

International Scientific Conference  
**Between Enslavement and Resistance:**  
**Attitudes toward Communism in East European Societies**  
**(1945-1989)**



Program and Abstract

Conference Venue:

DS Jowita, Zwierzyniecka Street 7, hall A  
June 15-16 2018, Poznań

## **Program**

9:00–9:20: Opening

### **Session I: The Cases of Resistance**

**Friday, June 15, 2018**

**Chair: Krzysztof Brzechczyn (The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań /**

**Adam Mickiewicz University)**

9:20–9:40:

Bogdana Negrei, Dr. Adrian Ardeț (Caransebes Museum of Ethnography and Border Regiment, Romania), *The Anticommunist Resistance in the Banat Mountains, Romania*

9:40–10:00:

István Papp (Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security), *The Limits of Power: the Impact of the 1956 Revolution on Hungarian Agricultural Policy*

10:00–10:20:

Tiberiu Sarafolean, (Timisoara Society), *Student Protests in Timisoara – October 1956*

10:20–10:40:

Lidia Prisac (Institute of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education, Culture and Research of the Republic of Moldova), Ion Valer Xenofontov (Faculty of the History and Philosophy of the State University of Moldova), *The Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia (1968): From the Memory of the One Military Doctor*

10:40–11:20: Coffee break

11:20–11:40:

Dominik Pick (Center for Historical Research in Berlin / Polish Academy of Sciences), *Cooperation with Abroad? Opportunities and Restriction in Communist Poland after 1970.*

11:40–12:00:

Elżbieta Wojcieszek (The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań), *Poznań Advocates in the Reality of the Polish People's Republic*

12:00–13:00: Discussion

## Session II: Communism and Spiritual Resistance

Friday, June 15, 2018

Chair: Dragos Petrescu (Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Bucharest)

15:00–15:20:

Lidija Bencetić (Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb), *Lydia Sklevicky's Struggle for Reopening the 'Woman Question' in the Public Sphere and Scientific Circles in Yugoslavia*

15:20–15:40:

Anna Marcinkiewicz-Kaczmarczyk (The Institute of National Remembrance in Warsaw), *Liberation or Enslavement – Attitudes Promoted Among Polish Women by Women's League (1945–1956)*

15:40–16:00:

Przemysław Pazik (Historical Institute, University of Warsaw), *Political Catholicism in Poland 1945–1948: Ideological Disputes and Emergence of Catholic Discourses under the Communist Rule*

16:00–16:40: Coffee break

16:40–17:00:

Katarzyna Korzeniewska (Polski Przeglad Dyplomatyczny), *Between a Supplication and a Political Claim. Lithuanian Catholics' Letters to Authorities Sent during the 1970s and the 1980 s.*

17:00–17:20:

Irina Nastasă-Matei (University of Bucharest), *Intellectuals' Support, Complicity, or Dissent in Ceaușescu's Romania? The Case of the Romanian Humboldt Fellows to the Federal Republic of Germany (1967–1989)*

17:20–17:40:

Łukasz Czajka, (Institute of Cultural Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań),

Adam Dohnal (Institute of Eastern Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań): *We Come in Peace! Communism on the Extraterrestrial Civilizations: from Ideology to Science Fiction*

17:40–18:30: Discussion

### Session III: On Resistance and Dissidence

Saturday: June 16, 2018

Chair: Rafal Paweł Wierzchosławski (University of Social Sciences and Humanities SWSP in Poznań)

9:00–9:30:

Teodora Shek Brnardić (Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb), *Differentiation as a Means of Party Control: A Case Study of Dissenters from the Croatian Spring in Zadar (1971–72)*

9:30–10:00:

Dragos Petrescu (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest), *The Entangled Resistance: On the Breakdown of Communism and its Populist Aftermath*

10:00–10:30:

Krzysztof Brzechczyn (The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań / Department of Philosophy, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), *On Courage of Action and Cowardice of Thinking. The Solidarność Movement in the Thought of Leszek Nowak*

10:30–11:00:

Cristina Petrescu (Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest) *No Words, but Images; If Words, then not Written, but Spoken History and Sociology in Post-1968 Communist Romania*

11:00–11:30:

Aviezer Tucker (Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, Harvard University), *Leaving and Returning to Europe: The View from Prague. On Jan Patocka's Political*

## ***Philosophy***

11:30–12:10: Discussion

12:10–12:30 Coffee break

### **Session IV: Around The Legacies of Totalitarianism in East-Central Europe**

**Saturday: June 16, 2018**

12:30–14:15: A discussion on Aviezer Tucker's book: *The Legacies of Totalitarianism: A Theoretical Framework*, with the participation of the author and of Krzysztof Brzechczyn, Michał Kwiecień, Grzegorz Lewicki, Cristina Petrescu, Dragos Petrescu and Rafał Paweł Wierzchosławski.

14:15–14:30 – Closing remarks

## **Abstracts and Biograms**

**Bogdana Negrei**

Caransebes County Museum of Ethnography and Border Regiment

**Adrian Ardet**

Caransebes County Museum of Ethnography and Border Regiment

### **The Anticommunist Resistance in the Banat Mountains, Romania**

The aim of this paper is to present the anticommunist resistance in the Banat Mountains, with its leaders and causes, from an objective perspective. Details, testimonials, and archive documents about the anti-communist resistance in Romania were not made public until after 1989. The center of the anti-communist resistance in the Banat Mountains was the town of Caransebes, and the most important leader was colonel Ion Uță, who led the group called National Bloc in 1948–1949. Other important leaders were Spiru Blănaru, Petru Domășneanu, and George Ionescu. They were also arrested by the Security in 1949. Most of the combatants were members of political parties or military veterans. The causes of the anti-communist fight in the Banat Mountains were traditions based on peasantry as a social class, the nationalization of the means of production, and the creation of preconditions for collectivization. The main consequence of the anti-communist resistance was that collectivization was not implemented in the Caransebes area. In the fight for democracy and against communism, the partisans groups received munitions and food by parachuting from Americans, which fueled the belief that Americans would come. Those who retreated to the mountains to organize an anti-communist battalion may have hoped that a popular war would break out and overthrow the regime. That did not happen – those resistance formations were not able to trigger the war, although the predominant mood was hostile to the regime.

**Adrian Ardet** - employed as manager and researcher in Caransebes County Museum of Ethnography and Border Regiment. He graduated Babeș Bolyai University in Cluj – Napoca, Romania in 1986. In 1998 get a PhD in the field of Ancient History. Between 2011 – 2013 he was associated professor of West University of Timisoara. His fields of interests is archaeology and 20th century history of the Banat Mountains.

**Bogdana Negrei** - graduated West University of Timișoara, Romania in 2006. She has a master degree in Communism in Romania (1945 – 1989) in 2009. Her fields of research are Communism in Banat Area and the period of the 19th to 20th century in Mountainous Banat.

**István Papp**

Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security,

### **The Limits of Power: the Impact of the 1956 Revolution on Hungarian Agricultural Policy**

As regards suppressed revolutions, interest focuses on the subsequent retaliation, and little attention is paid to their impact on the policies of the ruling regimes. The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 profoundly changed the HSWP led by János Kádár, forcing it to make concessions. This paper aims to show the new methods of exercising power in a specific field: agricultural policy. Compulsory delivery, which had been swept away by the revolution, was not restored after 1956. Although a fast collectivization process began in 1959, it was preceded by extensive debates within the party, which was a unique phenomenon in Eastern Europe. In order to increase public consumption, the government had to provide substantial resources for agriculture. The newly established National Council of Agricultural Cooperatives strengthened the positions of the cooperatives. In 1966, two years before the launch of the general economic reform, some benchmarks of the central plans were cancelled. The disintegrated ministries were merged as the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in 1967. Agriculture was the area with the highest proportion of experts from the former coalition political parties and even the pre-1945 economic elite in managerial positions. In my view, the key to the era was the 1956 revolution, as the power wanted to avoid its recurrence at all costs. The enhancement of consumption and the constant increase of the standard of living were regarded as the most appropriate tools for this. It substantially increased the importance of agricultural policy and weakened the Stalinist patterns of exercising power.

**István Papp** – employed in the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security; main research fields: the history of Hungarian agriculture, the history of communist agrarian policy, the history of Hungarian népi (populist) movement; he has been an editor-in-chief of “Betekinto,” an online periodical of the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security, since 2013.

**Tiberiu Sarafolean**  
Timisoara Society

### **Student Protests in Timisoara – October 1956**

For communist countries, 1956 marked the Hungarian revolution, suppressed by the brutal intervention of Soviet troops. Echoes of that anti-communist movement were felt in all Eastern European countries. In Romania, those who reacted immediately were students. In several university centers, protests took place, resulting in numerous arrests and expulsions. The best organized student movement occurred in Timisoara, where 2000 arrests took place. Thirty students were brought to justice, divided into two lots. Penalties ranged from 3 months to 8 years in prison. The greatest punishments were received by the initiators of the protest assembly: eight years in prison. The others were sentenced to jail between 3 months and 7 years.

The reaction of the authorities was immediate: arresting students, suspending courses, dismissing some teachers, setting up student associations to supervise students' activities more closely. The 'cleaning up' of the student population of the 'elements' opposing the party was the main goal of the measures taken by the authorities. New admission criteria were introduced in the faculties, and the candidates' files were checked and students were 'purged'.

The students' open protests in the autumn of 1956 demonstrated to the Communist leaders that after 10 years of power, in spite of an aggressive policy of the implementation of new values, the Romanian society could revolt, even if they did not show up at the level of those in Hungary, Poland or Germany.

**Tiberiu Sarafolean** – lawyer, a member of the Timisoara Society, a representative of the Former Deportees in Baragan Association

**Ion Valer Xenofontov**

Faculty of the History and Philosophy of the State University of Moldova

**Lidia Prisac**

Institute of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education

Culture and Research of Republic of Moldova

### **The Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia (1968):**

#### **from the Memory of One Military Doctor**

2018 marks a series of notorious historical events that meet 50 or 100 years from the run. One of them is the moment of intervention of the Warsaw Pact states in Czechoslovakia. That is why we have decided to discuss that subject anew.

In context of the ‘Prague Spring’, the Soviet Union had political reasons to desire an urgent withdrawal of the socio-economic reforms instituted in the capital of Czechoslovakia. As a result, the *Brezhnev doctrine* was promulgated. According to that doctrine, socialist states were to come to the aid of other ‘sister’ states threatened by the so-called ‘reactionary forces’. During the Czechoslovak crisis, there was no meeting of the Warsaw Pact Advisory Political, due to Romania’s opposition.

In the meantime, at the border with Romania, the Moldavian SSR, an integral part of the USSR, was preparing to intervene in the Czechoslovak territory. Although today, according to the legislation, the participation of a human contingent from soviet Moldova is not recognized, testimonies include information about Moldovans’ involvement in the 1968 events of Czechoslovakia. Therefore, on this occasion, we would like to recall the testimonies of the academician Mihail Popovici' who, at that time, was a 26-years-old university assistant mobilized as a military doctor in Czechoslovakia. His testimonies in accordance with a taboo subject place him in the epicenter of ‘lived history’. Thanks to these memories, we can now analyze the culture of the ‘hidden war’. Also, recorded testimonies accentuate the adventure dimensions of the military scourge.

**Lidia Prisac** – employed in the Institute of Cultural Heritage, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research of the Republic of Moldova, a senior researcher, she earned a PhD in Historical Sciences in 2013. Her research area is the history of the Republic of Moldova, ethnic identity, and interethnic relations, Transnistrian separatism, and the history of the Armenian community in Bessarabia. She is an author of two monographs about the historiography of Transnistrian separatism and interethnic relations in the Republic of Moldova.

**Ion Valer Xenofontov** – employed at the Faculty of the History and Philosophy of the State University of Moldova, an associate professor, a senior researcher, he earned a PhD in Historical Sciences in 2006. His research area is oral history, military history, and the science of science. He is an author of over 200 essays and papers, including two works about the Soviet-Afghan war (1979–1989).

**Dominik Pick**

Center for Historical Research in Berlin  
Polish Academy of Sciences

**Cooperation with Abroad? Opportunities and Restriction in Communist Poland**  
**after 1970**

The new Gierek's regime in 1970 began a gradual liberalization of cooperation opportunities with abroad for Polish citizens and institutions. Not only has travel to western countries become much more accessible but also institutional cooperation with western partners could be developed in different areas, such as twinning cities, science, universities, theaters, syndicates, or students associations, and even school exchanges. At the beginning of 1970s, the communist regime, especially the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of the Interior, was still trying to control all forms of contacts and cooperation with Western countries. However, the cooperation between the ministries was generally inefficient as the Minister of the Interior very unwillingly and only partially shared the available information with the colleagues from other ministries or even with the communist party itself. That fact, as well as the growing number of cooperation agreements between Polish and western institutions, made state control more problematic and week with each passing year. In my paper, I would like to present the main aims of the Polish foreign policy in this area, as well as the methods of control used by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Persons engaged in a cooperation with foreign institutions perceived it mostly as an opportunity for their institutions and their own professional lives (access to new research, technologies, and trends, new travel opportunities etc.) This practical approach to the cooperation with Western partners did not exactly correspond with the official state policy which tried to restrict some areas of cooperation until the official Polish political or economic demands were met. Thus, there existed still a number of restrictions. However, the most profitable method of coping with them was not open resistance against the communist rule. As Thomas Lindenberger (1999) pointed out, using the metaphor of *Eigen-Sinn* for describing a communist society (GDR), many persons in official positions tried to reinterpret and adapt the official policy in accordance with their own aims and to present their action as compliant with the regime. For the Polish society, a similar explanation was provided Krystyna Kersten (1993; 2005) who pointed out that most of the society either fully accepted the communist policy or resisted it in an official form. More than that, the society was eager to use the existing opportunities within the system, without triggering unwanted interest on the part of

the state. Both Lindenberger and Kersten applied their methodological approaches to the society in the country. In this paper, I will also try to present how this approach applies to the international cooperation across the iron curtain in the 1970s and 1980s. I would like to use mostly examples from the Polish-German and Polish-French cooperation.

**Dominik Pick** – employed in the Center for Historical Research in Berlin and in the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Secretary of the Joint German-Polish Textbook Commission of Historians and Geographers since 2016. He authored *Ponad żelazną kurtyną. Kontakty społeczne między PRL i RFN w okresie détente i stanu wojennego* (English: *Across the Iron Curtain. The Social Contacts between the Polish People's Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany in the period of Détente and the Martial Law*) (Warszawa 2016) and *Brücken nach Osten. Helmut Schmidt und Polen* (Bremen 2011).

**Elżbieta Wojcieszysz**

Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań

## **The Indomitable Poznań Attorneys in the Political Reality of ‘People’s’ Poland in 1945–1989. An Outline of the Problem**

In the spring of 1945, the Bar Association in Poznań renewed its activity, interrupted during the war, in the new political conditions. The decree of May 24, 1945 on the form of the bar introduced the supervision of the state which lasted, in principle, from 1989. There were processes of defendants in political trials. Simultaneously, the press viciously attacked the accused and did not spare the attorneys. Despite the chicanery, Poznań attorneys defended, for example, the people accused of storing weapons and trying to destroy the sculpture of the ‘Heroes of the Red Army’ in 1953, those accused of participating in the Poznań 1956 protests, the defendants in 1968 who allegedly worked for the Student Committee for Supporting Political Prisoners and disseminated false news about the evaluation of the policy of the Polish United Workers’ Party during the 1968 Polish political crisis, and the illegal opposition from 1975–1989. The attorneys were also engaged in the difficult attempts at restoring the self-government of the bar and in other independent social actions. They were, among other lawyers, Aleksander Berger, Antoni Dynowski Michał Grzegorzewicz, Stanisław Hejmowski, Stanisław Hęćka, Jan Jacek Nikisch, Jerzy Pomin, and Marian W. Schroeder.

**Elżbieta Wojcieszysz** – employed in The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań, a history graduate of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (1977), a PhD holder (since 1988) habilitated (since 2014). She has been employed in the Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań. She has published in Polish *The Activity of the Poznań City Council in 1919–1939 and the Lives of Poznań Councillors* (Poznań 2012) and *The Ministry of the Youth in the Poznań Archdiocese in 1945–1989* (Poznań 2013). She edited in Polish *The Authorities and the Churches and Religious Denominations in the Middle Odra Region in 1945–1989* cycle in 2012–2016. She is an author of articles in joint publications and of biographical notes in *The Encyclopedia of “Solidarity”*, reviews and popularizing articles.

**Lydia Sklevicky's Struggle for Reopening the “Woman Question” in the Public  
Sphere and Scientific Circles in Yugoslavia**

Croatian scientist and intellectual Lydia Sklevicky is one of those people about whom their contemporaries would say that they were ahead of their time. Sklevicky had an exceptional life and intellectual strength. In one decade of professional activity, she processed more topics than numerous colleagues did throughout their working life and, at the same time, she had a greater impact on society. As an active feminist she operated in Zagreb, Ljubljana, and Belgrade, where she was one of the active participants of the late 1970s and 1980s discourse which put the woman question in focus and criticized women's position in Yugoslavia, emphasizing the discrepancy between their contribution in the fights in World War II and their prominent role in the post-war period versus their marginalization since the mid-1950s. Also, she was one of the few scientists who, both scientifically and popularly (in the media), spoke about the position of women in Yugoslavia in the context of human rights, claiming that there was no serious research on the subject of women's position in Yugoslavia because it was “bypassed and marginalized” in scientific circles, while at the social and political level the communist regime thought that Marxism has resolved the woman question.

**Lidija Bencetić** – employed at Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb since 2009. In 2008, she graduated in history from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb. She was awarded the 2007/2008 University of Zagreb Rector's Award for a paper entitled “Cominform Resolution – Perception of Croatian Public Opinion Exemplified by the Case of Regional Newspapers”. In December 2014, under the supervision of Associate Professor Marino Manin, she defended her PhD dissertation entitled “Political Cartoons in Newspapers *Borba* and *Vjesnik* – Comparative Analysis of the Perception of Political and Social Life in Communist Yugoslavia (1945–1962)”. She has also participated in various scientific projects and is currently involved in an international project entitled “COURAGE – Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries” financed by the HORIZON 2020 EU program. Her primary areas of interest are the Croatian and Yugoslav history in the period from 1945 to 1990, with the main focus on political and social issues, and the issues of media, culture and propaganda.

**Anna Marcinkiewicz-Kaczmarczyk**  
The Institute of National Remembrance in Warsaw

**Liberation or Enslavement – Attitudes Promoted Among Polish Women  
by Women’s League (1945–1956)**

This paper explores pro communist propaganda which was conducted among Polish women by government organization Women’s League in 1945–1956. After the end of the Second World War, the government institutions in Poland were taken over by Polish politicians who were controlled by the Soviet Union. Most of the society did not accept the new government and the methods which were used at that time. For this reason, communists tried to force the society to accept the new political system, in various ways. One important form of manipulation was the propaganda conducted by many social organization for many years, particularly in 1945–1956. One of those organizations, the Women’s League, was established in 1945 with the main goal to spread propaganda among Polish women and to encourage them to accept the political changes and government policy.

It should be emphasized that members of the Women’s League were enslaved by the communist authorities and, in accordance with the goal of the organization, propagated communist attitudes among Polish women. Their activity, during the period from 1945 to 1956, was designed to shape a new pattern of women in socialist society who would accept and participate in the creation of the new communist motherland. According to that propaganda, women in socialist Poland not only were mothers or wives but also could take on professional careers and social activity, and even participate in political life. By those means, under the guise of promoting emancipation, communists were forming the attitudes of enslavement among Polish women.

**Anna Marcinkiewicz-Kaczmarczyk** – employed in The Institute of National Remembrance in Warsaw. She graduated from the Warsaw University in Poland and completed her doctor’s degree in 2007. She focuses on the twentieth-century history and is interested in the issue of women serving in the Polish army during the First and Second War World as well as of soldiers serving in the Polish Armed Forces in the West who returned to Poland after the Second War World. She authored the following books in Polish: *The Voluntary Women’s Legion, 1918–1922* (Warsaw 2006) *Women in Defense of Warsaw, 1918–1922 and 1939–1945* (Warsaw 2016).

**Przemysław Pazik**

Institute of History in Warsaw University

## **Political Catholicism in Poland 1945-1948: Ideological Disputes and Emergence of Catholic Discourses under the Communist Rule**

The aim of my presentation is to analyze the discursive strategies adopted by Catholic intellectuals during the construction of the totalitarian regime in Poland. Resorting to conceptual and intellectual history methods, I want to add a nuance to the thesis that there were three distinct catholic groups since 1945, each having its own ideology and strategy *vis-à-vis* the communists. I argue that their emergence lasted three years and had three important phases.

The first one, the ‘institutional uncertainty phase’, was characterized by a lack of clarity as to what shape the political representation of Catholics would have. Between 1945 and 1946, there were two competing concepts of political representation: Christian Democratic Party (*Stronnictwo Pracy*) and the Radical catholic movement. This phase ended in December 1946 when it became clear that none of them would gather all catholic forces.

The second phase, of ‘ideological differentiation’, between 1947 and September 1948, was a time when ideological differences among Catholic became visible. That was the moment when catholic weekly magazines became central institutions in the organization of catholic intellectual life and it was no longer possible to present oneself as an author of more than one title.

Finally, the ‘external selection’ phase from the mid 1948 until the end of the year is the moment when communists reacted to the Catholic debates and closed down one of the magazines sending an important message to the remaining groups.

**Przemysław Pazik** – graduated from the University of Warsaw and from the College of Europe. Since 2015, he has been a doctoral student at UW, working on the intellectual history of post-WWII political Catholicism in Poland. In 2016, he received NCN funding for his doctoral project, and between September 2017 and February 2018 he was a visiting fellow at the Institute of European History in Mainz.

**Katarzyna Korzeniewska**  
Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny

## **Between a Supplication and a Political Claim. Lithuanian Catholics’ Letters to Authorities Sent during the 1970s and the 1980s**

Taking into consideration the variety of shapes and manifestations of anti-communist attitudes and dissent, I intend to analyze one form of them. It was relatively frequent in societies under the Communist rule, but not always regarded as politically very significant.

In my presentation, I will discuss petitions, appeals, and complaints that were sent to Soviet authorities by Catholic parishioners in Lithuania during the 1970s and the 1980s. They are now accessible at the archival collection of the Representative of the *Soviet for Religious Affaires* (*Sovyet po dyelam religyi*), at the Lithuanian Central State Archives. I’ll try to show that those writings, entirely legal and concerning mostly local issues (organizing a parish feast, a protest against a local church closure, a permission to use church bells, etc.) cannot be classified as merely ‘pre-political’ or spontaneous ‘social resistance’.

To analyze the material, I will use two models of classifying anti-communists dissent, opposition, and attitudes: one proposed by Łukasz Kaminski and his colleagues (*Opór społeczny w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej...*, 2004), and the other elaborated by Hungarian political scientist Elemer Hankiss when the phenomenon under discussion was not yet a historical one (*East European Alternatives*, 1990). I will try to show that, at least in the Lithuanian context, addressing authorities with petitions and complaints, initially close to ‘archaic’ and spontaneous forms of social dissent (Kaminski’s term), later on became clearly and deliberately political. My argumentation will be based on the two concepts mentioned above, but I will also discuss specific Lithuanian circumstances that produced such a transformation.

**Katarzyna Korzeniewska** – holds a PhD in sociology. She is an independent researcher interested in the Communist period, particularly in Lithuania. Currently, she collaborates with the Witold Pilecki Center for Totalitarian Studies and The Polish Institute of International Affairs. She is also an editor at the “Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny” quarterly and a translator.

**Irina Nastasă-Matei**

University of Bucharest

**Intellectuals' Support, Complicity, or Dissent in Ceaușescu's Romania?**  
**The case of the Romanian Humboldt Fellows to the Federal Republic of Germany**  
**(1967-1989)**

My paper is a part of a bigger postdoctoral project I am currently working on, entitled “Forms of soft power in Cold War Europe. Humboldt fellowships for Romanian scholars (1967-1989)”. It aims to establish the details of the very complex Humboldt fellowship scheme between communist Romania and West-Germany during Ceaușescu’s rule. It is a subject relevant not only from the point of view of the cultural collaboration and knowledge transfer between a communist country from the Eastern Block and a Western democracy but also from the point of view of East-West soft power strategies during the Cold War. It also reveals a great deal about the status of young intellectuals in the communist state: the extent to which they collaborated with or supported the regime in order to gain access to academic opportunities (such as being allowed to receive a Humboldt fellowship and go to study in FRG), as well as about their later attitudes towards the regime: collaboration or complacency in some cases, dissidence in others. I am also interested in how the communist state controlled the Humboldt fellows. In Ceaușescu’s Romania (1965-1989), periods of relative relaxation alternated with periods of strict control and terror. An aspect that this research aims to establish is if and how those oscillations affected the Romanian-West German relationships, the Humboldt fellowship scheme, and the Romanian Humboldt fellows.

**Irina Nastasă-Matei** – a junior lecturer at the University of Bucharest, Political Science Department. She holds a PhD in history from Babeș-Bolyai University in Cluj. She is the author of the monograph *Educație, politică și propagandă: Studenți români în Germania nazistă* (English: *Education, politics and propaganda: Romanian students in Nazi Germany*), Cluj, Editura Școala Ardeleană / București, Eikon, 2016) and a co-editor of two volumes of cultural and intellectual history. She is currently running a postdoc grant on the “Forms of soft power in Cold War Europe. Humboldt fellowships for Romanian scholars (1967–1989)”. Her research focus is cultural politics, cultural diplomacy, propaganda, ideology, academic migration

**Łukasz Czajka**

Institute of Cultural Studies

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

**Adam Dohnal**

Institute of Eastern Studies

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

## **We Come in Peace! Communism on the Extraterrestrial Civilizations: from Ideology to Science Fiction**

The main research task of this paper is the analysis of the attitude of communism toward the question of the possible existence of extraterrestrial civilizations.

In the first step, the problem must be analyzed at the ideological level (one of the most important sources in this matter are Juan Posadas's and Soviet astrophysicist Iosif Shklovsky's writings). Does the communist ideology allow the existence of extraterrestrial civilizations, and, if so, can extraterrestrials be conducive to communism? Could the thesis about the existence of alien civilizations be used as a propaganda tool in the ideological struggle with the West or as means of control of the Soviet societies?

In the second step, the practical actions of the communist Eastern European regimes will be analyzed. Did the Soviets conduct UFO research or were they looking for a way to contact extraterrestrial civilizations? How did the communist regimes react to emerging reports of contacts with extraterrestrials?

Finally, in the third step, the use of ufological motifs in Eastern European science fiction will be presented (for example, in Arkady and Boris Strugatsky's or Andrei Tarkovsky's works). The aim of this part of the paper will be an attempt to answer the question whether fantastic stories about contact with extraterrestrial aliens contain a hidden criticism of communist society.

**Adam Dohnal** – PhD candidate at the History Department of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan (UAM). Dohnal is also a researcher at the Center of Central Asian Studies of UAM and borderstudies.pl. His main research interests: Marks, Marxism, Soviet Historiography, border studies, the history and culture of Asia (Mongolia, China, Japan and Korea), anthropology of the Internet. His publications in English are: *The Basis of Modern Mongolian Statehood in the Thought of Shardyn Bira* (“Eurasia: Statum Et Legem” 1(4) 2015), *We Have All Been Winners and Losers of This War* (“New Eastern Europe” 2(2)/2013), *North from the*

*Genghis Khan's Square* (“Historia@Teoria” 3(5)/2017)

**Łukasz Czajka** – employed at the Institute of Cultural Studies (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań). He is the author of the book (in Polish) *The Sacred Anarchy. Introduction to the Radical Hermeneutics of John D. Caputo*. His main research interests are: cultural war studies, Leo Strauss’s hermeneutics and his political philosophy, philosophical ideas in popular culture, and Christian thought (Chesterton, John D. Caputo). Publications in English: *The Scandal of the Cross in Chesterton's Romance of Orthodoxy* (“The Chesterton Review” 42(3/4)2016) and *The Beauty and War. From the Aesthetics of Violence to Conflicts in the Communities of Gamers* (“*Studia Kulturoznawcze*” 1(9) 2016)

**Teodora Shek Brnardić**

Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb

## **Differentiation as a Means of Party Control: A Case Study of Dissenters from the Croatian Spring in Zadar (1971–72)**

Apart from imprisonment, dissenting party members in socialist Yugoslavia were punished and intimidated by means of a purge campaign called ‘ideological-political differentiation’. Differentiation means that a person is suspended from the communist party, removed from his/her job, and ‘differentiated’ out of political, economic, and public life. Differentiation processes were frequent phenomena in the aftermath of the Croatian Spring (1971), when 25,000 people in Croatia were expelled from the party. On December 1, 1971, Josip Broz Tito convened a joint meeting at Karadžorđevo in Vojvodina, where the presidency of the League of the Communists of Yugoslavia met with the presidency of the League of the Communists of Croatia. The main topic of the discussion during that meeting was the Croatian national Mass Movement, which had grown into a crisis. Under pressure, the Croatian party leaders resigned and the Mass Movement collapsed. In January 1972, differentiation processes started on a large scale.

In this paper, I will examine a case study and the practice of a differentiation process against the writer Ivan Aralica in Zadar, based on the collection of reports and minutes of the working group commissioned to interrogate the most prominent persons and party members of the local version of the Croatian Spring. The collection, which is preserved in the State Archives in Zadar, will be described in the COURAGE register.

**Teodora Shek Brnardić** – holds a PhD from the Central European University and is a senior research fellow at the Croatian Institute of History in Zagreb. Her main research interests include the history of political thought, early modern and modern intellectual and cultural history (with the emphasis on the Enlightenment), twentieth-century historiography and history of intellectuals, and digital humanities. She has participated in several international projects and is currently a Croatian National Task Manager in the Horizon 2020 “COURAGE-Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent” project.

**Dragos Petrescu**

Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest

## **The Entangled Resistance: On the Breakdown of Communism and its Populist Aftermath**

In my book *Entangled Revolutions: The Breakdown of the Communist Regimes in East-Central Europe* (2014), I argue that the complexity of the 1989 phenomenon – i.e., the collapse of the communist regimes in Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania – does not allow for a single-factor explanation. A variety of factors influenced the political decisions by the incumbents and opposition groups throughout the revolutionary year 1989. Thus, a causal explanation for the inception, unfolding and outcome of the 1989 revolutions should take into consideration agency, and contingency, as well as path dependence. The above-mentioned *1989 sequence of the collapse* of communist dictatorships in East-Central Europe (ECE) is understood as a *reactive sequence*, in which each event in the sequence represented a reaction to previous events and a cause of subsequent events. An initial event, namely the roundtable talks in Poland, under the influence of certain external and internal factors, set in motion a chain of closely linked reactions and counter-reactions, which ultimately provoked the breakdown of the communist regimes in the six countries under scrutiny. In 1989, in the six countries under discussion, there were three configurations which linked the monolithism of the power elite and the level of emancipation from Moscow with the degree of the structuring of societal opposition in order to determine the nature of the respective revolutions, as follows:

(1) factionalism of the power elite, which provoked major splits at the top of the communist hierarchy, in the conditions of revolutionary experiences which had lasting society-wide effects – ‘self-limiting’, as in Poland (August 1980–December 1981), or genuine, as in Hungary, (23 October–4 November 1956) – led to the ‘negotiated revolutions’ in these two countries;

(2) monolithism of the power elite and a more or less structured societal opposition, in the conditions of a lack of emancipation from Moscow, led to ‘peaceful revolutions’, that is, non-negotiated and non-violent revolutions (East Germany and Czechoslovakia), or to a palace coup followed by unprecedented popular mobilization in support of the opposition (Bulgaria);

(3) monolithism of the power elite and a poorly structured societal opposition, in the conditions of the emancipation of the power elite from Moscow, led to a non-negotiated and violent revolution (Romania) – in Romania, in December 1989, the ruling elite ignored the recent developments in the Soviet bloc, ordered the repressive apparatus to use deadly force against demonstrators, and had its orders obeyed in the first instance.

Starting from the argument presented above, one can employ the recent path to dependence in order to explain the current political developments in ECE. The above-mentioned 1989 collapse of communist dictatorships in ECE can be considered as the initial event that set in motion a chain of closely linked reactions and counter-reactions aimed at re-integrating the six countries under scrutiny into Europe and the West, which can be seen as a *reactive sequence*. Each event in the sequence represented a reaction to previous events and a cause of subsequent events. However, certain external conditions – war on international terrorism beginning in 2001 and the world economic crisis of 2007–2008 – contributed heavily to the rise of populist politics in ECE. It may be argued that a new reactive sequence was initiated in 1989, having the same frontrunners as in the case of the 1989 regime changes, i.e., Poland and Hungary. The nature of the 1989 regime changes (negotiated), the political mindset of the most representative political leaders (center-right or conservative), and the rapid pace of the neoliberal economic reforms in the immediate aftermath of the 1989 regime changes created the environment conducive to the rise of political populism one witnesses today in Poland and Hungary, which increasingly serves as a model for the countries that were engaged in the 1989 sequence of collapse of communist regimes in ECE almost thirty years ago.

**Dragoș Petrescu** – is a historian and political scientist, the chair of the Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității (CNSAS; English: the National Council for Research on the Archives of the Security) in Bucharest, and a lecturer on comparative political science and modern history in the Political Science Faculty of the University of Bucharest. His scientific interests include: the comparative analysis of communist systems in Central and Eastern Europe and the transformation of the form of government in 1989 in Central and Eastern Europe, taking into account such aspects of the transformation as the institutionalization of historical memory and transitional justice. He is the author *Explaining the Romanian Revolution of 1989: Culture, Structure, and Contingency* (Bucharest 2010) and *Entangled Revolutions: The Breakdown of the Communist Regimes in East-Central Europe* (Bucharest 2014).

**Krzysztof Brzechczyn**

The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań/

The Department of Philosophy at Adam Mickiewicz University

**On Courage of Action and Cowardice of Thinking. The Solidarność Movement in  
the Thought of Leszek Nowak**

In the opinion of many Western observers (e.g. Timothy Garton Ash) as well as Polish authors (e.g., Zdzisław Krasnodębski), the political thought of Solidarność was a mixture of ideas taken from different ideological traditions (right and left). What, in the aforementioned authors opinion, was a reason for pride was an object of criticism by Leszek Nowak, the eminent Polish philosopher, engaged in the movement. One of his most important charges against the political thought of this movement was its intellectual provincialism and its inability to propose something new and fresh. The purpose of this paper is to present Nowak's reflection on the political thought of Solidarność in years 1980-1981. I show that he presses three general kinds of objections. According to Nowak, the political thought of the movement had formal-internal deficiencies (it provided no clear theoretical vision), cognitive deficiencies (it was incapable of offering an adequate diagnosis of the situation) and policy deficiencies (it was incapable of indicating the appropriate course of action).

**Krzysztof Brzechczyn** – employed in The Institute of National Remembrance in Poznań and the Institute of Philosophy of Adam Mickiewicz University. He has authored four books (in Polish) and numerous papers in Chinese, English, German, Italian, Polish, and Romanian. He edited *Modeling in History* (Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi 2009), *Thinking about Provincialism in Thinking* (with K. Paprzycka Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi 2012), *Idealization XIV: Models in Science* (with G. Borbone, Leiden-Boston: Brill 2016). *Towards a Revival of Analytical Philosophy of History: Around Paul A. Roth's Vision of Historical Sciences* (Leiden-Boston: Brill 2018). His fields of interests are: current history, intellectual history, philosophy of history, philosophy of social sciences, political and social philosophy, and theory of history.

**Cristina Petrescu**

Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest

**No Words, but Images; If Words, then not Written,  
but Spoken History and Sociology in Post-1968 Communist Romania**

This paper is the result of research carried out within the framework of the Horizon 2020 project COURAGE – Cultural Opposition in the Former Socialist Countries. This project analyzes countercultures under the pre-1989 regimes in East-Central Europe on the basis of the preserved collections of material (and digital copies of) objects from the period, which illustrate the existence of alternative thinking and activities in relation to the system of meanings imposed by the party-states in the region. This paper focuses on two paradigmatic collections in Romania, which constitute – according to the author – relevant examples of non-conformism in the fields of sociology and history: the Zoltán Rostás Oral History Collection and the Alexandru Barnea Photograph Collection. The two collections epitomize the state of the two academic disciplines, which were among the most thematically and methodologically affected by the ideological control of the party-state, as well as the quest to find those constantly changing niches that allowed a greater liberty of expression in those fields. As compared to the usual approach to intellectual dissent, which focused mostly on radically independent thinking that could have been expressed only in samizdat or tamizdat, this paper explores the rather neglected zone of dissent within state-controlled academic institutions and tolerated professional careers. Accordingly, these collections exemplify two microhistories from the gray zone of alternative thinking. I argue that, given the audio-visual culture of that time, the two analyzed collections suggest that the strategy to perform a tolerated yet oppositional cultural activity in Ceaușescu's Romania was to choose images to avoid words or, if this was not appropriate, to choose spoken words to avoid written ones.

**Cristina Petrescu** – is an associate professor in modern European history at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest. She received a PhD in 2004 from Central European University, Budapest. She authored *From Robin Hood to Don Quixote: Resistance and Dissent in Communist Romania* (Bucharest 2013). She has published over 30 studies on communism and the memory of this recent past in East-Central Europe in international volumes and peer-reviewed journals in the United States, Great Britain, Spain, Germany, Poland, and Hungary. She is currently a National Task Manager in the Horizon 2020 “COURAGE – Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries, 2016-2019” project.

**Aviezer Tucker**

Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies  
Harvard University

## **Leaving and Returning to Europe: The View from Prague. On Jan Patočka's Political Philosophy**

Czech philosopher Jan Patočka (1907–1977), who co-founded Charter 77 of human rights with Vaclav Havel and Jiri Hajek, dedicated his philosophy of history to understanding the self-destruction of Europe in the twentieth century and the reasons and ways in which Czechs found themselves in, out, in again, and then outside of Europe. After Patočka's death, one of the slogans of the 1989 Velvet Revolution was the "return to Europe". Today, if we take opinion polls seriously, Czechs are one of the more Eurosceptic nations in Europe. How are we to understand all that from a historical perspective?

Patočka offered some interesting insights and critical thoughts about Czech historical consciousness and its place in Europe. Patočka considered the Holy Roman Empire to have been an early embodiment of European unity, founded on transcendence and spirituality rather than economics and labor. The nadir of European history was the 14<sup>th</sup> century when the capital of the Holy Roman Empire was in Prague under Emperor Charles IV who founded Charles University in Prague. The early destruction of Europe in religious wars expelled Czechs from Europe and condemned them to provincialism. When Josef the Wise liberated the serfs in 1781, he liberated universal humanity, but the liberated people had a culture and a language but no universal vision. Later, Europe progressed toward the self-destruction of the First World War, in cycles of everyday material progress and boredom followed by orgiastic eruptions of mindless destruction that resulted from the denial of the spiritual transcendent nature of the soul and its search for life in truth. The European universal vision of the founder of Czechoslovakia, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, fell victim to the Czechs' inability to rise above their master-slave dialectics with the stronger nations that occupied them, Germany and Russia. Patočka concluded that history has no meaning because nobody asks the question anymore.

Life in truth and the return to Europe that mobilized the demonstrators of 1989 were followed by corruption of the ideals and by disillusionment, exactly at the point at which Europeans reached boredom again, and some of them, at least, were looking for an orgiastic xenophobic eruption to end it all in the absence of historical consciousness. Therefore, I examine the contemporary relevance of Patočka's philosophy.

**Aviezer Tucker** – is employed at the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, Harvard University. His areas of expertise are: philosophy of historiography and history, political philosophy and theory, intellectual history, and history of ideas. He authored the following books: *The Legacies of Totalitarianism: A Theoretical Framework* (Cambridge UP, 2015). *Our Knowledge of the Past: A Philosophy of Historiography* (Cambridge UP, 2004). *The Philosophy and Politics of Czech Dissidence: From Patocka to Havel* (Pittsburgh UP, 2000) and edited: *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography* (Boston 2009) and *Panarchy: Political Theories of Non-Territorial States* (with Gian Piero de Bellis, Routledge, 2016).

A discussion on Aviezer Tucker's book: *The Legacies of Totalitarianism: A Theoretical Framework*, with the participation of the author and of Krzysztof Brzechczyn, Michał Kwiecień, Grzegorz Lewicki, Cristina Petrescu, Dragos Petrescu and Rafał Paweł Wierzchosławski.

**Content of the book:** Introduction, **1:** Post-Totalitarianism: The Adjustment of Elite Rights to Interests, **2:** Post-Totalitarian Rough Justice, **3:** Rough Justice: Post-Totalitarian Retribution, **4:** Rough and Shallow: Post-Totalitarian Rectification, **5:** The New Politics of Property Rights, **6:** Old to New Totalitarianism: Post-Totalitarian Higher Education, **7:** Short-Circuiting Reason: The Legacies of Totalitarian Thinking, Conclusion: Only dissident Can Save Us Now.

**Krzysztof Brzechczyn** – see biogram at the page 23.

**Michał Kwiecień** – a master degree student in The Department of Philosophy of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. He received his undergraduate degree at the Faculty of Economics and Management of University of Szczecin. Kwiecień spent one year in Nanjing, China as a Nanjing Business School student, completing two semesters of the Master of Business Administration programme. His main areas of interest include philosophy of history and philosophy of economics. Currently he is preparing his master thesis about Feliks Konieczny's and Arnold J. Toynbee's historiosophical concepts.

**Dr Greg Grzegorz Lewicki** – a philosopher of history, a foresight consultant for private and public sector, a journalist, and a TEDx speaker. He is a graduate of London School of Economics, with a focus on the game theoretic modelling of social and historical interaction, as well as of Maastricht University, with a focus on the future of science and technology. During his PhD studies at Jagiellonian University he studied the evolution of philosophy of history, socio-political complexity, and the notion of a ‘civilization’. Lewicki has served as an international observer at the UN Commission of Social Development in New York and has authored reports for the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He has also participated in prognostic projects financed by the European Commission and has authored hundreds of articles on international affairs and science in the mainstream Polish press. His essays were translated into 5 languages.

**Cristina Petrescu** – see biogram at the page 24.

**Dragos Petrescu** – see biogram at the page 22.

**Aviezer Tucker** – see biogram at the page 26.

**Rafał Paweł Wierzchosławski** – PhD, graduated in philosophy from the Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. He continued his studies in Bielefeld, Köln, Paris, Louvain-la-Neuve, Genève, and Neuchatel. His main interests are philosophy of social sciences, modern social theories, social ontology (collective intentionalities), political philosophy (republicanism), SSS, and STS (experts studies). He obtained his PhD. for: *The Intentional Subject and Explanation in the Social Sciences. Methodological Approach*. He has taught at the Faculty of Philosophy, Catholic University of Lublin (1990–2015), Department of History, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2005–2014), and University of Social Sciences and Humanities SWPS in Poznań (since 2014). He is a member of the European Network of Social Ontology, the International Social Theory Consortium, the European Network of the Philosophy of the Social Sciences, and the International Social Ontology Society.



**INSTYTUT  
PAMIĘCI  
NARODOWEJ**

Oddział w Poznaniu



Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne,  
Oddział w Poznaniu



**UNIWERSYTET  
IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA  
W POZNANIU**

