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Twentieth century dictatorships and/or totalitarian regimes (with all the necessary conceptual and methodological explanations attached to the use of these problematic notions) have represented objects of specific historical, cultural, media or social approaches in the last decades. However, the development of contemporary research within Human and Social Sciences towards interdisciplinary approaches and especially the development of Cultural Studies (placing such topics at the border between history, media, arts, sociology and political sciences) have shown that beyond investigating individual phenomena, collective projects are equally necessary and useful – bringing together the expertise of the several fields mentioned earlier and attempting to understand the complexity and the multileveled implications of these totalitarian/dictatorial regimes.

This collective work aims to compare media (and in particular cultural press) in Francoist Spain and Communist Romania, placing the two opposing paradigms in a common approach with the intention to identify common patterns and intricate connections between them, without ignoring, at the same time, their radical differences. The volume is particularly interested in the manner in which press (and especially cultural press and the culture as mirrored by it) manifested within two European dictatorial/totalitarian regimes.

In designing the volume, we started from the idea that while maintaining the features of individual approaches (specialised in history, cultural studies, media or literature), the volume can also represent an attempt to approach two such individual regimes – Francoism and Communism - from a comparative perspective. This comparison is performed both implicitly (by offering the academic frame to a series of case studies from both regimes) and explicitly (by several chapters focusing on the general methodological implications of such a comparison, as well as on the similarities present at the functional level – the similarities and differences between Francoist Spain and Communist Romania in the development of totalitarian/dictatorial propagandistic systems).

The volume focused on the importance of media (and, as a particular example, cultural press) for these regimes (although the complexity of both phenomena taken individually and the multiple level of their possible
comparison offer several interesting prospective frameworks). The choice is justified by the fact that media represented if not the main tool then definitely one of the most significant among those used by a regime to communicate its ideological message, to implement and/or justify its policies, as well as create and maintain the illusion of its legitimacy, while imposing its specific models and identity patterns, shape mentalities and level all opposition. Media established, thus, specific persuasive and propagandistic relations, while mirroring the dynamics of policies and ideological approaches, of international politics and relations as well as the manner in which culture (and intellectuals, cultural project and events in particular) was being affected by censorship (and political control). For contemporary research, press also represents a privileged element in approaching totalitarian and/or dictatorial regimes due to its dynamic (through its total or partial simultaneity to the events) as well as its complex character (through its textual and visual language).

The contributors to this volume – mainly Spanish and Romanian scholars – are approaching several aspects of media in relation to politics, propaganda, historical or social aspects in the two regimes, based on their academic background: history (mainly), cultural studies, media and literature.

This collection is divided into three thematic sections, approaching the areas of Francoist and respectively Communist phenomena in relation to press, culture and censorship from several different angles. This first section plays the role to introduce the debate, while its authors create the historical, theoretical and methodological basis for the further discussions and case studies. Thus, the first section focuses – in a reflexive manner – on a direct comparison performed at the theoretical level between the two phenomena, drawing parallels, acknowledging differences and difficulties as well as inquiring on the limits of such historical (Àlex Amaya Quer and Manuela Marin), methodological, theoretical (Florin Abraham) or functional comparisons (Amaya Quer). Without ignoring the difficulty of periodisation (although initially the volume was meant to focus on the same decade, the fifties), the particular researches have revealed that it is necessary to approach these phenomena based on their functional features, their inner mechanisms as reflected by media (and discussed in the same analytic framework) rather than remain at the level of analysing a certain period and thus their contextualised differences.

The second section of the volume is devoted to Francoism as reflected in controlled media, as well as the evolution of the latter in relation to the instalment of the dictatorship. Evans Pim revisits the initial spawn of totalitarian/dictatorial thought in Spanish Press during the World War I
and Pro-German Press in Spanish periodicals so as to account the initial state of Fascism and Francoism in Spain. With the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War and the settlement of Francoism, censorship apparatus and the limitations over the publishing industry were defining factors in the construction of a new totalitarian/dictatorial cultural regime, but the ideological substrate that sustained it cannot be understood without analysing such influential precedents of nationalist and conservative press at the local and regional level. Rubén Jarazo Álvarez attempts to illustrate with his contribution the only surviving literature published in the Spanish periodicals (1936-1975), the main mechanisms to avoid censorship, as well as the strategy that many peripheral communities within the Spanish state used to preserve their literary traditions and languages in the press.

Cultural unity and homogeneity was strongly emphasized specially during the years after the war. In order to survive, autochthonous cultures had to resort to foreign media, as Adrian Healy proves in a process defined as the Internationalization of Galician Press, violently suppressed by Francoist censorship. However, in the final years of Francoism, some cultural openness was reflected in the Spanish periodical Press, especially to the news and publications related to the American Culture.

The analysis of the media during Francoism (with extensions in the media phenomena preceding or announcing it) allowed us to approach the Spanish society of the time, which inevitably reflects the social, political and ideological situation of the Spanish state after the Civil War. Its analysis is essential to discern not only the impact of censorship in Spanish publications, but also the limitations suffered on peripheral communities such as Galicia, Catalonia and the Basque Country, as well as a thermometer of the cultural reality during Francoist regime and its openness to European cultures. After the most difficult years in Spain during the forties and fifties, the new agreements with the American government helped to recover some economic stability in Spain. That stability was also reflected in the media, mirroring a new social and cultural reality in the periodicals. But that apparent cultural openness was, however, a delusion in the cultural sphere, a delusion that could not break apart from the strict censorship in Francoist Spain, as Maria Luz Arroyo and Elena Domínguez Romero posed in their respective contributions.

The third and final section is devoted to Communist Romania (especially under Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, in the 1950s, but also with references, when necessary, to the prior or further evolution of media in relation to the installment of totalitarianism/communist dictatorship). After World War II the Romanian cultural press became part of the propaganda apparatus, together with all media. The political monopoly imposed a
unique discourse, which had to be reflected by every article on culture, art or education, prose and poetry, literary or art criticism. Moreover, the unified political convictions had to be revealed by the reproduction of enthusiastic interviews with artists or transcriptions of their official meetings, a sort of (t)stimulated cultural debates, conventional, stereotypical language replacing a real cultural effervescence. Thus, culture did no longer perform a “live recording” of real cultural phenomena but rather described a convention. Cultural press mirrored the complex mechanisms of propaganda of spreading the official discourse and cultural policies (the latter presented by the periodicals, which reproduced extensively decrees and laws referring to culture).

The section includes a series of specific analyses and case studies referring to the manner in which political control and propaganda manifested within press, in particular cultural periodicals but also in other cultural environments (such as libraries). In a paper suggesting the title of the volume (“Periodicals, Propaganda and Politics in Romanian Culture: Media Discourse Strategies in the 1950s Romanian Cultural Periodicals. Case Study: Flacăra and Contemporanul”), Andra Fătu-Tutoveanu approaches the emergence and evolution in 1950s Romanian cultural press of specific discursive strategies associated to political manipulation and propaganda, following the Soviet model. Manuela Marin focuses on the female identity patterns associated with political propaganda and official discourse and promoted by the rural women’s magazine, Săteanca, within the same decade. Andi Mihalache approaches, from the perspective of the contemporary historian, the manner in which specialised press such as the History periodical Studii (1954-1964) was used by the regime as a space for promoting official policies and propaganda discourse. Censorship, as a recurrent phenomenon in relation to cultural manifestations and especially to media as important political tools, is also studied by Ruxandra Moaşă Nazare in a chapter focusing on local press. She approaches the evolution of local periodicals from the early 1940s towards their appropriation by communism (and particularly the evolution of Gazeta Transilvaniei, chosen for a case study as it was one of the oldest and more important Romanian local periodicals). Dealing with the early 1940s, the approach is however relevant and useful for this volume because beyond the particular phenomenon it offers an element of comparison with the late 1940s communist censorship practices, revealing the evolution and persistence of censorship and control mechanisms and patterns within different regimes (more significantly when the comparison refers to the succession of dictatorial regimes in the same decade and the same country). Finally, an interesting extension from periodicals to larger press and book funds and
library archives (as specifically treated by the regime in Communist Romania) is achieved by Daniel Nazare in his paper *Press, Libraries and Secret Funds in Romania (1945-1989). Case Study*. The study discusses the mechanisms of censorship in relation to purge, prohibition (or even burning of books) as well as the specific practice of creating “secret funds” for a selection of books and archived periodicals. The approaches in this section aim therefore to offer a perspective on the communist censorship and control practices applied to press and in the same time a space, at a micro level, for debating and comparing patterns and mechanisms individually or in a larger framework.

The volume intends thus to suggest - through its collection of general, comparative and analytic chapters, as well as through this new approach on two political and cultural phenomena traditionally studied only as opposing paradigms – the need for a larger debate on the potential of approaching these phenomena under a common framework.

—*The Editors*
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PART I:

COMPARING FRANCOISM AND COMMUNISM
Francoism: Origins and Nature

Franco’s dictatorship emerged in full force in April 1939 after the final victory of the nationalist or rebel side in the Spanish Civil War. This side consisted of civilian and military forces that had rebelled against the authority of the Second Republic almost three years before, and its success made possible the establishment in Spain of a forty years dictatorship led by General Francisco Franco Bahamonde. The failure of the coup, started in the Canary Islands and North Africa on 17 and 18 July 1936, resulted in a civil conflict that led to more than 500,000 deaths (Ortega Silvestre 2005), counting the victims of the military actions on the front, the political repression in the rearguard, the bombing of civilian population, and the famine and epidemics that hit vast areas of the country. Francisco Franco held absolute power from October 1, 1936, when he became Head of State and Generalísimo of all the armies on the rebel side, until his death on November 20, 1975. His political profile followed the characteristics of his military tactics: he had pursued a strategy of war characterised by a cautious and slow progress - due not only to his nineteenth-century concept of the art of war (Cardona 2006), but also to his interest in consolidating his personal power and systematising an intense repression policy in the conquered territories. Similarly, in politics Franco slowly built a personal dictatorship which was never fully institutionalised. Even though it lasted nearly four decades, the dictatorship relied so much on Franco’s political persona that it eventually disappeared just a year after the dictator died.

At the end of the civil war the Francoist New State had a well-defined profile which remained almost unchanged until the end of the dictatorship. This meant the existence of a leader with unlimited power who was the
Francoism and Communism: A Historical Approach

Head of State, of the Government and of the Armed Forces; a single party -FET y de las JONS- under the command of a National Chief who was no other than Franco himself; a group of framework organisations such as the Spanish Trade Union Organisation, the Women’s Section and the Youth Front, devised to control, indoctrinate and mobilise different sectors of society; a close collaboration between the regime and the Catholic Church, which legitimised the dictatorship until the early seventies; a formidable repressive apparatus responsible for tens of thousands of executions and for a horrific constellation of concentration camps which held hundreds of thousands of citizens, many of whom died of starvation, torture or as a consequence of the inhumane prison conditions (Molinero, Sala and Sobrequés 2003); and a far-reaching apparatus of propaganda and censorship intended to establish a totalitarian system of press and communication based on the models of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. Although the structure created around Franco contained different right-wing attitudes and degrees of attachment, from the overt and genuine fascism of the falangists to the Bourbon monarchists or the Carlist traditionalists, a fact that conditioned the internal balance of the dictatorship, the basic similarities between all these political families were sufficient to maintain the authoritarian and undemocratic essence of the dictatorship over four decades.

That need to ensure this sustainable balance determined the notable lack of institutionalisation of the dictatorship, unlike other totalitarian or authoritarian regimes. Franco forced a slow institutional configuration of his regime; keeping the different ideological sectors that helped him rise to power sufficiently satisfied – or not too unhappy – so that they would not rebel. Such an internal rebellion would have threatened the survival of a regime that in 1945 had really feared for its very existence. Thus the Franco regime itself was organised by ambiguous fundamental laws, without ever enacting a constitution. Moreover, the establishment of FET y de las JONS in April 1937, uniting in one single party all the trends that had supported the coup of July 1936 or the configuration of the Spanish Trade Union Organisation in 1939-1940 followed the same pattern. This led to tension and anxiety among the political class which was at the service of Franco, for example because of the fact that he did not appoint a successor, the current King Juan Carlos of Bourbon, until 1969. But this also prevented dramatic ruptures, and ensured not only the survival of the dictatorship during the change of the international system that took place after 1945, despite the birthmark of its alliance with Hitler and Mussolini, but also its continuity deep into the second half of the twentieth century without changing in the least its undemocratic essences.
Presently a historiographic debate regarding the nature of Franco’s dictatorship is troubling historians. Was Franco’s regime a fascist one or was it not? Similarly to the analysis of the historical events in Romania in December 1989, which orbits around the question of whether or not they were a revolution, historians specialising in the Francoist dictatorship have spent more than three decades locked in a debate that goes beyond the semantic meaning of words and which itself involves the discussion on whether to include Franco’s regime within the framework of twentieth century totalitarianism. The authors who defend the characterisation of Francoism as a fascist regime insist that fascism – as a phenomenon – took different shapes in its embodiments. Even Italy and Germany, the epitomes of fascism, did not share exactly the same characteristics and therefore Spain would represent a different but genuine application of fascist ideology, specifically a Catholic-traditionalist and corporative one due to its historical evolution and social structure (Morodo 1985; Germani 1975). Other authors also claim that the regime in its early years revealed its obvious fascist nature, and that this was disguised later by the imperatives of the international context after World War II, a fact that would not be sufficient to remove the label of totalitarian when analysing the Francoist dictatorship (Fontana 1986). After all, it was the only system of its kind to survive World War II.

Another perspective equates Franco’s regime with other European fascisms in its classist goal of defence of capitalism against the threat of Bolshevism, and notes that the counter-revolutionary alliance responsible for carrying it out was very similar in Germany, Italy and Spain (Casanova 1992). In a similar vein, some historians have identified for the entire tenure of the regime the usual elements of fascist totalitarianism, in both its structure and propagandistic speech, taking into account its differences from other historical examples (Molinero and Ysás 1992). However, other scholars have characterized Franco’s regime as a personal dictatorship tinged with fascist elements in its repressive apparatus (Elorza 1988) or simply as a military dictatorship of a traditional type (Pérez Ledesma 1994; Sánchez Recio 1996). More recently, it has been argued that the apparent fascistisation in some characteristic elements of the Francoist dictatorship is not enough to justify its inclusion in the group of European fascism. These authors note the lack of strength of the most openly fascist actors in the reactionary coalition that brought Franco to power – the original Falange; the lack of attempts to build an active popular consensus, as opposed to its policy of annihilation against its political rivals (Molinero 2003); the artificiality of FET y de las JONS as a single party; the absence of a clearly fascist official ideology; and the smaller
capacity of interventionism on civil society in comparison with Germany and Italy (Thomás 2001; Saz 2004). These discussions are still alive and should be taken into account when dealing with topics such as politics and propaganda press in Spain, or Franco’s relationship with the cultural environment, and even more when designing a comparative approach with other totalitarian regimes, such as the case of Romania.

Greater consensus among historians – both from Spain and from other countries – has been generated by the analysis of Franco’s regime as a brutal dictatorship that caused the killing, torture or exile of hundreds of thousands of citizens, and understood liberal democracy as an obsolete and outdated formula that had to be destroyed. The illegitimacy of the Franco dictatorship is marked by its origins in a barbaric civil war which was the result of a coup against a democratic government. Despite recent revisionist attempts – totally rejected by the academic world, though highly publicized by some types of media – which try to blame the unstable republican order and the leftist political parties for the outbreak of the war of 1936-1939 (Moa 1999; 2009), the specialized and respected historiography agrees to analyse the Francoist dictatorship under the prism of its brutality and undemocratic nature which was incapable of reforming itself. This includes a relationship with the press and culture that sought to make a clean sweep with the previous liberal traditions, searching for a totalitarian homogenisation by eliminating the cultural representations from the peripheral regions and making the most of the conservative ideological foundations of the pre-existing press. To identify the depth and consequences of that relationship, whether labelled as totalitarian or authoritarian, proves absolutely necessary in order to analyse correctly the society, politics and culture in the current constitutional Spain, and to enrich comparative perspectives with respect to other countries’ history, which have also experienced traumatic dictatorships and complex processes of democratic transition.

Communism: The Beginnings (1945-1964)

The Communist Party of Romania11 (CPR) played an insignificant role in Romanian political life until August 1944. Soon after its creation in 1921, CPR became an illegal party, preserving this status during the interwar period. Among the factors contributing to its political marginalisation there were the limited number of members (2,000 in the most optimistic statistics), the existence of several factions among its leaders and last but not least the strict control Moscow exerted over the party and its political direction. This subordination of the Communist
Party of Romania to the Soviet interests had limited furthermore the former’s social basis, this being perceived as an instrument of a foreign and constantly hostile power (King 1980, 9-38, Tismăneanu 2005, 67-106). Following the coup of 23 August 1944, to which CPR made its own contribution, Romania abandoned the Nazi Germany ally position and continued by fighting alongside the Allies until their final victory. However, Romania was soon occupied by Soviet troops. The presence of the latter on Romanian territory as well as the role the Soviet Union played in Romania since August 1944 strengthened the political status of the CPR (King 1980, 39-47, Tismăneanu 2005, 107-109).

The following period, until the instalment on March 6, 1945, of the first communist government led by Petru Groza, was marked by permanent government instability generated by the attempts made by CPR representatives to take control over the state apparatus. After the establishment of the government led by Petru Groza, the communists gained control over all levels of power consolidating their position within some key ministries (Internal Affairs, Justice, Economy). They managed to achieve – due to an apparent fraud of the November 19, 1946 elections – the majority within the Romanian Parliament. Simultaneously, the arrestment of the opponents of the CPR focused especially on the members or supporters of the so-called Romanian historical parties (The Liberal and respectively The Peasants’ Party). Later, in the summer of 1947, all political parties opposing the instalment of the CPR were dissolved, with the exception of the Social Democrat Party, which merged with CPR in February 1948, creating together the Romanian Workers’ Party (RWP) (Ionescu 1994, 124-173).

At the end of 1947, the last obstacle faced by the communists in their attempt to take total control was the institution of monarchy. Blackmailed to resign, the last king of Romania, Michael I, signed the Abdication Act on December 30, 1947 and left the country into exile. The forced abdication of the last Romanian king meant not only a change of political leadership but also a change of political regime. Thus, Romania became the Romanian People’s Republic [Republica Populară Română] and had a new, Soviet-inspired constitution, which made official the political domination and control of the unique party, the Romanian Workers’ Party, over all areas of political, social and economic life (Deletant 1997:61-68).

The control imposed by the RWP made it possible to initiate a programme in order to transform the country following the Soviet model. Thus, the nationalisation of industry was followed by the imposing of a centralised model for economic development. This meant a centralised control of the economic resources and their use according to some
priorities decided by the national development medium-term plan. In addition, the early 1950s First Five Years Plan, inspired by the Soviet experience, included a massive investment into heavy industry at the expense of agriculture, consumer goods industry and public services. The next step in the socialist transformation of the country concerned the collectivisation of agriculture. Announced in March 1949, this new direction in “developing the country” caused a concentration of agricultural land in the newly created collective or state farms (King 1980, 53-54).

Within these farms, labour was provided by the same farmers who – more or less forced – gave up their lands and agricultural inventory in favour of collective farms. Moreover, in order to strengthen its monopoly over the Romanian society, the RWP sought to establish control over education, religious and secular organisations, and, last but not least, over the Romanian intelligentsia. The communisation of education meant subordinating it to the political and ideological goals of the new regime. The emphasis placed on the industrial development model favoured technical education at the expense of the Humanities, while the adoption of Marxism-Leninism as the official state ideology influenced the education system and the way certain topics were taught. In addition, the political alliance with the Soviet Union led to a process of sovietisation of the public and cultural life. A series of streets, cities or towns have been given Russian or Soviet names, Romanian-Soviet institutions were created and the whole national history was reinterpreted based on the positions of the party and official ideology. Historians of the new regime tried to highlight the Slavic influence on the formation of the Romanian people, the superiority of the Russian civilization as well as the so-called historical friendship that has bound the two nations over their existence (Georgescu 2008, 1-46).

The political changes have also affected the status of Romanian intelligentsia. Part of it refused to collaborate with the new regime, as a consequence being marginalized or even excluded from the Romanian cultural life. Those who embraced socialist realism (the official cultural model) and used their talents to create convincing and ideologically correct images (considered to reflect the new realities of the time) were motivated, among other things, by the privileges offered by the regime in return for such services. An important motivation was the amount of social and professional advancement opportunities offered by the regime in such circumstances, even to individuals with an insufficient educational background (Gabanyi 2001, 30-37).

Another major issue concerned religion. The interest shown by RWP to the religious organisations is explainable in the context in which the
latter, through their work, promoted alternative or even contradictory views to the atheistic, materialistic worldview promoted by the communist ideology. Still, although ideologically desirable, the prohibition of all religious manifestations would have determined significant opposition from the Romanian population. Therefore, the Romanian communist regimes chose the solution to survey and limit religious activities, in parallel with an educational and propagandistic offensive, designed to consolidate the materialist and atheist worldview.

The regimenting of the entire Romanian social life continued with the abolition of all associations which could have been immune to the influence of the RWP. They were replaced by mass and communal organisations - targeting certain social and age groups - existing and functioning under the direct leadership of the single party.

However, there was an even more ambitious project than the economical transformation and that was the creation of the new socialist man, which involved two main directions. The first was aimed at the transformation of the material life conditions by supporting the implementation of industrialisation, collectivisation of agriculture, and respectively urbanisation. Designated in Marxist terminology by the notion of structure, these changes – made according to the national plan – were supposed to proportionally influence the superstructure, the socialist consciousness of those called to contribute to building the socialist project.

Consequently, the second direction followed by the Romanian communist regime in order to create the new man targeted the process of political socialisation of the popular masses. The aim of this political socialisation was to impose a set of attitudes, beliefs, values, feelings that individuals were supposed to have towards the political regime and their officially assigned roles within the society (Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt 1969, 16-17). Political socialisation – as a process and also as the result of the internalisation of socialist norms and values – was primarily based on educational action. Education, conceived as an activity organised around the transmission and assimilation of values and norms was not reduced to the action of institutional factors represented by the school. It also aimed to continue and even deepen the specific educational principles and direction through auxiliary activities. In the case of the Romanian Communist regime, these activities involved the organisation and mass participation in official propaganda activities. Culture played an important guiding role within the latter, as it was the environment for the creation and promotion of convincing images and values of the new socialist society.
Those who refused the political and social uniformity imposed by RWP were sent to labour camps (the largest being the building site of the Danube-Black Sea Canal), prisons (an entire prison system was created, the most famous ones being at Sighet and Pitești) or were deported (forced deportations being organised for example in Banat for those identified as enemies of the regime).

Despite the official political unanimity regarding the necessity to transform the entire national structure on the Soviet model, at the political superior level (among the leaders of the RWP) a dispute took place between different factions of the party over political supremacy. Counting on Soviet support, the fraction led by the General Secretary of the Party, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, managed in 1952 to politically neutralise their rival group, led by Ana Pauker and Vasile Luca. Moreover, Gheorghiu-Dej acted against another of the party leaders, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu, who was sentenced to death in 1954, after a long detention and a mock trial. (Betea 2001).

Stalin’s death in March 1953 and the so-called Secret Report or Speech presented by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956 established new challenges for the RWP leaders. Accused by Miron Constantinescu and Iosif Chișinevski of using Stalinist methods in his political activity, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej neutralised the political attack with the help of the other Romanian party leaders. The consolidation of Gheorghiu-Dej’s position within the party, after he had supported the Soviet Union in solving the 1956 Hungarian crisis, allowed the RWP leader to eliminate his last opponents at the superior level of the party. During the plenary that took place in June-July 1957, Miron Constantinescu and Iosif Chișinevski were politically marginalised, losing all their functions within the party (Tismăneanu 2005, 173-203).

1958 was a year marked by two significant events for the evolution of the Romanian communist regime. The withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the Romanian territory, as well as the aggressive measures to finish the collectivisation process determined the tightening of the internal security measures. Thus, criminal laws became more severe and the number of political prisoners serving their sentences in the labour camps increased (Deletant 1997, 114-118).

Early 1960s coincided with the official announcement in 1962 of the completion of the socialist transformation of agriculture and also with the first tensions between the Soviets and the Romanians, due to the refusal of the Soviets to support the Romanian commitment to continue the industrialisation policy. This conflict influenced the autonomous direction
taken by the Romanian international affair policies in relation to Moscow. The conflict was determined mainly by the necessity to find alternative sources of technology for Romanian industry. Simultaneously, by distancing itself from the Soviet position, the RWP was left without its main source of internal legitimacy (the proletarian internationalism and the political alliance with the Soviet Union). As a consequence, the RWP was forced to adopt nationalism as a legitimising discourse. The main element of the nationalist discourse promoted at the time by the party in order to support the industrialisation plans of the country was the argument of following the national interests. In other words, from the Marxist ideological perspective, such a model of inner development was identified by the Romanian leadership as the only viable option for consolidating national independence and development, respectively for creating a strong working class as a support of the political regime (Ionescu 1965, 51-83, Floyd 1965, 72-81).

The tensions between the Soviet Union and Romania also determined in 1962-1964 a campaign for the de-sovietisation of the Romanian public and cultural life: a series of institutions with a Romanian-Russian profile were closed, and the Russian names previously given to streets, research institutes or towns were changed (Niculescu-Mizil 2003, 12). Moreover, the emphasis previously placed on the importance of the Slavic element in relation to the new “historical truths” decreased (Georgescu 2008, 47-53) within the cultural or academic publications.

Following Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej’s death in March 1965, his political successor to the party leadership, Nicolae Ceaușescu, continued and even intensified the ambitious plans for industrialising the country. His public defiance towards the Soviet leaders brought him genuine popular support and strengthened his national and international image. More significantly, during his leadership, nationalism not only survived but also succeeded in subduing the Marxist discourse resulting in what Katherine Verdery termed as the indigenization of Marxism” (Verdery 1994, 121).
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**Notes**

1 It is important to note that another half a million people left Spain in 1939, frightened by the Francoist political repression.

2 Compared, for example, with the German Blitzkrieg strategy.

3 The key elements of the dictatorship continued to exist throughout 1976. It was not until November of that year that the Francoist parliament – the Cortes – passed a law for political reform. This was followed by the dismantling of the single party and trade unions and the legalization of the Communist Party in the spring of 1977, the first democratic elections in June 1977, the amnesty of political prisoners in October 1977 and the adoption of a democratic constitution in June 1978.

4 Due to his advanced age, Franco handed over the position of Prime Minister to Luis Carrero Blanco in June 1973. After the assassination of Carrero Blanco in December 1973 by the ETA organisation, the position of Prime Minister fell into the hands of Carlos Arias Navarro, former Minister of Security. Because of his long and fatal illness, Franco also handed over the functions of head of state to Juan Carlos of Bourbon between July 19 and September 2, 1974, and again between October 30 and November 20, 1975.

5 Spanish Traditionalist Phalanx of the Assemblies of the National Syndicalist Offensive (Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista). Years later it was simply known as the National Movement (Movimiento Nacional).

6 In September 2008, Judge Baltasar Garzon issued a list of 143,353 people known to have been executed by the Francoist regime, although the true figure may be considerably higher according to historians.
The last concentration camp was dismantled in 1962.

The individual laws were the Fuero del Trabajo (March, 1938), the Ley Constitutiva de las Cortes (July, 1942), the Fuero de los Españoles (July, 1945), the Ley de Referéndum Nacional (October, 1945), the Ley de Sucesión en la Jefatura del Estado (July, 1947), the Ley de Principios del Movimiento Nacional (May, 1958), and the Ley Orgánica del Estado (January, 1967).

The military aid from Hitler and Mussolini was instrumental in Franco’s victory in the Spanish Civil War. However, the Spanish dictator used the terrible economic situation in Spain after the war as a pretext not to get involved in World War II on the Axis side. Spain was neutral between September 1939 and June 1940, non-belligerent between June 1940 and October 1943, and again neutral from October 1943 until the end of the war. Between August 1941 and October 1943, about 47,000 Spanish volunteers – the Blue Division – participated along with the Wehrmacht in important military actions on the Eastern Front. The balance of casualties was 5,000 dead and over 11,000 wounded.

Gino Germani distinguishes between "totalitarian fascism" in the case of Germany and Italy, and "authoritarian fascism" in the case of Spain.

CPR existed until 1948; a new version of the name, Romanian Communist Party (RCP), appeared in 1965 [Partidul Comunist Român]
CHAPTER TWO

COMPARING FRANCOISM AND COMMUNISM:
METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

FLORIN ABRAHAM

Research Premises

Using rational instruments for researching human societies’ organization has implied from the very beginning a comparative undertaking. Aristotle, in his Politics, can rightfully be considered the founder of comparative political analysis (Ishiyama 2012, 8-9; O’Neil 2009, 7-8). In an operational definition, the comparative method consists in identifying, analysing and explaining resemblances and differences between the subjects of the comparison. Giovanni Sartori identifies three essential questions for the comparative method: “why we compare?”; “what is comparable?”; “how we compare?” (Sartori 1994, 14-34).

Although the comparative method has been known and used for more than two millennia, and during the twentieth century Comparativism in political science defined itself as a distinct topic under the influence of Behaviourism, with important results, the epistemological dilemmas and the methodological controversies remain numerous (Landman 2008, 11-5). When associating different phenomena and historical processes they are inevitably resembled or even cognitively homogenized in order to be more easily comparable. However, we must instantly ask ourselves if the elements identified to be comparable are the most important features, or we confront ourselves with the risk of essentialising and de-contextualising events, phenomena and historical processes which are not only distinct but also different. This is the disadvantage of any synchronic comparative analysis, by which the importance of the fundamentally diachronic nature of historical facts is minimized. The collocation “comparing the (in)comparable” can describe the problematic knot of the comparative method, also used for analysing Communism in Romania and the Francoist regime in Spain.