, 1927-1944], vol.1, Ed. Geo Șerban. Bucharest: Cartea Românească.
- Blaga, Dorli. 2012. *Tatăl meu, Lucian Blaga* [My Father, Lucian Blaga]. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Bosomitu, Ștefan. 2011. Notes and Remarks on the (Re)Institutionalization of Sociology in communist Romania in the 1960s. *History of Communism in Europe*, 2: 85-113.
- Bosomitu, Ștefan. 2014. *Miron Constantinescu. O biografie* [Miron Constantinescu. A Biography]. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Cazacu, Honorina, Mihail Cernea, Gheorghe Chepeș, Constantin Vlad (Ed.). 1964. *Profilul spiritual al clasei muncitoare în socialism. Pe baza unor cercetări sociologice în uzine* [The Spiritual Profile of the Working Class in Socialism. Based on Sociological Research in the Factories], Bucharest: Academia RPR Publishing House.

- Cătănuș, Dan (Ed.). 2006. *Intellectualii români în arhivele comunismului* [Romanian Intellectuals in Communist Archives]. Bucharest: Nemira.
- \*\*\* *Cercetări filozofice* [Philosophical Research]. 1956. 3, no. 1: 2-3.
- Cernea, Mihai (Ed.). 1967. *Mișcarea inovatorilor. Studiu sociologic* [Innovators' Movement. Sociological Research]. Bucharest: Editura Politică.
- Crohmalniceanu Ovid. 2004. Blaga, Lucian, in *Dicționarul general al literaturii române*, vol. I, A–B [General Dictionary of Romanian Literature], Ed. Eugen Simion, 542. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Flonta, Mircea. 2016. *Drumul meu spre filozofie* [My Journey to Philosophy]. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Ghiță, Simion. 1954. Concepția filosofică materialistă a lui Ștefan Michăilescu și lupta lui împotriva idealismului [The Materialist Philosophical Concept of Ștefan Mihăilescu and his Struggle against Idealism], in *Cercetări filozofice* 1: 135-192.
- . 1974. *Titu Maiorescu, filozof și teoretician al culturii* [Titu Maiorescu, Philosopher and Technician of Culture]. Bucharest: Scientific Publishing House.
- Gulian, Constantin Ionescu. 1946. *Introducere în etica nouă* [Introduction in the New Ethics]. Bucharest: State Publishing House.
- . 1957. *Metodă și sistem la Hegel* [Method and System at Hegel], vol. I. Bucharest: Academia RPR Publishing House.
- . 1963. *Metodă și sistem la Hegel*, vol. II. Bucharest: Academia RPR Publishing House.
- Gulian, Ionescu Constantin (Ed.), Simion Ghiță, Nicolae Gogoneață, Crizantema Joja, Radu Pantazi, Al. Posescu. 1964. *Istoria gândirii sociale și filozofice în România* [History of Social and Philosophical Thought in Romania]. Bucharest: Academia RPR Publishing House.
- Iordan, Iorgu. 1979. *Memorii* [Memoirs], vol. 3. Bucharest: Eminescu Publishing House.
- Kuller, Hary. 2010. Intelighenția evreiască în anii comunismului local. Considerații preliminare și studiu de caz [Jewish Intelligentsia in the Years of Local Communism. Preliminary Considerations and Case Studies], in *Noi perspective în istoriografia evreilor din România* [New Perspectives on the Historiography of Jews in Romania], Ed. Liviu Rotman, 168-192. Bucharest: Federation of Jewish Communities in Romania – Centre for the Study of Jewish History in Romania, Hasefer Publishing House.
- Kolakowski, Leszek. 1978. *Main Currents of Marxism: Its Origin, Growth, and Dissolution*, vol. 3: *The Breakdown*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Liiceanu, Gabriel. 2013. *Dragul meu turnător* [My Dear Snitcher], Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Manolescu, Florin. 2003. *Enciclopedia exilului literar românesc, 1945-1989. Scriitori, reviste, instituții, organizații* [Encyclopaedia of the Romanian Exile, 1945-1989. Writers, Reviews, Organizations]. Bucharest: Compania Publishing House.
- Masek, Victor Ernest (Ed). 1978. *De la Apollo la Faust. Dialog între civilizații, dialog între generații* [From Apollo to Faust. Dialogue between Civilizations, Dialogue between Generations]. Trans. Lucian Blaga, Ion Dobrogeanu-Gherea and Ion Herdan. Bucharest: Meridiane Publishing House.

- Nițescu, Marin. 1995. *Sub zodia proletcultismului. O carte cu domiciliu forțat (1979-1995). Dialectica puterii. Eșeu politologic* [Under the Proletcultist Sign. A Book on House Arrest (1979-1995). The Dialectics of Power. Political Essay]. Ed. M. Ciurdariu. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Ornea, Zigu. 1997. *Medalioane* [Medallions]. Iasi: Institutul European.
- Popa, Marian. 2009. *Istoria literaturii române de azi pe mâine*, vol. 1, *23 august 1944-22 decembrie 1989* [History of Romanian Literature from Today to Tomorrow: August 23, 1944-December 22, 1989]. Bucharest: Semne.
- Rădulescu-Motru, Constantin. 2000. *Revizuri și adăugiri VI, 1948* [Reviews and Accessions VI, 1948]. Ed. Rodica Bichis. Bucharest: Floarea Darurilor Publishing House.
- . 2001. *Revizuri și adăugiri VII, 1949*. Ed. Gabriela Dumitrescu. Bucharest: Floarea Darurilor.
- Răutu, Leonte. 2008. Împotriva cosmopolitanismului și obiectivismului burghez în științele sociale [Against Cosmopolitanism and Bourgeois Objectivism in Social Sciences], in *Perfectul acrobat. Leonte Răutu, măștile răului* [The Perfect Acrobat. Leonte Răutu, Masks of Evil], Ed. Vladimir Tismăneanu and Cristian Vasile, 216-257. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Rusu, Dorina. 2003. Ionescu-Gulian Constantin. In *Membrii Academiei Române, 1866-2003. Dicționar* [Members of the Romanian Academy, 1866-2003. Dictionary], 408-409. Bucharest: Enciclopedica Publishing House/ Academia Română Publishing House.
- Stan, Apostol. 2012. *De veghe la scrierea istoriei (Securitatea)* [Watching over the Writing of History (Securitatea)]. Bucharest: Curtea Veche.
- Vasile, Cristian. 2014. *Viața intelectuală și artistică în primul deceniu al regimului Ceaușescu 1965-1974* [The Intellectual and Artistic Life of Ceaușescu's Regime in the first Decade, 1965-1974]. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Zavarache, Camelia. 2017. Tranziție și strategii de adaptare: Mihai Ralea și activitatea Secției de filosofie a Institutului de Istorie și Filosofie al Academiei RPR (1949-1952) [Transition and Strategies of Adaptation: Mihai Ralea and the activity of the Philosophy Section of the Institute of History and Philosophy, 1949-1952]. *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Contemporană* 16: 36-65.

## Endnotes

- 1 In his memoirs the renowned linguist Iorgu Iordan who became vice-president of Romanian Academy in late 1950s recalled that the real head of the Academy was not its president biologist Traian Savulescu, but its vice-president, Mihail Roller; (Iordan, 3, 1979; Iordan 1979).
- 2 *Agitprop* was an organ of the Romanian Communist Party/RCP (Romanian Workers' Party/RWP from February 1948). By *Agitprop* I understand the Direction for Propaganda and Agitation (1948-1950), Section for Propaganda and Agitation (1950-1955); from 1955 the Section for Propaganda and Agitation was included within the Direction for Propaganda and Culture. The head of

- Agitprop* under its various titles was Leonte Răutu whose hierarchical chief within RWP Central Committee was Iosif Chisinevski.
- 3 Since March 1949 until December 1953 the title was *Institutul de Istorie și Filosofie* (the Institute of History and Philosophy).
  - 4 Iosif Chișinevski and Leonte Răutu were prominent interwar *cadres* of the illegal Romanian Communist Party. Both of them belonged to the Bessarabian group within RCP. After 1945 Chișinevski was for a short period the first head of Romanian communist Agitprop while Răutu became his deputy. In 1948 the latter replaced Chișinevski who was promoted within the ranks of *nomenklatura*. For almost a decade after 1945 they coordinated their actions regarding the cultural artistic creation in order to impose Soviet type Socialist Realism.
  - 5 Pavel Țugui headed the Literature and Arts Sector within the Propaganda and Agitation Department.
  - 6 In fact, Roller was not explicitly named; Țugui mentioned only his function. The SSC report (drafted at the end of 1956 or early 1957) stated that “after 1948 social sciences had an uneven development as a result of a preferential attitude towards the historical sciences from the deputy of the Central Committee’s Propaganda Section,” Report on Some Aspects of Work among Intellectuals – ANIC, fond CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, file no. 9/1958, f. 75.
  - 7 Epicur, Lucrețiu, *Texte filosofice* [Philosophical Texts], edited by C.I. Gulian and Marcel Breazu, Editura de Stat, Bucharest, 1950; Aristotel, *Texte filosofice*, edited by C.I. Gulian, Editura de Stat, Bucharest, 1951; Bacon, Morus, Hobbes, Locke, *Texte filosofice*, edited by C.I. Gulian and Ion Banu, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură Științifică și Didactică, Bucharest, 1951; Giordano Bruno, Galilei, Campanella, *Texte filosofice*, edited by C.I. Gulian and I. Banu, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură Științifică și Didactică, Bucharest, 1951; *Descartes*, edited by C.I. Gulian, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură Științifică, Bucharest, 1952.
  - 8 Titu Maiorescu (1840-1917) was one of the most prominent Romanian intellectuals (philosopher, literary critic and professor of Aesthetics) in the second half of nineteenth century. He was a staunch opponent of both Socialism and Marxist critique.
  - 9 Constantin Noica, Romanian philosopher and writer, former sympathizer of the Fascist Legionary Movement in 1930s, arrested by the communist authorities in 1959 together with other undesirable intellectuals. They were gathered more or less arbitrarily in a *group* (*Lot*, in Romanian) of suspects, “enemies of the people” and sentenced in a show-trial.
  - 10 Group – *Lot* in Romanian – group of defendants, victims of the communist justice system.
  - 11 “Marian” was identified by historian Apostol Stan with Nicolae Maris, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy; (Stan 2012, 24).
  - 12 *Ardelean* – in Romanian this term (*Romanian Transylvanian*) is positively connotated, meaning a *good person, trustworthy, temperate*.