

NOTES AND REVIEWS

MARK BRYANT, *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons*, Grub Street Publishing, London, 2009, 160 pp. + ill.

Mark Bryant's *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons* completes his tetralogy of cartoons produced in response to conflict, and practically concludes this sumptuous series devoted to what was considered until rather recently a minor genre, even if approached with zest by many prestigious artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci, William Hogarth, Francisco de Goya, James Abbott McNeill Whistler, Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, James Ensor, Georg Grosz, and the Romanians Nicolae Grigorescu, Iosif Iser, and Nicolae Tonitza.

A well-known figure in British press, secretary of London Press Club for several years, with a fruitful activity in organization and promotion, Mark Bryant (b. 1953) has linked his name to this synthetic and hilarious genre of graphics presenting the realities of time. The author already has several reference titles in the field: *Dictionary of British Cartoonists and Caricaturists 1730-1980*, co-author with S. Heneage (Scolar Press, London, 1994), *Dictionary of Twentieth-Century British Cartoonists and Caricaturists* (Ashgate Publishing, London, 2000), *God in Cartoons* (Highland Books Ltd., Godalming, 1997), and the aforementioned tetralogy, opening with *World War II in Cartoons* (Grub Street Publishing, London, 1989, re-edited in 2005), *World War I in Cartoons* (Grub Street Publishing, London, 2006), *Wars of the Empire in Cartoons* (Grub Street Publishing, London, 2008), and concluded by the present book. The volumes published by Bryant follow a backward chronology, from the contemporary period to the beginnings of modern times, respectively from World War Two to the Great War, and from the armed conflicts of the metropolis with the colonies during the French Revolution and Napoleon's time. With this new title, the author travels further back into history.

In his *Foreword*, Bryant gives a definition of the terms employed and identifies their origin. Specifically designating in the Anglo-Saxon world a humoristic drawing published in the press, the word *cartoon* comes from the Italian *cartone*, signifying a sketch of a planned tapestry, fresco or mosaic, namely a preparatory drawing for the aforementioned decorative techniques. Also, caricature comes from the Italian *caricare*, meaning to exaggerate. Notable differences arise here between the Latin and the Insular worlds: what we, the Romanians, term *caricature* – having taken over the word from French – is termed *cartoon* by the British and the Americans, who give a larger meaning to the term, so as to include the entire humoristic graphics, irrespective of size or support, be it the exaggerated

portrait of a political or military figure, the satirical drawing with or without a caption, or the bill and any other piece of propagandistic material with ludicrous flavor. The term came in use in 1843, when John Leech, illustrator for “Punch” magazine, derided the contest for decoration of the walls of the new House of Parliament in times of crisis in a drawing entitled *Cartoon No. 1*.

If for his other volumes of the series the author collected his documentary material from the press of the time, things stood quite differently for the present book, as publications in Napoleon’s time were scarcely illustrated if at all. Therefore, his documentation effort was directed towards the collections of lithographs housed by the Department of Prints and Drawings, knowing that caricatures were made and multiplied by lithographers. The most famous publishers in London were Hannah Humphrey, William Holland, Rudolph Ackermann, Thomas Tegg, and Samuel Fores – who, having published a considerable number of engravings mocking Bonaparte, had ironically and quite rightfully entitled himself “caricaturist to the First Consul” – in Paris, Martinet, and in Nuremberg, Friedrich Campe. Engravings were widely spread, they could be bought or rented, they would be passed from hand to hand, and whenever a new drawing came out, a large crowd would gather in front of the publisher’s to laugh at the approached topic.

Undoubtedly, during Napoleon’s reign few ventured in France to make or distribute caricatures criticizing the emperor (in any case such an enterprise would have remained anonymous), although the emperor himself encouraged the genre – provided he was not the target himself – being quite aware of its value as propagandistic material and as a means to influence/manipulate the general public. For example, the author quotes an order of the emperor to his Minister of Police Joseph Fouché, asking him to commission a set of caricatures deriding England’s effort to win over allies against him. He seemed to appreciate some of James Gillray’s drawings, although found quite a number of them infuriating, such as *The Handwriting on the Wall* (1803) – with reference to the Biblical banquet of Balthazar – and *The Grand Coronation Procession of Napoleon the 1st* (1805), in which the characters’ traits and dress were deadly mocked.

Drawings by London authors, made safely away from French censure and distributed freely, often on the continent as well, are predominant. Some of these authors attained celebrity status owing to these drawings. The best known British caricaturist of the time – who, next to Hogarth, reached perfection in style and established the humoristic drawing as a genre in itself, freeing it of the label of timewaster for a bored artist – was Thomas Rowlandson. But there were many others, just as inspired and skillful in ridiculing their contemporaries at home or abroad, such as the aforementioned Gillray, or the prolific Isaac and George Cruikshank (father and son), Charles Ansell, William Elmes, William Heath, and George Woodward. In the German area, the authors of satirical drawings were only

able to express themselves after 1813, when France had been defeated at Leipzig and the fear of the censorship in effect in the time of the Rhine Confederation had vanished. The exquisite drawings of Johann Michael Voltz and Johann Gottfried Schadow, genuine academic studies of character and expression, then came out.

Targets of the poisonous darts were the leading characters of the time, starting with the major enemy, General Bonaparte, and further on Emperor Napoleon and his family, followed by local political and military figures, such as the British Prime Minister William Pitt, tall, lean and snub-nosed, with rosy cheeks owing to his indulgence in Port wine, the chubby Prince of Wales – the future Prince Regent –, a renowned gourmet more interested in gallant adventures than in state affairs, the “insane” King George III, Admiral Horatio Nelson wearing the bicorn trimmed with plumes and the fur mantle received as a gift from the sultan after the Battle of the Nile, or his voluptuous friend, Emma, Lady Hamilton who, very young, had sat for painters, field marshal Sir Arthur Wellesley, Viscount of Wellington, known for his martial inflexibility, with his traits made up of drums, battlements, canons, standards, and laurels, like in a portrait by Arcimboldo, or stuffed in a boot labeled with his name, Tsar Paul I with a monkey face and the tails of his uniform sweeping the ground, field marshal Blücher with his bushy moustache, Talleyrand with his club foot, hair powdered.

In 1803, Gillray made of Bonaparte a ridiculous character, dwarfish, irritable and aggressive, “Little Boney,” adopted by other cartoonists as well. To enhance the ridicule, reference was often made to Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, the little general being featured as a visitor to Brobdingnag – placed by James Gillray in the palm of George III, who is observing him through a long-view; or, by the same author, the King and the Queen of England as the rulers of Brobdingnag, amused at the sight of Bonaparte in a small boat floating in a pool, with two young courtiers blowing to make wind for the sails. The small stature of the general or the lean and lanky figures of his starved grenadiers set against a hefty John Bull towering over his adversary are constant themes of irony (*Facing the Enemy* by Isaac Cruikshank, 1803; *John Bull Sounding His Bugle!* by George Woodward, 1803; *The English Lamb and the French Tiger* by Charles Ansell, 1806).

Bonaparte – often connoted Buonaparte, to indicate his Corsican origin – then Napoleon, was portrayed along the time as a crocodile (1799), a mushroom, an earwig, a monkey (1803), a dragon slain by the Prince Regent of England (*St. George and the Dragon – a Design for an Equestrian Statue, from the Original in Windsor Castle*, by James Gillray, 1805), a hound, a snake or a jay, feathers plucked off by Prussia, Austria, Russia and Sweden featured as eagles (1814), impaled on the horns of the Spanish bull (1808), a butcher (1803) or a baker taking out of the oven his gingerbread brothers and other relatives, in order to place them on some European throne (*Tiddy Doll, the Great French Gingerbread-Baker, Drawing Out a New Batch of Kings*, by James Gillray, 1806), or even a toy, such as

a nutcracker holding between its jaws a nut hard to crack, labeled Leipzig (1813), or a whirligig, flogged into motion by the allied commanders (1814). No less spared were the other protagonists of the great history show: the Russians were featured as bears, the British as a bulldog (the lion had not yet become the symbol of Albion), the Spaniards as bulls or donkeys, the Portuguese as wolves, the Dutch as pipe smoking frogs, and the Austrians and Prussians as eagles, a nobler symbol.

Possibly the best known caricature of the time was the one created by James Gillray in 1805, when France had made a conditioned peace proposal to England, with the purpose of re-dividing areas of influence. Entitled *The Plum-Pudding in Danger, or State Epicures Taking un Petit Souper*, it shows William Pitt sitting at a table with Napoleon, each carving slices of the world in the form of a plum pudding – the former chooses the ocean and the latter Europe. This composition would be a subsequent source of inspiration for other caricaturists, during political or military crises similar to that of the early nineteenth century. For example, during World War Two, Leslie Illingworth, illustrator for “Daily Mail,” made an almost similar cartoon showing Hitler and Mussolini sticking their country flags into the terrestrial globe, instead of slicing it. Several years later, in 1967, the same cartoonist would publish in the same journal a similar cartoon featuring Lyndon B. Johnson, president of the United States, and Aleksei Kosygin, prime minister of the USSR.

Some of the drawings were inspired by consecrated works of art, such as *Dutch Nightmare* by Thomas Rowlandson (1813), which drew on the Swiss Romantic painter Henry Fuseli’s *Nightmare*. Others make reference to dramatic composition, such as *The Right Owner* by Isaac Cruikshank (1804): like Richard III in the Shakespearean play, Napoleon, freshly crowned, is tormented by the ghost of Louis XVI reclaiming his royal mantle and crown. Another example of bookish reference can be found in an anonymous French engraving, *Robinson Crusoe d’Elbe*, in which the abdicated emperor resembles Daniel Defoe’s adventurous character. After the Hundred Days, while the emperor was a prisoner on the island of St. Helena, another engraving by an anonymous French artist showed the great vanquished as an enchained Prometheus on his desert island, whereas George Cruikshank was identifying him with the Devil shouting at the sun, as in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.

The drawings are often awkwardly made, characters lack resemblance, the humor is naïve, the intrigue almost unnoticeable, hence the necessity for ample explanatory captions or a dialogue among the characters, often uninspired. However, one should convene that caricature was then unfledged, and caricaturists pioneers of the genre, to be praised for their quality of road openers rather than criticized for their shortcomings in style.

A keen connoisseur of history, Bryant follows in the line of his previous books and organizes his material chronologically. With method and clarity, he begins every chapter – designated by a year – with a brief description of the related

developments (campaigns, political and social events) that provided humorists with worthy topics for their venomous pen. A detailed presentation of each event and a discussion on the illustration are further provided. Captions enable a quick identification of the image through its essential elements: title, author, and publishing year.

The cover shows a French engraving in which the captive emperor writes at the foot of a monument “Napoléon se rend et ne meurt pas” – a paraphrase of the famous words uttered by General Cambronne in the last stage of the Battle of Waterloo.¹ The author, whimsically and in a stroke of inspiration, substitutes the initial inscription with the proper name written by the imperial pen.

Exquisitely illustrated and documented, Mark Bryant’s *Napoleonic Wars in Cartoons* is a reference title for every First French Empire enthusiast, offering through the selected cartoons a new outlook on the related period.

For every Napoleonic period buff, Bryant’s book is a **must**.

Adrian-Silvan Ionescu

EUGEN DENIZE, *Propaganda comunistă în România*, Edit. Cetatea de Scaun, Târgoviște, 2009, 280 pp.

Many works on propaganda have been published in Romania in the last two decades, especially concerning the role of propaganda in controlling minds under totalitarian regimes. Such books were focused mainly on Communism, an issue of great significance for Romanian scholars. But most authors of such books were political scientists, either Romanian or foreign, and used instruments of analysis, concepts and theories specific to political science. Romanian historiography had not seen an in-depth analysis of Communist propaganda, written by a historian, until Eugen Denize started researching the issue, with a historian’s methods.

Eugen Denize was one of the most laborious and meticulous historians who ever approached the history of Communism in Romania. Formerly director of “Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History in Bucharest and professor at Valachia University in Târgoviște, Eugen Denize started his research with radio propaganda, later becoming one of the best documented historians of Communist propaganda in Romania. He disseminated his work in various academic journals in Bucharest such as “Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană,” before publishing his first book on this issue in 2003, along with historian Cezar Mățu. The book consisted of

¹ “La Garde meurt mais ne se rend pas!” Cf. Alessandro Barbero, *Bătălia. Așa a fost la Waterloo*, București, 2005, p. 336.

two parts, the first regarding the organization of state institutions between 1948 and 1953 and the second part regarding propaganda. The book had a major success among historians but Denize's research continued in the following years, before his premature death in 2007.

The present volume, published in 2009 by *Cetatea de Scaun*, includes other parts of his studies which did not appear in 2003. It represents a complete and structured version of Denize's work and also the first elaborated research of Communist propaganda undertaken by a historian in the last two decades. The book is a comprehensive presentation of the organization and mechanisms of propaganda in a Communist regime, with strong emphasis on its content and finalities. As the author stated in the *Introduction*, his purpose was to reveal the "mechanism and effects of Communist propaganda in Romania, in its darkest period, during 1948 and 1953, the years of absolute paranoia before Stalin's death." During these years, the propaganda apparatus was confronted with its greatest challenges: the regime was facing the strongest opposition in society while the removal of political enemies was still at the very beginning. Propaganda was called upon to justify an entire destructive undertaking, keen on removing all reminiscences of the past and building a new society, based on Marxist-Leninist principles. Also, the Cold War was reaching its most heated moments during these years.

Eugen Denize's book is structured in five chapters, to which an *Introduction* and *Conclusions* were added. The first chapter refers to the historical framework of Communist propaganda, explaining the conditions in which the Communist Party took over power in the aftermath of World War II. The second chapter consists of general considerations regarding Communist propaganda. The author clarifies the meaning of the word, its theoretical understanding as defined by previous authors, from a historical, political and sociological point of view. Denize explains the ultimate purpose of propaganda, in terms of perpetuating the regime's power, generally speaking. Specifically, the regime was interested in changing the society, its identity and collective memories, through a "cultural revolution" which aimed at creating the "new man." Only under such conditions could its power be absolute. The regime demanded control of the minds, as its most important prerequisite for perpetuating absolute power.

The third chapter refers to the organizational structure of the propaganda apparatus. The central core was the Agitation and Propaganda Section (APS) of the Central Committee, but the decisions were made at a higher level, by the Politburo. The APS was responsible for applying the leadership's decisions, for supervising all publications or other mass information instruments, and for instructing other state or party bodies. Denize describes with great accuracy the entire structure of APS and other institutions or departments working in education, publishing, arts, media, libraries, etc. Practically there was no field of social or political life escaping propaganda control. Further on, the author discusses the means and

methods used by propaganda. Agitation was divided in many categories: written, spoken, visual, and was performed by agitators, party members with special responsibilities in the field. Education and media were the most important instruments of propaganda, except for party organs, which is why party control was very strict in these areas.

The last chapter is dedicated to the content of propaganda. In order to increase its efficiency, propaganda employed themes and subjects inspired by the daily life. So, contrary to what people may think, propaganda was not a rigid and static organism, but rather dynamic, always active, always ready to incorporate new information, new experiences in its framework. Propaganda was describing a permanent social conflict, with “enemies” rising up everywhere, wishing to destroy the “revolutionary conquests of the working class.” The state of conflict, of threat, of danger, required vigilance, excused abuses and, above all, left reason behind. Denize presents all these narratives, studies and compares them. He removes their metaphors and slogans out of the context, for a lucid analysis meant to reveal their purpose. The book is therefore a valuable mixture of description and analysis, useful both to the researcher and to the common reader. The author sees the Communists’ fight for power against the Romanian society in terms of repression and persuasion, as he states in his conclusions. The repression tried to destroy physical resistance and persuasion tried to destroy moral resistance. Propaganda was their understanding of “persuasion.”

After having studied the entire press and other publications, as well as the documents available in the archives of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, Eugen Denize managed to put together one of the most important books on propaganda published in Romania. Its 280 pages are an original work, from a historical perspective, in an area where historians still have much to say.

Cezar Stanciu

ADRIAN-SILVAN IONESCU, *Regina Maria și America*, Noi Media Print, București, 358 pp.

Si le panthéon de la mythologie historique roumaine, avec ses héros et ses vaincus, ses moments de gloire et ses batailles perdues, se cristallisa à la fin du XIX^e siècle, l’histoire justifiant alors l’action politique du présent, l’entrée des images publiques des membres de la nouvelle famille régnante, les Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, se fit surtout autour de trois dates commémoratives : le Jubilé de quarante ans de règne du roi Carol I^{er} (1906) ; les cérémonies du couronnement du

roi Ferdinand I^{er} et de la reine Marie à Alba Julia (15 octobre 1922) et l'intense propagande du « Culte de la Dynastie », démarrée en 1934 en vue du centenaire de la naissance du roi Carol I^{er} en 1939.

Pour la reine Marie (1875-1938), 1922, avec ses innombrables cérémonies et publications lui rendant hommage, fut l'année qui consacra son personnage : celui de la reine guerrière, menant l'épopée de la réalisation de la Grande Roumanie. Si la passion de jeunesse de la princesse Marie pour la décoration était peu connue en dehors des cercles qui gravitaient autour de la Cour, elle n'est devenue un objet d'étude que ces vingt dernières années. En revanche, sa farouche volonté que la Roumanie rejoigne les armées de l'Entente, son entrée victorieuse aux côtés de son époux à Bucarest le 1^{er} décembre 1918 et surtout la preuve de son courage lorsqu'elle visita les tranchées et organisa la mise en place d'hôpitaux de campagne changèrent complètement la stature du personnage. Son rôle ne se limitait plus au protocolaire et dépassait celui d'une reine consort connue pour sa beauté et son assurance : elle prenait une part directe dans la grande histoire.

Elle avait conscience de l'importance des grandes cérémonies qui marquent la vie d'un pays et de l'influence de l'image de ses héros, sachant que la sienne en bénéficierait grandement. Cela grâce à son éducation, même incomplète, qu'elle avait reçue dans sa jeunesse et grâce aux idées qui lui furent ensuite inculquées par la Cour à son arrivée en Roumanie, surtout par le roi Carol et la reine Elisabeth, malgré l'image d'un continuel conflit qui persiste dans l'historiographie roumaine. Du couronnement, le 15 octobre 1922, elle décida les moindres détails, allant jusqu'à dessiner sa couronne et ses robes avec l'aide du peintre Costin Petrescu. L'événement intensément médiatisé à l'étranger lui attira une notoriété considérable qu'elle mit au profit du pays par des nombreuses visites à caractère officiel ou privé, comme celle aux États-Unis qui fait le sujet de ce remarquable volume.

Après sa disparition le 18 juin 1938, qui provoqua une très grande émotion, elle demeura une figure très populaire pendant encore une décennie ou deux et cela malgré la destruction de ses effigies par le régime communiste installé en 1948. Ses portraits peints et sculptés, quand ils ne furent pas anéantis, furent enfouis dans les réserves des musées d'où ils devaient ne jamais ressortir. Le régime interdit aussi toute référence à son œuvre littéraire classée dans des fonds de bibliothèques spéciaux inaccessibles. Quand son nom était mentionné, fait rarissime, c'était généralement en relation avec de supposées frasques de jeunesse racontées par l'une des langues de vipère du Bucarest de l'entre-deux guerres, Constantin Argetoianu, cet Edmond de Goncourt à la roumaine, aux yeux de qui personne ne trouvait grâce, dont les écrits furent publiés de façon fragmentaire, isolés de leur contexte, sous l'égide de Editura Politică, qui dépendait du régime.

Cependant, lors des restitutions historiques qui suivirent les événements de 1989, sa figure resurgit. Plusieurs de ses volumes furent publiés et surtout les trois volumes de *Histoire de ma vie*, qui connut plusieurs éditions à grands tirages. On en

trouva même un quatrième, fragmentaire, publié par Diana Mandache, sans toutefois préciser son lieu de conservation. Ses autres journaux conservés aux Archives Nationales à Bucarest sont traduits et publiés, bien que de façon assez irrégulière, désordonnée et négligente, ses biographies, écrites par Hannah Pakula et Guy Gauthier, furent traduites et parurent en roumain, des expositions, de valeur certes très inégale, l'évoquent presque chaque année, pour ne pas citer les innombrables thèses de doctorat ou mémoires d'étude. Sa maison de Balci, Tenka Juvah, est devenue lieu de pèlerinage pour les touristes roumains. Parmi les auteurs de ses évocations on retrouve des historiens d'horizons très différents, des historiens et historiens d'art professionnels, des amateurs et d'autres qui, avant 1989, ne manquèrent de dénigrer le personnage avec virulence, mais se disent à présent ses plus farouches admirateurs, comme Ioan Scurtu ou Vasile Arimia ! Une nouvelle image, peut-être plus sereine, plus proche du rôle qu'elle joua est en train de naître.

Regina Maria și America, que nous propose Adrian-Silvan Ionescu, est une édition annotée du journal du voyage américain de la reine (18 octobre – 24 novembre 1926). Le texte du journal proprement dit est précédé d'une première partie comprenant une introduction qui fait le point sur les ouvrages, articles ou biographies de la souveraine, qui présentèrent ou simplement citèrent ce voyage (pp. 9-15) ; dix chapitres consacrés à la préparation du voyage (chapitre I, pp. 15-28), au début du voyage (chapitre II, pp. 29-32), à la traversée de l'océan à bord du *Leviathan* (chapitre III, pp. 33-37), à l'Amérique (chapitre IV, pp. 38-56), au Canada (chapitre V, pp. 57-60), aux Indiens (pp. 61-70), à la reine Marie et à la radio américaine (chapitre VII, pp. 71-76), aux Américains écrivant à la reine Marie (chapitre VIII, pp. 77-88), à son voyage vers l'Europe sur le *Berengaria* (chapitre IX, pp. 89-93), à son retour en Roumanie (chapitre X, pp. 94-103).

Ces dix chapitres ont pour but de compléter le texte du journal proprement dit, car ils reprennent la riche correspondance en grande partie inédite, à présent aux Archives Nationales, fonds Regina Maria – Personale, entre la reine et sa grande amie, Loïe Fuller, avec le magnat Sam Hill, ou encore les rapports des diplomates roumains chargés de l'organisation de cette tournée qui s'avéra fort difficile, où jalousies et coups bas entrecoupèrent cérémonies grandioses et rencontres officielles. Les détails sur les membres de sa suite et sur les rencontres de la souveraine foisonnent et sont d'autant plus intéressants que beaucoup sont oubliés aujourd'hui. Ils aident à reconstruire avec plus de précision l'atmosphère d'une cour royale au début du XX^e siècle.

L'auteur accorde une importance toute particulière aux rencontres de la reine Marie avec les Indiens. Très passionnée par le cinéma, amie de Mary Pickford, qui lui rendit même visite à Sinaïa, la reine souhaita rencontrer de vrais indiens et son désir fut exaucé. Elle fut reçue par le chef Sioux Red Tomhawk qui en signe de reconnaissance pour ses faits de bravoure pendant la Première Guerre mondiale lui offrit une parure en plume d'aigle et la nomma Winyan Kipanpi Win [La femme qu'on appelle].

Très intéressants et assurément divertissants sont les fragments tirés des innombrables lettres, certaines reproduites en annexe (pp. 240-350), de divers correspondants, pour la plupart inconnus, qui suggèrent à la reine d'intervenir à la radio, souhaitent la rencontrer, l'invitent à visiter leurs maisons, lui demandent une faveur, une photo avec autographe. Certains lui firent des présents somptueux, modestes ou même farfelus. La factrice de Sylvan Grove, Texas, n'hésite même pas à lui demander les vêtements qu'elle ne porte plus, en s'obligeant à supporter le coût de leurs envois vers les États-Unis. L'une des missives les plus désopilantes ne lui était pas directement adressée, mais à Crag, son cocker, de la part d'un autre chien appelé Woh tee shias nue [la fillette], lui prodiguant multiples conseils, accompagnés de ses salutations canines. La reine amusée n'hésita pas à répondre. Toute cette correspondance malgré son caractère anecdotique est la preuve de l'énorme popularité créée par les médias autour de la visite de la souveraine.

Nous ne nous attarderons pas sur le texte du journal afin de laisser le plaisir de le découvrir aux lecteurs, mais remarquons toutefois la qualité non seulement de sa traduction et sa transcription, mais aussi des notices biographiques, très complètes, de personnes parfois complètement inconnues de nos jours.

Les carnets manuscrits du journal de la reine sont toujours richement illustrés par des photos, articles de presse ou lettres reçues. Désirant sans doute épouser l'esprit de l'original, Adrian-Silvan Ionescu reproduit, à presque chaque page, un instantané de cette visite, des photos des hôtels ou de la suite royale, des caricatures, ou plus rarement des fac-similés des manuscrits. Une bibliographie sélective clôt le volume.

Cette remarquable édition du voyage de la reine Marie aux États-Unis en 1926, dans une présentation graphique de très haute qualité, grâce sans doute à l'exigence commune de l'éditeur, Noi Media Print, et de l'auteur, impose d'emblée cet ouvrage comme un exemple à suivre pour les auteurs qui se consacrent à des moments importants de l'histoire roumaine.

Gabriel Badea-Păun

L.E. SEMIONOVA, *Kniažestva Valahia i Moldavija. Konets XIV – načalo XIX v. Ocerki vnešnepolitieskoj istorii*, Izd. Indrik, Moskva, 2006, 400 pp. + 21 ill.

The increasingly frequent practice among Romanian historians to gather in one volume papers and studies published by an author in a lifetime, which seems to have extended to historians in the Russian Federation as well, can offer a good and honest insight into abilities demonstrated at various times and in various publications.

The present book is all the more interesting as the author, Lidia Egorovna Semionova, is a competent and resilient researcher of Romanian-Russian relations in medieval and modern times. This highly respected historian has been a researcher at the Institute of Slavistics (and Balkanistics, until 1998) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and a member of several mixed commissions of historians from Russia and Romania.

The present volume gathers 14 studies on political relations between Russia and the Romanian Principalities from the late fourteenth century until 1821, and on the international political and juridical statute of Moldavia and Wallachia in the same period.

The first nine studies are mainly investigations into medieval history. Issues approached include: *The Capitulations in Historiography* (pp. 21-30); *Origin of the Capitulations* (pp. 31-65); *Establishment of Wallachia's Vassalage to the Porte* (pp. 67-77); *Moldavia's International Stand during the Ottoman Expansion of the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century* (pp. 78-111); *Increasing Ottoman Influence in Wallachia in the Sixteenth Century* (pp. 112-126); *The Fall into Vassalage to the Ottoman Empire of the Feudal State of Moldavia* (p. 127-167); *The Role of the Danubian Principalities in the Relations of Central and South-East European Countries with the Ottoman Empire, End of the Sixteenth Century – First Half of the Seventeenth Century* (pp. 168-209); *Political Contacts between Russia and the Danubian Principalities in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century* (pp. 210-231), *Moldavia and Wallachia on the Background of International Relations in East and South-East Europe in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century* (pp. 232-265).

Quite noteworthy is Semionova's detailed analysis of Russian-Romanian relations in the early eighteenth century (pp. 266-309), especially as the relations of Peter I to the Romanian princes of the time, Constantin Brâncoveanu and, particularly, Dimitrie Cantemir, as well as the Prut campaign of 1711, which ended in a clear defeat of the Russian army and its Moldavian allies, have been rarely approached in Russian historiography. No less interesting is Semionova's approach to a cliché introduced in Romanian and Russian historiography during the first years of communism (1955-1965), namely to the theory of the "Romanian-Russian alliance of 1710," promoted by M. Roller and his partisans, a distorted interpretation of the real political and juridical nature of the diploma granted by Peter I to Cantemir at Lutsk (1-13 April 1711), a document which could under no circumstances be considered a bilateral treaty of alliance concluded by the two parties on an equal footing.

However, several errors of interpretation can be noted, especially as the bibliography does not include writings on this topic published after 1972. Therefore, one cannot agree with the interpretation of Constantin Brâncoveanu's elusive attitude of 1711 as being due to an increased surveillance by the Turks limiting his possibilities to act. Unfortunately, as already pointed out by prominent

historians such as N. Iorga, P. Panait, N. Stoicescu, P. Cernovodeanu, etc., the Wallachian prince's conduct stemmed from the duplicity of his character, and not from any hypothetical increase in Turkish surveillance. As known, although supplies had been paid for by Peter I and stored at Maxineni (Department of Brăila), the Wallachian Prince withdrew them at the last moment and, with a small military band, took a strategic position "at Urlați, towards the mountains," to wait out the hostilities. Subsequently, Brâncoveanu returned the money to the tsar and, as a "faithful *raya*," sent out provisions to the victorious vizier Mehmed Baltagi-pasha. Unfortunately, this is the historical truth about this deceitful Wallachian prince, whose tragic fate is also mentioned in the paper.

The second study presents a modern approach to the consequences and effects of the Russian-Turkish wars on the Romanian society (pp. 266-309), and to the place held by the Romanian Principalities in Russia's expansionist policy in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Semionova believes that in the last two clashes with the Porte (1768-1774; 1787-1792), Russia had no real intention to annex the two Romanian Principalities. Even if delegations of the local nobility pleaded on several occasions for "protection from the illustrious monarch" (whether spurred on by the occupation forces or not), the explanation provided by the historian seems quite plausible: too many difficulties would have ensued for Catherine II on the international background from such annexation. On the other hand, a buffer state virtually under Russian influence (1774 is the year of reference) was a good means to avoid a direct clash with Austria, and to allow full access to the north-Pontic littoral and a borderline to the Dniester in the last war of the century. With these targets achieved and under complicated international circumstances (the French Revolution, the successive partitions of Poland, etc.), Russia would limit direct action and resort to means recently made available: the consulates newly created in the Romanian Principalities and legislative protection offered to the Romanians by interference with the Porte's policy. From this point of view, Semionova's analysis is quite objective, her narration viable, and the picture painted historically correct.

The closing section of the volume includes contributions to *The Position of the Danubian Principalities in the International Relations in Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (pp. 344-359), *Constantine Ypsilantis and the First Revolt of the Serbs (1804 – August 1807)* (pp. 360-375), and *The 1821 Revolt in Wallachia and in Russia (Several Aspects)*. A coincidence in research interests prompts me to dwell on the first and third topics. I would note here that the terminology of events has been updated (the hattı-sheriffs of 1802 are not regarded anymore as Russian-Turkish bilateral treaties), and that Semionova's interpretation of events coincides with my recent opinions regarding the outbreak of the Russian-Turkish war of 1806-1812 (unwanted by Russia) and the position of Russia (at the level of the central authority) towards the events of 1821. However, it may be important to

know that in Romanian historiography the term “revolt” was replaced with “revolution” more than three decades ago.

The study on Ypsilantis and his relations with the Serbian insurgents during the three years of the movement has remained unchallenged by any subsequent research work on the issue, although published by Semionova in Belgrade almost a quarter of a century ago, more exactly in 1983, to the best of my knowledge.

Two surprising discrepancies should be nonetheless noted: the bibliography listing Romanian contributions to the topics was updated only for the first 6 studies in the book; and, against common practice, no indication of the source or year in which the studies were initially published is given.

Published in Moscow by the Indrik publishing house, the present book has excellent graphics and includes 21 illustrations of the period, a list of abbreviations, an index of special terms, and an index of proper nouns.

The book is quite commendable and illustrative of the research activity of Lidia Egorovna Semionova, a distinguished Russian historian.

Marian Stroia

STELIAN TĂNASE, *Cioran și Securitatea*, Edit. Polirom, Iași, 2010, 356 pp.

Stelian Tănase’s book gathers documents from the Archives of the Romanian Intelligence Service and the Archive of the National Council for Investigation of the Archives of the Securitate on Emil Cioran, starting with World War Two (1941-1942) through the postwar period (1949-1951, 1954-1961, 1963-1969).

These documents show a pervading interest of the Securitate in Cioran stemming not so much from the notoriety of his past as a supporter of the extreme right in interwar Romania, as from the possibility of identifying through him connections among members of the Diaspora, and between the Diaspora and people in Romania. This interest was all the more vivid as the monitoring of Cioran was instrumental to anticipating and/or preventing activities by the members of the Diaspora liable to blacken or discredit the regime abroad.

After the surveillance, arrest and trial of family members – his brother Aurel Cioran, sentenced in 1948 for legionary activities, and subsequently his sister Virginia Cioran, deported to the Danube-Black Sea Canal – a “local surveillance” file would be opened on 14 January 1954 for Emil Cioran, who had been living in Paris since 1939. According to this file, Cioran appears to have been monitored since 1951, by strict surveillance of his correspondence with his parents and through reports on his life in the capital of France.

A year later, in August 1955, Cioran was placed under “surveillance at country level” under the code name of “Ciobanu,” and in March 1965, his file was turned into a “personal surveillance” file by the Direction of Foreign Intelligence. His circle of friends and acquaintances in Romania was infiltrated with informers and his personal correspondence was drastically monitored. In February 1968, against the backdrop of rekindled bilateral relations between France and Romania, the decision was reached to close his file, although disparate informative notes and reports continued to be written, Cioran being attributed now the two additional code names of “Chiru” and “Ene.”

Apart from quasi-hilarious passages in agreement with the profile created by authorities in Bucharest, the informative notes speak of the recognition of Cioran’s merits in French academic milieus. The author of one such note “*fully condemns the critical, non-scientific and non-patriotic, even injurious attitude towards our people,*” to subsequently admit that Cioran was “acknowledged as one of the greatest European essay writers, with considerable influence in the French cultural circles.” It may be interesting to note that many of the authors of these notes, judging by the writing, must have been close acquaintances of Cioran.

Quite surprisingly, Cioran appears to have continued to be monitored by the Securitate after the events of December 1989, his file being closed only on 5 May 1990 (*sic!*). Thus, the top secret document A-6/005553/15, issued by UM X-609 and reproduced entirely, includes a proposal to “close the informative action of influence” regarding “Ene,” an individual of Romanian nationality with French citizenship, professor of philosophy residing in Paris (“*taken into preoccupation (sic!) in 1981, within the operation ‘Recuperation’*”), now aged 79, as “at present Ene is of no operative interest to our unit.”

The long term objective of the regime in Bucharest was to “recuperate” Cioran and lure him back into the country one way or another, propagandistically, in order to endorse the Romanian political regime. Similar efforts targeted Mircea Eliade and Eugen Ionesco, to no avail, as neither ever returned to Romania.

Published by Polirom, the present book is a valuable contribution to the issue of how Emil Cioran was seen by the authorities in Bucharest, whose interest (surveillance) in this philosopher never wavered through the postwar decades, until May 1990.

Radu Tudorancea