

**THE STRUGGLE OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME WITH THE PAST
AND ITS PERSONALITIES: TWO STUDIES CASE: ION I.C. BRATIANU
AND NICOLAE IORGA**

Ion ZAINEA*

Abstract. Găsirea unui drum propriu al puterii de la București, începută în ultimii ani ai regimului Dej, presupunea racordarea la tradițiile și valorile naționale românești, precum și recuperarea "moștenirii culturale", cu precădere a celei interbelice. Reconsiderarea trecutului falsificat și debarasarea de molozul grosier al epocii staliniste, a devenit sarcina principală a istoriografiei române după 1966. Totul însă trebuia să se desfășoare într-un mod controlat, cu arma "criticii de clasă" și numai în termenii acceptați de regim. Studiul nostru are la bază constatările instituției de cenzură, în sintezele realizate în anii 1969 și 1972 asupra scrisului istoric în intervalul 1966-1972.

Keywords: comunism, istoriografie, control, eliminări, modificări

DOI <https://doi.org/10.56082/annalsarscihist.2021.2.42>

In its aberrant desire to legitimize itself through history, the communist regime fought a permanent battle with the past, with its people/personalities, but also with its servants, with historians. The past had to be reshaped/rewritten according to the ideology/vision of the communist party. Research activity and historical writing were subject to a firm political order and, consequently, to a rigorous control, through censorship, control that was carried out at the DGPT, an institution that operated under the Council of Ministers. As a general idea, the aim of control was, on the one hand, to reduce/present as negative/critical as possible the role/importance that a number of events and elites/personalities had in our past, and, on the other hand, the swelling of the role/presentation as positive as possible of the history and leaders of the labor movement (in the background there were also problems of political expediency, those regarding the history of nationalities, etc.)

We stopped, for our presentation, on the way in which it was operated, in the control of history works, before printing, with important personalities from the modern history of Romania, and then in this case with Ion I. C. Bratianu and Nicolae Iorga. I have extracted examples from two reports drawn up by the censorship institution, the first referring to the historical works published in the interval

* University of Oradea, corresponding member of AOSR

January 1966 - December 1968¹, and the second to those published in the interval 1969-1972². According to the author(s) of the Reports, a number of personalities (Ion I. C. Bratianu and the Brătian family in general, Iuliu Maniu, Alexandru Vaida-Voevod, I.G. Duca, Take Ionescu, Ion Mihalache, kings Carol I, Ferdinand) were presented too positively, as "having an overwhelming role in certain crucial moments of our history", without "highlighting the negative sides through which they influenced the political life of the country" or (the second report) "without the delimitations imposed by the differentiated role played by them in various historical moments or the different position they had from one political circumstance to another".

1. The case of Ion I. C. Bratianu

Among the politicians from old Romania whose role was considered by the censorship to be often revealed (in works, studies, articles) "without the limitations imposed by a critical, objective analysis", Ion I. C. Bratianu is first and foremost. From his activity, as head of the party and government, the control body appreciated that "especially his clairvoyance, ability and diplomatic sense are emphasized", put "disinterestedly" in the service of the "national ideal", neglecting or passing by easily over the internal policy promoted by him, the discrepancy between the programs pronounced in this direction and their implementation.

Thus, in the study *Three original documents about Romanian-Russian relations from 1909*³, I. Gheorghiu reproduced the following assessments of the Russian ambassador in Bucharest on the person of the Prime Minister of Romania: "I.I.C. Bratianu has the advantage of being a stranger to any outside influence... In him, Russia will find a statesman perhaps with a somewhat exaggerated national arrogance, but who is driven exclusively by the interests of his homeland, as he understands them, and not by influences from outside... As the most honest and

¹ General Directorate of Press and Printing, Secretariat Service, No. 3478, of June 17, 1969, Confidential, located in the National Archives-Bihor County Service (hereinafter A.N.-S.J. BH), General Directorate of Press and Printing Fund-Oradea Unit (hereinafter D.G.P.T.-U.O.), file 24/1969, unnumbered ; fully reproduced in: Ion Zainea, *Censorship of history - censored history, documents (1966-1972)*, Oradea University Publishing House, Oradea, 2006, pp. 97-143.

² General Directorate of the Press and Printing under the Council of Ministers, No. S/1734, dated 14.X.1972, located in the National Archives-Satu Mare County Service (hereinafter A.N.-S.J. SM), Fond Central Presse si Tiparituri (hereinafter C.P.T.), folder 12, f. 54-133; fully reproduced in: Ion Zainea, *Censorship of history - censored history, documents (1966-1972)*, Oradea University Publishing House, Oradea, 2006, pp.270-311.

³ *Annales of the University of Bucharest*, history series, 1967.

talented representative of the Romanians, I cannot help but recognize the current head of the government and the liberal party, Ionel Bratianu". Without "accompanying the text of the document with other clarifications", the censors appreciated, the author - referring to the attempts of the tsarist government to attract Romania to the side of the Entente - wrote: "I.I.C. Bratianu was not willing to give a categorical answer to these negotiations, before he had received the assurance that Romania's national interests would be satisfied"⁴.

In the study *Diplomatic activity of Romania between the years 1914-1918*⁵, E. Campus "extensively presented" the diplomatic activity of Ion I.C. Bratianu for the defense, during the period of neutrality, of the interests of the Romanian state - both against the Central Powers and against the Entente - with the aim of obtaining optimal conditions for Romania's interests in the war and the recognition of Romanian political-territorial aspirations.

In another study, *Romania and the problem of the union of Transylvania and Bucovina in the years 1914-1916*, signed by I. Gheorghiu⁶, talking about the speech given by Ion I. C. Bratianu in the Crown Council in August 1916, it was written that the head of the government, found that Romania must pursue the realization of its national unity, because circumstances like today's will never occur again. He was convinced that, even defeated in this war, we will still ensure our national unity later on"⁷.

In the work *Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia*, by Stefan Pascu, the program formulated by Ion I.C. Bratianu on November 18, 1918 was summarized as follows: "the immediate need for organization based on the perfect union of all souls and all lands around the king; freedom and justice for all, of any nationality and any religion; broadly democratic development; electoral and agrarian reform; living conditions for workers, which would ensure their legitimate claims and share of the fruits of their labor". On the side of this text, the author only stated that Bratianu enunciated "an advanced program, within the limits of bourgeois democracy"⁸. Both this work, as well as the study of the *Assembly of Alba*

⁴ Ion Zainea, *Censorship of history - censored history, documents (1966-1972)*, Oradea University Publishing House, Oradea, 2006, pp. 108-109.

⁵ *Romanian history magazine*, no. 6/1968.

⁶ From the volume *Unity and continuity in the history of the Romanian people*, Academy Publishing House, 1968.

⁷ Ion Zainea, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

⁸ *Ibidem*.

Iulia by V. Netea⁹, included "some formulations that indirectly accredited the unfounded thesis of the old historiography" about the special role of the indications sent by Ion I.C. Bratianu from Iasi and "appropriated" by Transylvanians exactly, in relation to the way of organizing the Assembly, its program and the broad democratic principles that had to be proclaimed in the documents subject to approval¹⁰.

Bratianu's diplomatic activity was extensively covered by E. Campus in the article *International recognition of the completion of the state union of Romania*¹¹. Considering the entire activity of I.I.C. Bratianu as a "patriotic work", defending the interests of the country, the national sovereignty of Romania, the author of "citing passages from the statements made by him", as prime minister, during the negotiations in Paris: "Romania is ready to accept any kind of provision that any member state of the League of Nations would admit on its territory in the field of minorities. Otherwise, under no circumstances, the prime minister firmly declared, Romania will not accept the intervention of foreign governments in the enforcement of its internal laws...". Due to his uncompromising position - stated E. Campus - Bratianu was regarded with antipathy by the great powers. "Probably considering that the political methods he had used no longer served the country's interests well enough", and the unfolding of events - it was written further - led Bratianu, "who had fought passionately for the recognition of the complete unity of the country", to give himself resignation¹².

Article *I.I.C. Bratianu and the completion of the unity of the Romanian state*¹³, V. Novac and C. Dumitrescu - in the initial form - "began with a general appreciation of the role that the Brătian family had for almost a century in the public life of our country. After a pithy reservation - that in social matters the Bratians were never in advanced positions and served the interests of the exploiting classes they represented - the authors emphasized at length that, on the other hand, as regards the national interests of the Romanians, and especially in the great historical acts that led to the creation of modern Romania, they had a progressive attitude that corresponded to the historical necessity, the interests of the entire Romanian nation.

⁹ *Romanian history magazine*, no. 6/1968.

¹⁰ Ion Zainea, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

¹¹ Appeared in *Studies - history magazine*, no. 6/1968.

¹² Ion Zainea, "The historiography of the years 1968-1975 with reference to the Great Union under the microscope of communist censorship", in vol. *Union of 1918, fundamental act of Romanian history* (coordinators: Vasile Ciobanu * Sorin Radu), Sibiu: Techno Media, 2008, p. 269.

¹³ *Argeş Magazine*, Pitesti, no. 5/1968.

That's why to deny the activity submitted by them for the fulfillment of our national ideals, means denying the legitimacy of their achievement". The rest of the article dealt exclusively with the diplomatic activity carried out by the I.I.C. Bratianu for the completion of the Romanian unitary state, for the confirmation of this act on a diplomatic level. In this sense, it is appreciated - as a merit of I.I.C. Bratianu - the fact that he "notified and categorically rejected the inequitable nature of the Peace Treaty of 1919, based on interests aimed at the enslavement of small states. According to the authors, Bratianu was concerned not to tie Romania to an unjust, therefore ephemeral conjuncture of interests, but to the permanent and indisputable, national and ethnic realities of the Romanian people"¹⁴.

In the study *War of independence in our historiography* - by P. Constantinescu - Iași and Tr. Lungu¹⁵, the authors, exposing the achievements and shortcomings of both the old and the new historiography regarding the moment of 1877, wrote: "The new, Marxist historiography, sometimes passed with too much ease over emphasizing the contribution of some political personalities to obtaining state independence, who, even if they pursued personal or class interests through the war, still had a positive role that must be highlighted. It is, among others, the case of Prince Carol and I.C. Bratianu whose contributions in the preparation and conduct of the war and in obtaining independence should not be neglected"¹⁶. Similar assessments were made in other studies in that issue of the magazine.

From the Report on the historical works and studies published in the period 1969-1972, we mention, first, the article *The formation of the liberal government and the parliamentary elections of 1922*, by I. Bitoleanu¹⁷, which included, in the opinion of the censors, "a sequence of positive assessments on to some parties, groups and bourgeois politicians, to whom he attributed merits in the democratization of the socio-political life of Romania, in the first years after the end of the process of perfecting the state unit"¹⁸. The work *Political life in Romania, 1910-1914*, by A. Iordache, Scientific Publishing House, which was in print at the time the Report was prepared, deals, in its initial form, with "the events almost exclusively through the prism of bourgeois parties, the actions of the masses, or the struggles of the workers and peasants or the one carried out by the PSD being

¹⁴ Ion Zainea, *Censorship*...., pp. 109-110.

¹⁵ *Annals of the Institute of Historical and Social-Political Studies attached to the CC of the PCR*, no. 2/1967.

¹⁶ Ion Zainea, *Censorship*...., p. 110.

¹⁷ *History studies and articles*, vol. XV/1970.

¹⁸ Ion Zainea, *Censorship*...., p. 279.

practically omitted"¹⁹. The censors found praise for the Liberal Party in the article Studies regarding the disappearance of the Conservative Party, by M. Musat²⁰, in which it was mentioned that the Liberal Party adopted oscillating attitudes, procrastinating agrarian and electoral reforms "determined not by their own class positions, but by right-wing liberal elements and the leaders of democratic conservatives, with whom he formed, in 1916, the government of national collaboration"²¹ and, likewise, in the volume I. G. Duca - Speeches, letters, telegrams and articles, edited by V. Arimia, where the documents, reproduced in full, included "superlative praises of the liberal program and governments", the National Liberal Party being considered the "supreme hope" of the Romanian people, and the liberal political line in full accordance with the interests of the country"²².

In the volume *Romania in the years of neutrality, 1914-1916*, by C. Nutu, Scientific Publishing House, 1972, „the political activity of I.I.C. Bratianu was predominantly positive assessments: political realism, intransigence in defending the country's interests and promoting an independent policy ; that "he was one of the few members of the political leadership of that time who did not participate in financial and commercial combinations"; that "he won a high prestige and the trust of public opinion". In the edition edited by N. Cursaru from Nicolae Iorga, *Romania as it was until 1918*, Minerva Publishing House, texts were found that expressed "deep respect for the creative work" of Ion I. C. Bratianu, and in the work *Political life in Romania, 1910- 1914*, by A. Iordache, "unilateral assessments" of the same Bratianu, who was attributed "the merit of having initiated a left-wing movement in the Liberal Party"²³. On the same line were the study signed by Savel Rădulescu about Nicolae Titulescu from the collection *Illustrious Diplomats*²⁴, Politică Publishing House, 1969, the compendium *The history of the Romanian people*,

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 280.

²⁰ *Studies and researches*, Cumidava, vol. IV/1970-1971, Brasov History Museum.

²¹ In addition, for the characterization of the National Liberal Party, the author quoted from Nicolae Iorga: "Rich in historical merits, led with a strong hand by a startled dynasty whose representative surpassed the crown itself with his proud forehead...".

²² A.N.S.J.SM, Press and Printing Center Fund, folder 12, f. 79.

²³ Ion Zainea, *Romanian Historiography and Communist Censorship (1966-1977)*, Oradea University Publishing House, Oradea, 2010, p. 40.

²⁴ I.I.C. Bratianu - as Romania's first delegate to the peace negotiations at Versailles - "appeared as an ardent patriot, driven by a high sense of national pride and initiator of a policy of resistance against the great allies".

edited by Andrei Oțetea²⁵, Scientific Publishing House, 1970, the work *The labor movement in Romania in 1921-1924*, by M. C. Stănescu²⁶, Politică Publishing House, 1971, synthesis of *The history of the Romanians*, Albatros Publishing House, by C. C. Giurescu²⁷, or volume V of the treatise *Romanian history (1878-1918)*, Academy Publishing House, 1972, edited by V. Maciu, in which there were "appreciations repeated eulogies on the activity of Ion I. C. Bratianu" during the period of neutrality and perseverance with which he campaigned for the realization of the national ideal, at the Versailles peace negotiations, or as the initiator of the democratic reforms after the First World War²⁸.

Conclusion: Ion I.C. Bratianu, the Bratianu family in general, like other mentioned personalities, was presented in an insufficiently critical light. It is the reason why the mentioned passages were either redone or removed from the mentioned works and studies.

2. The Nicolae Iorga case

The re-editing of some works by well-known historians gave rise to frequent interventions by the censorship, which is why most of them could not receive "print approval" in the form in which they were sent for control. A somewhat general warning about this category of works referred to the "lack of consistently critical criteria for selecting the materials" and "easily going over wrong theses" or over "the limits of the thinking and activity of the respective historians". In addition, some works contained "passages with insulting content, derogatory towards communism, marxism-leninism", others "apologised for some reactionary political concepts", "denigrated figures of Romanian patriots", or "conveyed racist, chauvinistic and offensive ideas to address to other peoples", finally others "raised problems of political expediency, with implications on the country's external relations"²⁹.

²⁵ Where the author "recirculated the thesis that I.I.C. Bratianu would have had the idea of convening the Great National Assembly from Alba Iulia on December 1, 1918 and the indications regarding the main democratic principles stipulated later in the adopted declaration".

²⁶ In which it was written that "the king intended in 1921 to bring I.I.C. to the government. Bratianu because - as N. Iorga said - it seemed to him more and more that he was the only man of great authority and obedience to whom he could leave the country".

²⁷ In which Ion I.C. Bratianu "was presented as the initiator of the democratic reforms adopted after the First World War".

²⁸ A.N.S.J.SM, Press and Printing Center Fund, folder 12, f. 82-83.

²⁹ Ion Zainea, *Censorship....*, p. 274.

The volume *Nicolae Iorga – Etudes Byzantines*, which was to be republished in 1969, under the care of Eugen Stănescu, in the Academy Publishing House, raised serious problems related to "his negative views regarding the creative capacity of the Orient, including the Balkan peoples", but especially by "N. Iorga's concepts in relation to the presence, the role played by the Wallachians from the south of the Danube in the Byzantine era, including reflections on how Romania had to safeguard the interests of the countrymen from the Balkans", threatened, said Iorga, by "the ambitions of the Bulgarians present to rule alone a territory bathed by the three seas"³⁰.

N. Iorga's autobiographical work, *O life of a man, as it was*, republished in an abbreviated form, Minerva Publishing House, raised for reading/censorship "a series of political issues such as: the apology of the monarchy or the attribution as merits in the history homeland of some reactionary politicians like A. C. Cuza, P. Șeicaru, harsh assessments of the Bulgarian state". Moreover, the introductory study, belonging to V. Râpeanu, combated "those who today confuse the national doctrine of N. Iorga with hatred and chauvinism" and claimed that "he never promoted the elimination from political life of those of a different nationality". Problems of the same nature also intervened in the two volumes from *Romania as it was until 1918*, where, in addition, "inappropriate assessments formulated by N. Iorga regarding the cohabiting nationalities (especially the Hungarians and Jews) or some peoples were circulated neighbors (Russians, for example), in parallel with other considerations of a racist nuance on <the leadership qualities of the nation> embodied by the Romanian peasant, as a representative of the <pure> race"³¹.

Passages with "offensive content against neighboring nationalities", "strong xenophobic accents", with "offensive epithets against Hungarians, Saxons, Jews" were reported in some fragments of the volume *N. Iorga - Selected Writings*, Kriterion Publishing House, 1971, translation in Hungarian.

In the preface to N. Iorga's *The history of Michael the Brave* - Military Publishing House, 1968 - Barbu Teodorescu, referring to the slander brought to the Romanian ruler after the conquest of Transylvania, selected from a letter by Basta, a fragment full of insults addressed to him : "Often nature, luck and madness, tied together, give princely ambitions to a small and weak heart" which will not be able to enjoy in peace "what it has won through cunning, cunning means and ungodly war".

³⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 298-299.

³¹ A.N.S.J.SM, Press and Printing Center Fund, folder 12, f. 112.

The authors of the valorization works were accused of usually limiting themselves "to exposing the valuable fund of ideas, without warning the reader about the limits and misconceptions" of the presented work and its author. The statements were supported by reports. The introductory study, signed by V. Căndrea, to the volume *Bizanț after Bizanț*, Enciclopedică Publishing House, 1971, "practically did not contain any critical reservations about Iorga's conceptions", although in the work, according to the censors' assessment, he "manifested the tendency to exaggerate the role of the church in the preservation of Byzantine civilization, to underestimate the creative spiritual possibilities of the East and to overestimate the possibilities of the West". In the introductory study to the anthology *N. Iorga - historical writings*, Youth Publishing House, 1969, Barbu Teodorescu - to prove that Iorga recognizes, under certain aspects, the importance of Marxism - "cites passages in which the scholar harshly challenges the originality of Marx's conceptions".

Collections of studies such as *N. Iorga – Man and Opera*, French language, edited by D. M. Pippidi, Academy Publishing House, 1971, *Nicolae Iorga – About Man and Opera*, Junimea Publishing House, Iasi, 1971, *N. Iorga – History of Byzantium*, under Eugen Stănescu's editorship, Academy Publishing House, 1971, as well as the groupings of studies published, on the occasion of the centenary of the scholar's birth, in *Studies-History magazine*, *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* no. 4/1971, *Historic store* no. 6/1971, *Magazine of archives* no. 3/1971, signed by historians such as M. Berza, M. Holban, D. M. Pippidi, D. Berindei, Șt. Stefanescu, Al. Zub, Gh. Buzatu, V. Netea, E. Stănescu, G. Georgescu-Buzau, A. Sacerdoteanu, "they were limited to the presentation of the scientist's conceptions of history, of research methods of historical facts and processes, of literary-artistic phenomena, etc., without analyzing them critically from Marxist positions". Some of the articles "were written in dithyrambic style, with laudatory assessments of Iorga's entire work, without any attempt to delimit him from his idealistic conceptions and from those unscientific interpretations, determined by his social position". Moreover, P. Popescu, in the article *N. Iorga at the Romanian Academy*, characterizing Iorga's historical thinking as materialistic, fought "contemporary researchers who support the idealism of his historical conception in relation to the role of masses and personalities in history, or with the influences of romanticism in

the interpretation of the past". In the same way, the author appreciated the activity carried out by Iorga on the political level, as head of government³².

For the "wrong orientation, as well as for the terminology used", the study of N. Iorga - fighter for national unity, from the volume *Nicolae Iorga - about man and work*, Junimea Publishing House, Iași, 1971, was reported to the publisher, a work that was to appear on the occasion the 100th anniversary of the birth of Nicolae Iorga and included studies on some less researched aspects of the scientist's life and work, developed by researchers from Bucharest and Iasi. Through eliminations and modifications, the publishing house substantially improved the study, in which the idea was accredited that the perfection of state unity - according to the author's frequent terminology "the perfection of national unity", "the whole nation" and the country "within its natural borders" - was a exclusive result of the war, characterized as a "war of national unity", "of integration"³³.

The article *The parliamentary activity of N. Iorga in the years 1917-1921* by Eufrosina Popescu outlined³⁴, in the opinion of the censors, in a "unilateral and confusing" way the scholar's political profile, the author "failing to define the class position" he was in the political sphere. On the contrary, he believed that N. Iorga "would have had the most advanced position" in the important socio-political issues of the country.

A series of historical works and articles were flagged by censorship on the grounds that they "exaggerate the role played by the church", attesting to the idea that it was always with the people and that the entire clergy was consistently in the the leader of actions with a national or social-economic character. Numerous documents from volume II of the *Letters collection to N. Iorga*, Minerva Publishing House, under the editorship of B. Teodorescu, attributed to the "ancient church" a main role in the development of Romanian spirituality, in keeping the national consciousness awake.

Signed and "resolved" with the publisher, "according to the indications" was the volume *Nicolae Iorga 1871-1940 (bio-bibliography)* by Barbu Teodorescu, Scientific and Encyclopedic Publishing House, co-publishing with the Military Publishing House. As mentioned in the note from 19.1.1976, the author "does not distance himself critically" from certain conceptions of Iorga, or

³² Ibidem, f. 113.

³³ A.N.D.J. BH, Fund D.G.P.T.-U.O., folder 40/1971, f. 11-12.

³⁴ *Annals of the University of Bucharest*, History series, no. 1/1973.

regarding some aspects of his political activity, or regarding the issues addressed in the works. Barbu Theodorescu's lack of critical attitude was more prominently visible in the "Chronology" chapter (210 pages), where "exclusively laudatory assessments" of the historian's political activity and work were "insistently mentioned". For example, in the chapter dedicated to ecclesiastical history (p. 682-700), the scholar's ideas about the church, religion and its role in the historical past of the Romanian people were "stated uncritically"; from Iorga's works about Mihai Viteazul, the author also recorded quotes in which his rule over Transylvania and Moldavia was considered to have the character of "inheritance and conquest"; in addition, it included the communication to the Romanian Academy of May 8, 1926, in which he presented his modest origin ("son from flowers of a woman from the people"); for the year 1918, the author recorded only the moment of the union of Transylvania with Romania, the union of Bessarabia and Bucovina not being mentioned; The volume also recorded the audiences granted to Iorga by the monarchs of the Royal House, works about sovereigns or published under their patronage.

The scientific control over the work had been ensured by the Center for studies and researches of history and military theory of the Ministry of National Defense, with the participation of colonel Al. Savu, from the Center³⁵.

Solved "according to the indications, through eliminations" was the work *Death of a scholar: N. Iorga*, by Mihai Stoian, 2nd edition revised and added, Eminescu Publishing House, published in a print run of 54,000 copies. Compared to the first edition published in 1975, in the new edition the author had introduced some texts (from the *Secret History* of J. de Launay) in which the Soviet-German relations from the summer of 1939, related to the "conquering of Poland", Antonescu's attempt to to break away from the alliance with Germany (Hitler-Antonescu meeting of August 5, 1944), the circumstances in which Romania had to accept the territorial cessions of the summer of 1940. Since at the control it was considered that all the above problems "are not strictly related" of the subject of the volume - the circumstances of the assassination of the great scientist by the legionnaires - "indications" were given to the publishing house to give up their introduction in the pages of the new edition³⁶.

³⁵ Central National Historical Archives (hereafter A.N.I.C.), Press and Printing Committee Fund, folder 23/1976, f. 3-4.

³⁶ Ion Zainea, *Romanian Historiography and Communist Censorship (1966-1977)*, pp. 156-157.

Conclusion: As can be seen, at the notification of the General Directorate of Press and Printing, some works in the category of re-editions of Nicolae Iorga's volumes or dedicated to him were removed from the plan by the publishing houses, others - after going through a rigorous selection process and after their introductory studies were improved - they received printing approval.