'LEAVE, YOU BOTHER US!' - VIRGIL TĂNASE, FROM MEMORY TO (POST) EXILE

Nicoleta Ifrim

'Dunarea de Jos' University of Galati, Romania

The fall of East-European communist regimes leads to a revival of 'life writings', which are now employed by the intellectuals from the former 'communist camp' so as to produce identity fictions debating the issue of the individual 'caught' in a History post-traumatically re-written from a double perspective: that of the collective memory of totalitarianism and the personal one, functioning as filtering mechanism for the 'identity meta-history', wherein the experience of exile and post-exile. Equally, the confrontation with the West legitimizes the identity dilemmas and the interior construction of the individual profile. Virgil Tănase's novels point out the authorial identity passage of the initiating pilgrimage in a writing 'turned towards the Self' which strongly resonates with the socio-political context of totalitarian and post-totalitarian Romania.

Keywords: Autobiographic writing, Identity-focused quest, Romanian exile, Virgil Tănase.

Short Historical Survey on Romanian Communism. The Rise and Fall of the 'Ideological Enclave'. The Literary Dissidence and Its Post-Totalitarian Testimony: The Case of Virgil Tanase

Identified as a period of violent spiritual and ideological break in the East-European geocultures that entered the Soviet Union's sphere of influence after the Second World War, the age of Proletkult and Romanian socialist realism defines, starting with the imperialist invasion of August 23rd, 1944, the experience of a historical and political experiment of shaping a utopian society, dogmatic and totalitarian, as well as of a socio-cultural and political age marked by acute denationalization and deculturalization. The forms of ideological regimentation manifested, in fact, in a messianic scenario applied in a Romanian society that evolved rapidly towards the installation of a mentality dystopia where purges, denunciations, schizoid thinking and the use of dogmatic Manichaeism characterized the 'discourse of power'. The founding myth of the 'new man' – *homo sovieticus*, freed from the 'toxic captivity' of bourgeois 'decadent' mentality, of the reactionary West in a state of 'systemic putrefaction' places in political history an oppressive ideological factor, that of collective terror which 'was unleashed almost as soon as the Soviet troops - then an "ally" - entered this country, viz. at the end of August 1944.

However, until December 30, 1947, the moment of King Michael's forced abdication, terror was still a rather "discreet" phenomenon. It had moments of climax, and moments when it was temporarily checked. From the beginning of 1948, the Soviet agents, and troops, got control over nearly all the key economical and strategic positions in Romania, and terror became, so to say, a "mass phenomenon." It was instaured both inside the Communist prisons - where terror was both physical and psychological -, and outside the prisons, in the so called "normal" life, which ceased to be quite normal, and where terror was basically psychological.' (Neț, 1999:12)

In terms of cultural dynamics, the dominant ideological system fuelled a new discourse overlapping the political official one, centred on the *teleology of purge* and re-politicization in the spirit of Soviet dogma, namely by the systemic transfer of the class struggle principle in the cultural area; which meant that censorship strategies and moral pressure became coercive instruments for the political 're-conversion' of the intellectuals to secure their adherence to the politics of the regime. The political 'ages' of totalitarianism in Romania (the Comintern regime of Gheorghe-Gheorghiu Dej and the nationalist-socialist one of Ceauşescu)[1] in the 1944-1989 period are associated with the literary ages, polarized on two ideological vectors: proletkultism viewed as 'promotion of mere proletarian culture in parallel with the violent rejection of tradition' and socialist realism 'as an ideological-literary direction having as a core the idea of art sending a message locked in the Marxist-Leninist dogmas and social/ political commands' (Chişu&Hanganu, 2008: 322 – the chronology follows the demonstration from the collective volume coordinated by the latter):

1. 1945-1947 – literature is converted into an instrument of political propaganda by means of a constant process of value demythization and destructuring of autochthonous cultural models, being purged of the writings belonging to 'class enemies'. The literary trials of those who published during the years of fascist occupation (such as Nae Ionescu, Constantin Noica, Emil Cioran and others), the vindictive attitude augmented as far as sentencing writers to isolation, prison or exile, the demaskings and purges, they all alimented terror in Romania, placing guilt on the intellectuals and their writing which is, at this time, 'revised' on ethical criteria.

2. 1948-1953 – a time of ideological sedimentation of the proletariat's dictatorship, but also of anti-democratic reform, and the inquisitorial 'files' are heavy with accusations of formalism, decadentism and cosmopolitism which induce the alternative of socialist realism and Stalin's cult of personality.

3. 1953-1056 – the stage of apparent political tempering, between two events with an impact on the dominant collective mentality, the death of Stalin and the Hungarian revolution. 'In reality, Romanian culture during this time, and all it had best, its greatest values were imprisoned, literally and figuratively. The new cultural model, which places the writers in the role of social fighters, consolidates at the same time with the *witch hunt*. The *crisis of culture* and the *trial of modernity* each pave, in their turn, the way towards socialist realism.' (Chişu&Hanganu, 2008: 305)

4. 1957-1959 – it stands for a period of doctrinarian consolidation, which greatly perverts the discourse of literary criticism as well.

5. 1960-1965 – it is the stage of lowering the pressure of ideology on literary discourse, which allows a significant return to aesthetic values with the appearance of an original literature that

---

[1] As Vladimir Tismăneanu's report poits out, 'There weren't two communist regimes in Romania: the first – "Cominternist", "foreign" to Romanian "nation" and "soul", and the second – after the "break" with the USSR, devoted to national values. Between the concentration-regime of the 1948-1964 period, a period of consolidation and institutionalization, and the one apparently more tolerant after 1964, there is an undeniable connection: under Dej's leadership, fear had been internalized to such an extent that open repressive actions were no longer necessary, except under extreme conditions (the persecution of the dissidents in the 70s and 80s says enough about the ability of the regime to resort to terror every time they felt the need). Ceauşescu's socialism, direct follower of the one built under Gheorghiu Dej, was extremely authoritarian, paternalist and manipulating. It was a tyranny inspired from the same ideological fixations as those of the founders of the regime (among whom N. Ceauşescu himself): the leading role of the single party, the annihilation and demonization of private property and market, the disrespect for human right, the genesis of the "new man-devoted builder of socialist society". The difference between the Dej period and the Nicolae Ceauşescu period resides in the predominantly oligarchic element under Dej and the accentuation of the feudal-personalist dimension under Ceauşescu. Otherwise, the internal structure of leadership remained similar. The nationalist rhetoric replaced the internationalist, the intimidation techniques became more subtle, but no less omnipresent and constraining. Denunciation continued to be the basis of the activity of mass control and supervision conducted by Securitate.' - *Raport final al Comisiei Prezidentiale pentru analiza dictaturii comuniste din Romania / Final Report of the Presidential Commission Regarding the Study of Communist Dictatorship in Romania*, Bucharest, 2006, p. 12.

imbues the text with indirectly allegorical or allusive forms, essentially a means to resist through literature.

With the instatement of Ceaușescu's socialist-nationalist regime in 1965, as well as his 'fictitious solidarity with *socialism with a human face*'[2] (immediately after Gheorghiu-Dej's death, N.Ceaușescu was elected general secretary of the Romanian Workers' Party on 22 March 1965), the literary world becomes representative, as Irina Culic observed (who analyses the Romanian cultural scene through Bourdieu's grid), for the conceptual validation of dissidence / exile as a phenomenon[3] :

> the communist state was able to render futile all struggles for hegemony in the literary (and cultural) field, and therefore […] there was indeed no alternative except the exile. As Bourdieu notes […], the state possesses meta-capital ('state capital') which exercises power over other species of capital, and particularly over their rate of exchange. There is no doubt that in Ceușescu's Romania political capital was the most effective 'currency', although there was constant insecurity regarding how long it would be held. Political capital was easily transformed into cultural capital […]. In my view, however, these two variables – state violence and the play of the actors within the field, which took the form of strategies – were checked by an independent variable […]: the third type of actor 'negotiating' the principles of consecration and reproduction in the cultural field, the 'intellectual diaspora'. (Culic, 1999: 63-64)

If the incisive zdhanovisation phenomenon of the cultural space before 1958 doubled the political program of social 'reconversion', in the mid 1960s, the issue of dissidence through literature and the politically imposed 'practice' of exile guide the writers' social behaviours and destinies, now caught between two choices: 'internal exile' in a society turned into a desert of values by permanent Russification, converted into a national utopia carefully monitored by Securitate (the Romanian Political Police) and external exile, defined as place of refuge politically imposed on the undesirables (Paul Goma, Doina Cornea, Virgil Tănase, Țepeneag, Monica Lovinescu and Virgil Ierunca et alii).[4] As Tănăsoiu states, 'the scope and target of the narrative of the dissent reflected reality. While in the 1950s dissent addressed the impact of newly introduced cultural and educational policies, the narrative of dissent in the

---

[2] Cosmina Tănăsoiu analyses the phenomenon of apparent de-Stalinization associated with the moment when, although N. Ceausescu publicly condemns the invasion of Czechoslovakia of August 1968, the forms of ideological coercion continue even more aggressively - in Revisiting Romanian Dissident under Communism. The Unbearable Lightness of Solitude. In: *History of Communism in Europe*, 2nd volume - *Avatars of Intellectuals under Communism.* Journal edited by The Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile, Bucharest: Zeta Books, 2011, p.327.

[3] In the case of Romanian exile from the period 1945-1989, Eva Behring notes a politically grounded motivation which triggers the identity anxiety and the inner fissures of the 'flight from the system': 'Oppression, political surveillance, discrimination, prison and threats with prison, interdiction to publish and censorship – in other words, political and culturally-political reasons for expulsion or for taking the decision to leave the country, we find all these to be determining, indispensable for the definition of exile.' – *Scriitori români din exil. 1945 – 1989/ Romanian Writers in Exile. 1945-1989* (Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Română, 2001), p.12. Similarly, the Romanian critic Laurențiu Ulici notes that the 'exile of Romanian writers represented, morphologically peaking, a flight, an option and a refusal, and it was determined by political reasons: the persecution by the communist regime, in its Stalinist phase, against everything standing for the "bourgeois-landowner past", including the creators of literature established in that "past" and the hostility of the same regime, in its Ceausescu stage with its nationalist core, towards any attempt at free ideological expression. (…) The arrival point, the West, (…) for more than 12% of all the Romanian writers in existence. The percentage is much larger than that of any country from the East of Europe.' – 'Avatarii lui Ovidiu' / 'Ovidiu's Avatars', in *Secolul 20 Journal*, 1-3 (1998), 14-17 (pp.14-16).

[4] As Cosmina Tănăsoiu points out, after 1968, 'Dissent was not a permanent attitude. It could follow years of complying with socialist realism (e.g. Dan Deșliu). With few exceptions, some tragic (Gheorghe Ursu), following interrogations, surveillance and psychological pressure they were spared time in prison and were forced into exile (while continuing to be targeted by the Securitate), house arrest, and/or internal exile (forced resettlement within the country, in remote villages with controlled access and limited freedom of movement). By contrast, the revolt of average individuals exposed one to prison and confinement to psychiatric institutions.' - Revisiting Romanian Dissident under Communism, p.338.

1980s was essentially Ceauşescu-centered, whether focused on policy or the cult of personality. Linguistically, dissent employed a vocabulary that escaped the constraints of the wooden language. It liberated the word even when hiding meaning under elaborate metaphors to confuse censors' (Tănăsoiu, 2011: 332) The cultural 'exodus' of the Romanian writers after the July Theses of 1971 delivered by Nicolae Ceauşescu[5] becomes a historical turning point which opened the way for writing memoirs and experience-based narratives to be published only after 1989, when the Romanian communist regime falls apart.

Thus, from the literary diachrony of the Romanian political exiles, Simona Antofi selects a representative narrative, namely Sanda Stolojan's journal, *Ceruri nomade. Jurnal din exilul parizian / Nomad Skies. Journal of the Parisian Exile*, published in 1999, ten years after the fall of Ceauşescu's dictatorship. Sanda Stolojan is a Romanian writer and political refugee to France, in 1962 and her memoirs are emblematic of the strategies for the 'ego-centric' re-writing of a history focalized on the *double-bind* identity – the confrontation with the experience of being politically 'uprooted' and the adaptation to 'the redeeming West'. In other words, exile as 'state of mind', as assumed interiority of the identity search, post-traumatically compensates the 'openness' towards an 'identity in transition'[6] which validates what the Hungarian writer Péter Esterházy called, in a collection of interviews, 'the appropriation of dictatorship as literary material' (Esterházy&Malamen, 2010: 98), actually a landmark common to all Eastern intellectuals who experienced the terror of the totalitarian dogma. For him, the 'spoken book', born out of the conversations with Iolanda Malamen, re-writes the 'life-story under totalitarianism' (the Kàdàr type of communist regime) of the Hungarian writer confronted with the ideological coercive Centre 'defeated' by writing as an aesthetic form of resistance.[7] Caught between

---

[5] As Irina Culic points out, 'The wind of change that marked the 1960s, accompanied by the emergence of a talented and oppositional generation (Stănescu, Blandiana, Liiceanu, Manolescu, Păunescu and others), was stopped in its tracks by Ceauşescu's cultural policy, the so-called 'July Theses' of 1971. These .ideas signed a brutal return to the Stalinist period: competence and aesthetics were to be placed by ideology; professionals were to be replaced by agitators; and culture was to become an instrument for political-ideological propaganda once again (…). Censorship seemed to be the most important means of neutralizing writers. Any suspicion that a work contained a political tint, or any personal difference of opinion with those who ran the political apparatus that governed literary activity (literary journals, publications, the Writers' Union) resulted in prohibition.' – 'The Strategies of Intellectuals: Romania under Communist Rule in Comparative Perspective', in *Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe*, ed.by András Bozóki, (Budapest: Central European University Press*, 1999), pp.43-72 (pp.56-57).

[6] In Simona Antofi's opinion, the journal re-writes the symbolic 'history' of the detention and the liberation from the doctrinarian oppression of the communist regime, legitimizing 'an Oriental mentality, almost archaic, one might say, in which the *imaginary homeland* keeps both the boundaries and the colours of the Balkan space, as well as the aromas, the sentimental vibrations and the images of the Romanian rural space, which had a clear connection with the interiorized myth of the golden age and of childhood. The dynamism, the ebullience and the devotion towards the political and moral cause of the Romanian political exile during Ceausescu's dictatorial regime are counterbalanced by the Pascalian restlessness of the woman who discovers that the world is void of sacrality. Furthermore, the collective memory, the mental representations with clear identitary functionality, which (re)write the history of survival through frequent imaginary or actual returns to Romania, imbue the writing with the marks of the feminine ego of Oriental essence, often inclined to daydream in nature, to idle while resting her spirit in the aromas of wild vegetation, as she used to do in her childhood, in her grandparents' courtyard. Whereas in appearance she is free of the spiritual servitudes that characterize femininity in the post-totalitarian space, the diarist carries within her, unconsciously, the need to build masculine patterns of behaviour and thought for her.' – 'The Role Played by Literature in the Inter-Cultural Educational Process. Educational Extensions of the Contemporary Feminine Diaries', *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 47 (2012), 1442-47 (p.1445).

[7] Péter Esterházy confesses, for example, that 'I was, obviously, aware of the system's lies, of its depravation, I expected nothing else, to say so. From this point of view, I didn't fall into temptation. I imagined writing as having greater dimensions than dictatorship. Of course, to a certain extent, one can say that writing was deliverance, because I had managed to convert everything into work, including anger and helplessness. The inability to act under dictatorship could become action in writing. For me, the language of dictatorship, which otherwise made me puke, was working material. I used to say that dictatorship was a linguistic gold mine.' – *La început eram încă un om normal. Dialog cyberspaţial/ In the Beginning I was Still a Normal Person. A Cyber-Spatial Dialogue,* translated into Romanian by Ana Maria Pop, (Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House, 2010), p.57.

Europe seen as a 'necessity, as well as an illusion', 'an alibi and self-deception'[8] and Memory of the dictatorship which fills the personal memory of the post-totalitarian 'outcast', the narrating self behaves like an 'inner exiled' in a writing turned towards the Self, maintaining *à rebours* the effect of a liberating scriptural reality, once manipulated by doctrine: 'Dictatorship did not overlook literature, because it considered it worthy of attention, it strived to manipulate it; there is no other regime granting so much importance to literature; it's true that the intent was to rob it of its most important possession: freedom.' (Esterházy&Malamen, 2010: 91-92)

Thus, autobiographic narrative[9] entails an identity pact by which the 'inner exile' exorcises the impact of the ideological oppression, liberating, through writing, the internal manifestations of identity. Virgil Tănase's autobiographical narratives published after 1989 enhance the re-lived 'in-between peripherality' Tötösy de Zepetnek talks about in postcolonial terms (Zepetnek, 2002:10). In his opinion, as Cristina Sandru noticed, 'prior to 1989, East-Central Europe could be described as a mediating peripherality, doubly marginalised by the two competing centres of influence: the political-economic and ideological one of the Soviet Union, and the cultural one of the West." (Şandru, 2012 :23) Tănase's Self-referenced book is relevant from the 'peripheral identity in-the-making' point of view, as well as displaying the atypical nature of 'dissidence through literature' of a Romanian writer re-narrating his tormented communist experience from a post-exilic perspective.

The confession-testimony – 'not of an age, as they say, but of our continuous, worthy struggle, with the mysterious monster which, by changing the century clothing it, doesn't change its habit, or its fierceness' (Tanase, 6)– describes the status of the intellectual 'caught in the claws of History', trying to 'keep from drowning in the swamp that had surrounded us' (Tanase, 7), retracing, under the personal mark of a narrated life, an entire, collective experience. Thematically polarized in two sections, Romania and France, standing for the two spaces 're-lived' by means of the confessional-fictional imaginary, *Leapșa pe murite / Playing Fetch with Death!* reflects, on the one hand, 'the individual and his autonomization as products of social history.'(Tanase, 7) In other words, the personal choice of the writer 'idelogically captive' in the totalitarian era, as re-confirmed by the autobiographical confession of the novel, is not that to 'comply' to the social role imposed by the doctrinarian canon of the age, but that to *resist* by exposing the aesthetic forms of rebellion in his writing. On the other hand, the book defines the acceptance of exile as means for survival which causes, however, inner anguish and identity dilemmas. Moreover, the conflicting duality of the two 'experiences' – communist Romania and the France of the pre/post-Ceausescu exile – monitors the internal disjunction fuelled by 'our game, everyone's, with power' (Tanase, 24) but also by the 'crossing over' which awakens, with 'passing beyond the Iron Curtain' a 'strange sensation of walking on the moon, of having beaten I don't know what gravity of history which kept me grounded in a country whose doors and windows seemed all closed for me, by force of implacable and fatal laws; a sensation of absolute unreality.' (Tanase, 181) 'The recognition conflicts' as 'revealers of tensions that give dynamism to the identity production'[10] covertly double the autobiographic trajectories of the writer, moving from the 'identity ideologically fabricated'[11] to the

---

[8] For Péter Esterházy, the East-European's relation with the long-envisioned Europe is formal: 'Our expectations for this elegant and remote club are strange, we either hope that it will teach us how to behave, or we hope it will give us money, so, we relate to it in a formal manner. We don't seriously tackle this problem, we don't really think about it, we selfishly think about how we could benefit from it.' - *ibid.,* p.74.

[9] It conceptually covers both confessional, diaristic and memorial writing which maintain a *fictionalizing* relation between the personal history of an *auctor in fabula* and the Great History of totalitarianism retold in a discourse of redefining the identity of the Periphery entered under the incidence of the openness towards a 'lived Europe.'

[10] Jean-Claude Kaufmann, *Quand **Je** est un autre. Pourquoi et comment ça change en nous.* (Paris : Armand Colin, 2008), p.67.

[11] The episode of the 'collaboration proposition' made by the Securitate starts the interior anxiety of the self confronted with the 'identity theft', now replaceable with the 'pre-fabricated' and superordinate one of the system: 'I had the feeling that the totalitarian state […] steals it to replace it with another, prefabricated and idiotic, which could not balance the scale on whose other pan was nothingness. […] The members of Securitate, poor fellows (not that I pity them!), were not the instruments of the political power, but of another, much more frightening and more

problematic one of the Romanian in exile, in Paris, 'a city present in my persona mythology.'[12] If the 'Prague Spring' and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia are relived, in the logic of autobiography, from the illusory perspective of an escape from the totalitarian space, motivated by the imminence of a possible armed colonization by the Russians, but quickly repressed by the formula of 'obedience as a patriotic act' ('advisors of all sorts prompted us to temper our protests and our style so as not to wake one day to the Soviet tanks in our yard'[13]), once arrived in exile, the narrating self turns its eyes towards the Romanian space left behind.

In this specific context of autobiographic fiction, the identity construction of the self in exile, peddler of a dominant History against which he aims a programmatic retort, validates the structuring mechanism mentioned by Kaufmann, 'the design of the double propeller': 'the first propeller is the conservative component of the individual, where his past is deposited and which unconsciously provides him with rules for behaviour. The second, by the contrary, determines identity breaches, due to the imaginative subjectivity, which become manifest as permanent identity reformulations.'[14] In its turn, the discourse marked by an autobiographic note, while fictionally projecting major events of the collective and personal history and generating the reconfiguration of the identity hypostases, ceases to be a 'smooth narrative', eventfully uniform, mediating in exchange 'the disjunctive odyssey' (Kaufmann) in which 'the event is used to produce an identity revival, as well as to mark it in spirit.'[15] The ideological pressure of the dictatorial regime, obsessively imprinting the existence before exile, the constant harassment by the Securitate and the opposition against the 'totalitarian machinery' (in Virgil Tănase's terms), 'the escape into a free world' and the retrieval of the interior freedom by means of the 'resisting books', the disappointments of exile and the hypostasis of the 'exiled among exiles', the crystallization of the anti-Ceauşescu dissident movement in exile, the politically ordered failed assassination attempt[16], the return to post-December Romania and the dilemmas of post-exile are as many moments of 'bifurcation'[17] for the identity construct, by which the self changes its world as a result of its passing through a reality crisis: 'his value system, certain behaviours and the content of the exchanges with the significant alterity will strongly contrast with what went before them [...] the bifurcations only account for a small part of the changes, where numerous identity reversals reign, as well as disturbances caused by ordinary events.'[18] The successive stages of the phenomenon generating identity splits and 'disruptions' are: a 'critical phase' marking the uncertainty and confusion ('Alternative imaginary identifications become more frequent, in conflict with the activated designs of implicit memory, causing dysfunctions [...], opening reflexive

---

radical, against which my whole being rebelled.' - Tănase, *Leapşa pe murite. Document poliţist şi literar / Playing Fetch with Death! Detective and Literary Document,* pp.82-83.

[12] Ibid., p.188.

[13] Ibid., p.103.

[14] Ibid., p.171.

[15] Ibid., p.188.

[16] The circumstances of his failed political assassination ordered by Bucharest are recounted by Virgil Tănase in the chapter *Mort fără moarte / Dead without Death (Leapşa pe murite / Playing Fetch with Death!,* pp.282-310). The novel *C'est mon affaire, sotie* published in Paris in 1983, projects into a ludic and intertextual fiction, 'the general political situation under the form of a bear hunt. The "multilaterally developed" Romania was becoming a burlesque circus show with an acrobat bride coming from the countryside, where it is not customary to wear knickers under the skirt. I had dedicated a chapter, *Temă cu variaţiuni/ Theme with variations*, to the various versions that had circulated about the "Tănase affair", each of them in a different literary key: the idea of a plot of the DTS meant to compromise the new socialist President of France was portrayed by a confrontation between the Tenor and the Choir of brutes, like in an opera by Verdi; the supposition that it was all a Russian was painted as a ballet by Asafiev, *The Fountain of Bakhchisarai*; in a scene from *comedia dell'arte,* a servant tricked his two masters, heads of state. [...] Bedtime stories!' - *Leapşa pe murite / Playing Fetch with Death!*, p.312.

[17] Borrowing the concept from the mathematics of dynamic systems or from non-Euclidian physics (Dang-Vu, Descartes or Prigogine), of morphologies, where 'the separation appears in singular moments when the trajectory followed by a system is split into several directions; only one will be realised, but they were all equally possible', Kaufmann proposes *bifurcation* as a notion associated to the minor biographical event, catalyst for the 'overturns', mediating the identity reconstruction. - *Quand **Je** est un autre*, pp. 194-197.

[18] Ibid., p.195.

paths'), followed by 'the open crisis and [...] reversal' so that 'the evolution of the biographic system is that for which the event is only a pretext, an element starting a mutation which, one way or another, would have occurred anyway.'[19] To that effect, the identity crises inserted in the autobiographic journey, fictionally recalled to memory by Virgil Tănase in *Leapṣa pe murite / Playing Fetch with Death!*, legitimate the construction, in confessional register, of a history 'I had not searched and through whose torrents I had passed as I knew best, striving to keep my cool and not let myself be diverted, a strange happening I had experienced […], a cataclysm which destroys people at random, no matter their merits; an attempt as many others in a life time, neither good, nor evil in itself, a brick that gains its worth from the wall in which it is built.'[20] In other words, a novel-scenario of the 'individual within history', an identity-focused meta-history ended 'in a victory which, as all other things in this world, proves to be another field overgrown with weeds and thorns. We ought to clear it with the same dedication, with the only joy of being able to say, in the evening, while praying before "going to sleep", that we filled our day with a rightful labour, guided by the light within us.'[21] (Tănase, 2011: 342)

Selective Bibliography

1. Antofi, S. 2012. The Role Played by Literature in the Inter-Cultural Educational Process. Educational Extensions of the Contemporary Feminine Diaries. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 47:1442-47, available at http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812025761 [accessed 1 October 2012].

2. Behring E.2001. *Scriitori români din exil. 1945 – 1989 / Romanian Writers in Exile. 1945-1989.* Bucharest: Fundaţia Culturală Română.

3. Chişu, L., Hanganu, L. 2008. (eds.) *Literatura în epoca totalitarismului. Perioada 1945-1965 în cultura română / Literature in Totalitarian Age. The Period of 1945-1965 in Romanian Culture.* Bucharest: Printech.

4. Cristofor, I. 1990. Confesiunile unui exilat / The Memoirs of an Exiled**,** *Tribuna Cultural Journal*, 23/ 7 June 1990.

5. Culic, I. 1999. The Strategies of Intellectuals: Romania under Communist Rule in Comparative Perspective. In: A. Bozóki, ed. *Intellectuals and Politics in Central Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press, pp.43-72.

6. Colonna, V. 1989. L'Autofiction. Essai sur la fictionnalisation de soi en littérature, [online]. PhD thesis Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, available at

    http://tel.archivesouvertes.fr/docs/00/04/70/04/PDF/tel-00006609.pdf [accessed 27 September 2012].

7. Compagnon, A. 1998. *Le démon de la théorie. Littérature et sens commun.* Paris: Seuil.

8. Dufoix, S. 2011. *La dispersion. Une histoire des usages du mot **diaspora***. Paris: Éditions Amsterdam.

9. Esterházy, P. & Malamen, I. 2010. *La început eram încă un om normal. Dialog cyberspaţial / In the Beginning I was Still a Normal Person. A Cyber-Spatial Dialogue,* trans. into Romanian by AnaMaria Pop. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House.

10. Etkind, A.2013. *Warped Mourning. Stories of the Undead in the Land of the Unburied*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

11. Ferréol, G. & Jucquois, G. eds. 2010. *Dictionnaire de l'altérite et des relations interculturelles,* Paris: Armand Colin.

12. Fistetti, F. 2009. *Théories du multiculturalisme. Un parcours entre philosophie et sciences sociales* (trans. by Phillippe Chanial and Marilisa Preziosi). Paris: Éditions La Découverte.

13. Gusdorf, G. 1990. *Les Ecritures du moi*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

14. Hall, S. 2008. *Identités et cultures. Politiques des **cultural studies*** (trans. by Christophe Jaquet). Paris: Éditions Amsterdam.

---

[19] Ibid., pp.195-96.
[20] Tănase, *Leapşa pe murite. Document poliţist şi literar / Playing Fetch with Death! Detective and Literary Document,* p.338.
[21] Ibid., p.342.

15. Hubier, S. 2003. *Littératures intimes : les expressions du moi, de l'autobiographie à l'autofiction*. Paris: Armand Colin.

16. Kaufmann, J.-C. 2004. *Ego. Pour une sociologie de l'individu*. Paris : Armand Colin.

17. Kaufmann, J.-C. 2004. *L'invention de soi. Une théorie de l'identité.* Paris : Armand Colin.

18. Kaufmann, J.-C. 2008. *Quand **Je** est un autre. Pourquoi et comment ça change en nous.* Paris : Armand Colin.

19. Lovinescu, M. 2008. *Etica neuitării. Eseuri politico-istorice / The Ethics of Non-oblivion. Political-Historical Essays*. Bucharest: Humanitas.

20. Maingueneau, D. 1993. *Le contexte de l'oeuvre littéraire*. Paris: Dunod.

21. Mattéi, J.- F. 2011. *Le procés de l'Europe. Grandeur et misère de la culture européenne.* Paris : PUF.

22. Milosz, C. 1980. *Une Autre Europe*. Paris: Gallimard.

23. Milosz, C. 1988. *La pensée captive,* Paris : Gallimard.

24. Neț, M. 1999. Post War Writers' Memoirs in Romania and France. A Study of Mentalities. *Research Support Scheme*. June-July [accessed 27 October 2015].

25. Nowicki, J. 2001. La question de l'altérité in Europe dans l'interface Est / Ouest. In : L.B. Tachot and S. Gruzinski, eds. *Passeurs culturels. Mécanismes de métissage.* Paris: Maison des Sciences de L'Homme, pp.285-99.

26. Strugaru, O. 2013. *Exilul ca mod de existență. Andrei Codrescu în spațiul textual al dezrădăcinării / Exile as Way of Living. Andrei Codrescu in the Textual Space of Uprooting*, Bucharest: Muzeul Literaturii Române.

27. Şandru, C. 2012. Worlds Apart? A Postcolonial Reading of post-1945 East-Central European Culture, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

28. Taylor, C. 1994. *Multiculturalisme. Différence et démocratie* (trans. in French by Denis-Armand Canal). Paris: Aubier.

29. Tănase, V. 2011. *Leapşa pe murite. Document polițist și literar / Playing Fetch with Death! Detective and Literary Document*. Bucharest: Adevărul Holding&Institutul Român de Istorie Recentă.

30. Tănăsoiu, C. 2011. Revisiting Romanian Dissident under Communism. The Unbearable Lightness of Solitude. In: *History of Communism in Europe*, 2nd volume - *Avatars of Intellectuals under Communism.* Journal edited by The Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile. Bucharest: Zeta Books, pp.323-344.

31. Tismăneanu, V. 2006. *Raport final al Comisiei Prezidentiale pentru analiza dictaturii comuniste din Romania / Final Report of the Presidential Commission Regarding the Study of Communist Dictatorship in Romania*, Bucharest, 2006 - available at http://www.presidency.ro/static/ordine/RAPORT_FINAL_CPADCR.pdf [accessed 28 October 2015].

32. Todorov, Tz. 2010. *Le siècle des totalitarismes.* Paris: Robert Laffont.

33. Ulici, L. 1998. Avatarii lui Ovidiu / Ovidiu's Avatars, *Secolul 20 Journal / 20th Century Journal*, 1-3: 14-17.

34. Wieviorka, M. 2001. *La différence.* Paris: Éditions Balland.

35. Zepetnek, de T. 2002 (ed.). *Comparative Central European Culture*, Purdue: Purdue University Press.