Coded Performance: Literary Resistance in Romania Under Ceauşescu's Censorship (1960s-1970s)

Abel MÎNDRILĂ
Stefan cel Mare University of Suceava
abel.mindrila@student.usv.ro

Abstract: This paper explores the innovative literary strategies employed by Romanian writers Marin Sorescu and Ana Blandiana during the 1960s and 1970s under Nicolae Ceaușescu's repressive communist regime. Facing stringent censorship and the pervasive surveillance of the Securitate, these authors developed a form of "coded performance" through absurdism, allegory, and metaliterature, embedding subtle critiques within works like Iona and "I Am Watching Myself." This approach transformed reading into a participatory act of resistance, relying on a "well-trained" audience to decode hidden meanings and preserve ethical and political values. Set against the historical backdrop of a brief cultural thaw and subsequent clampdown, the study contrasts Romania's subtle dissent with Václav Havel's theatrical provocation in Czechoslovakia and Soviet samizdat networks. Drawing on performance theory and historical analysis, the paper argues that coded performance not only survived censorship but also offered a resilient counter-narrative, with implications for understanding resistance in contemporary authoritarian contexts.
Keywords: *Romanian literature, Censorship, Coded performance, Communist resistance, Eastern European dissent*.

1. Introduction

The landscape of Romanian literature under the communist regime offers a compelling lens into how creativity can thrive amid suffocating control. Far from being a mere conduit for state propaganda, literature during this era often became a subtle arena for resistance, where writers navigated the treacherous waters of censorship through innovative, veiled strategies. This was especially true in the 1960s and 1970s, a period marked by fleeting liberalization followed by renewed repression under Nicolae Ceauşescu. What emerges from this turbulent time is not outright defiance, such acts were perilous and often impossible but a form of "coded performance," where texts performed dissent in ways that required active interpretation from readers attuned to the subtext.

Coded performance, as I conceptualize it here, refers to the deliberate use of literary techniques like allegory, absurdity, and metaliterature to embed critiques of the regime within seemingly innocuous narratives. Drawing from performance theory, this approach treats literature not as a static artifact but as a dynamic process, much like a theatrical act that unfolds through the interaction between text and audience (Benamou 1977). In a society where the

state policed every word, writers transformed reading into a participatory ritual, compelling audiences to "decode" hidden meanings and thus share in the act of resistance. This wasn't just aesthetic play; it was a moral imperative, preserving human dignity against ideological erasure.

Two figures stand out as exemplars of this strategy: Marin Sorescu and Ana Blandiana. Sorescu, with his wry humor and absurdist plays, turned everyday absurdity into metaphors for entrapment, as seen in his 1969 work *Iona*. Blandiana, meanwhile, wielded poetry as a tool of moral intransigence, using abstract imagery to probe the soul's depths and challenge the regime's manufactured reality, evident in poems like "I Am Watching Myself." Their works highlight how experimental forms rooted in earlier modernist influences but adapted to censorship allowed for ethical and political survival. Yet, this phenomenon raises intriguing questions about the interplay between aesthetics and politics. How did writers balance innovation with evasion? And what role did readers play in sustaining this underground dialogue? Weighing these perspectives, one might argue that coded performance was a double-edged sword: it enabled expression but also risked diluting direct confrontation, a tension echoed in broader Eastern European dissident literature (Wachtel 2006).

This essay argues that during the height of communist repression in Romania (1960s–70s), writers such as Marin Sorescu and Ana Blandiana employed a sophisticated form of "coded performance" by utilizing experimental literary techniques including absurdism, allegory, and metaliterature to critique the totalitarian regime. These works were performative not on a public stage but in their ability to compel a "well-trained" reader to actively "decode" hidden meanings, turning reading into a participatory act of resistance that preserved aesthetic, ethical, and political values in a society dominated by censorship and ideological control. By examining historical context, close textual analyses, theoretical frameworks, and comparative strategies, we can appreciate how Romanian literature not only endured but subtly undermined the very system that sought to silence it. In exploring this, I draw on historical accounts of the Ceauşescu era (Deletant 2017) and literary critiques of dissident writing (Vianu 2010), while considering the ethical dimensions of such resistance. Ultimately, this analysis reveals literature's power as a counter-narrative, one that continues to resonate in discussions of authoritarianism today.

2. The Historical Crucible of Censorship

Romanian literature in the communist era didn't emerge in a vacuum; it was forged in the fires of a regime that oscillated between tentative openness and iron-fisted control. To grasp how writers like Sorescu and Blandiana developed their coded strategies, we must first unpack the political shifts that defined the 1960s and 1970s. This period, bookended by the death of Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej in 1965 and the deepening repression under Nicolae Ceauşescu, reveals a brief window of liberalization abruptly slammed shut, compelling artists to innovate or perish. What began as a cautious thaw devolved into a "mini-cultural revolution," reshaping the very possibilities of expression (Deletant 2008).

The "Thaw" and the "Mini-Cultural Revolution" (1965-1971)

The mid-1960s marked a fleeting era of relative freedom in Romania, following Gheorghiu-Dej's death and Ceaușescu's ascent to power. Under Gheorghiu-Dej, Romania had already begun distancing itself from Moscow, fostering nationalist sentiments through policies like the abolition of compulsory Russian language education and the restoration of Romanian names for streets and institutions. Ceaușescu amplified this independence, positioning Romania as a maverick within the Soviet bloc condemning the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia, for instance, and welcoming U.S. President Richard Nixon in 1969. Domestically, this translated into a cultural thaw: greater access to Western translations, reduced ideological indoctrination in education, and a revival in poetry and arts. As historian Vladimir Tismăneanu observed, this period fostered a "national Stalinist 'contract' between the party leaders and national intelligentsia," allowing intellectuals tentative support in exchange for loyalty. For writers, it meant testing boundaries, with figures like Sorescu gaining popularity amid a surge in creative output.

Yet, this liberalization was more illusion than substance, a tactical maneuver to consolidate power rather than a genuine embrace of freedom. The turning point came in July 1971, when Ceaușescu, fresh from state visits to China and North Korea, unveiled the "July Theses." Officially titled "Proposals for measures to improve the political-ideological activity, Marxist-Leninist education of party members, of all working people," these theses demanded intensified political education, stricter party oversight of culture, and a purge of "bourgeois" influences deemed corrupting to society. Ceaușescu praised the Chinese model, stating, "In my opinion, they took a revolutionary turn and we can really speak of a cultural revolution. They put aside – maybe too suddenly, but in my view they did the right thing, all these petty bourgeois mentalities and started again from the very beginning." This "mini-cultural revolution," as it became known, echoed the rigid Stalinism of the 1950s, with state committees dictating artistic themes and criticizing deviations. The reversal caught many off guard, shattering hopes and forcing writers who had tasted autonomy to retreat into subtlety. One might weigh whether this was purely ideological zeal or a pragmatic response to Soviet pressures Brezhnev had repeatedly chided Romania's "deviations" but the outcome was clear: a clampdown that made overt dissent suicidal (Tismăneanu 2017).

The Apparatus of Control: Censorship and the Securitate

At the heart of this repression lay a multifaceted machinery of control, with censorship serving as the regime's blunt instrument and the Securitate as its omnipresent enforcer. Censorship in communist Romania was all-encompassing, requiring pre-approval for every published word, from books to broadcasts, to ensure alignment with party ideology. In the 1960s-70s, it targeted not just political content but cultural symbols of "bourgeois decadence," erasing pre-communist artifacts and banning Western influences post-1971. Lists of forbidden authors proliferated, and intellectuals faced expulsion or worse, creating a chilling effect on creativity. Writers adapted by embedding critiques in coded forms, a necessity born of survival rather than choice.

The Securitate amplified this terror, functioning as far more than a police force, it was the regime's eyes, ears, and fists. Established in 1948 with Soviet aid, it grew under Ceaușescu into one of the Eastern bloc's most formidable apparatuses, boasting 15,000 agents and up to half a million informants by 1989, roughly one collaborator per 43 citizens. Its methods were brutal: arrests, torture, surveillance via wiretaps and hidden microphones, and even assassinations, as in the case of defector Ion Mihai Pacepa. But beyond physical coercion, the Securitate operated as an "epistemic form," a pseudo-social science that gathered knowledge about society while reshaping it to fit ideological molds. As scholar Cristina Vatulescu argues, it was "an epistemic form through which the socialist state gathered knowledge about reality, while it also performatively sought to create reality in keeping with its ideological presuppositions." Agents acted like anthropologists, documenting social relations and hidden dissent through field notes and reports, then subordinating facts to party dogma to "define and protect its own, new, version of reality and social order."

This epistemic control had profound implications for literature. In a system that monopolized truth, writing became a battleground for reality itself. Dissent wasn't just policed physically but epistemologically any narrative challenging the "new man" or socialist utopia was a threat. Thus, coded performance arose as a counter-narrative, an ethical defiance that reclaimed ambiguity and subtext from the regime's grasp (Vianu 2010). Reflecting on this, one sees the Securitate not merely as repressors but as architects of a distorted worldview, necessitating the very literary ingenuity that undermined them.

3. Marin Sorescu's Absurdist Performance

Diving into the specifics of how Romanian writers turned censorship into a creative catalyst, Marin Sorescu's play *Iona* (1968) stands as a prime example of absurdist theater repurposed for subtle dissent. Sorescu, often hailed as a "cheerfully melancholic comic genius," emerged in the 1960s with a style that blended plainspoken humor with sharp irony, allowing him to skirt direct confrontation while probing deeper truths (Wachtel 2006). His work didn't shout rebellion; instead, it whispered it through layers of metaphor, making *Iona* not just a play but a performative act that invited audiences to unpack its veiled critiques. In a regime where explicit political commentary could lead to imprisonment, Sorescu's reliance on absurdity became a shield and a weapon.

At its core, *Iona* reimagines the biblical tale of Jonah, transforming it into a one-man monologue of existential entrapment. The protagonist, a fisherman named Iona, is swallowed by a whale, only to find himself in an "endless prison" of nested fish bellies, each one more confining than the last. Unlike the biblical Jonah, who is eventually released after prayer and obedience, Sorescu's Iona hacks his way through successive layers, only to discover no true exit emerging finally into a vast, empty sea that mirrors his isolation. This structure alone is allegorical: the whale's belly symbolizes the suffocating grip of totalitarianism, where individuals are trapped in a system that devours them from within (Deletant 2008). As Iona laments, "There's an entrance, but the presence of an exit has never been attested," the line echoes the futility of escape under

Ceaușescu's regime, where borders were sealed and dissent led to dead ends (Sorescu 1968, trans. 1983).

What makes *Iona* particularly performative is its use of absurdity to mirror the psychological fragmentation of life under communism. Iona's soliloquy splits him into dialogues with himself addressing his left and right hands as separate entities, or conversing with echoes in the void. This fragmentation captures the alienation bred by a society riddled with informants and self-censorship, where trust erodes even in one's own mind. Reviewers have noted how Sorescu's "wry humor and irony" allowed the play to "cheat the censor," presenting material that seemed whimsical on the surface but resonated as a chilling indictment (Vianu 2010). For instance, Iona's futile attempts to fish inside the whale parody the absurdities of daily life in Romania rationing, propaganda, endless queues turning personal despair into a broader commentary on ideological entrapment. One might argue that this approach risks ambiguity, potentially diluting the message for less attuned audiences, but in context, it empowered viewers to co-create meaning, making the performance interactive and resistant to outright suppression.

The play's reception underscores its subversive power. Premiering in 1969 at Bucharest's Teatrul Mic, *Iona* drew packed houses, its popularity stemming from audiences who grasped the unspoken parallels to their own lives. Yet, authorities quickly withdrew it, deeming it "too controversial", a testament to how coded performance could backfire when the regime caught on (Shapiro 2016). Sorescu himself navigated this delicately; as he later reflected in interviews, his reactions to the regime were "cleverly balanced: he never engaged in the servile praise of leader and party... but nor did he venture into dissidence" (Deletant 2008). This balance preserved his career while allowing works like *Iona* to circulate, often through samizdat-like channels after official bans. Comparing it to other absurdist traditions, one sees echoes of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, but Sorescu's version is distinctly Romanian, infusing global existentialism with local political bite.

In essence, *Iona* exemplifies how experimental techniques under censorship weren't mere evasion tactics but acts of ethical defiance. By compelling the audience, and later, readers to participate in decoding its layers, Sorescu turned passive consumption into active resistance, preserving aesthetic integrity amid political pressure. This performative quality not only critiqued the regime's "metaphysics of censorship" but also affirmed human resilience, a theme that resonates beyond Romania's borders (Benamou 1977).

4. Ana Blandiana and the Moral Performance of Poetry

Shifting from Sorescu's theatrical absurdism, Ana Blandiana's poetry offers a quieter yet no less potent form of resistance, one rooted in philosophical introspection and moral steadfastness. Blandiana, whose work evolved into a beacon for ethical defiance during the Ceaușescu years, approached censorship not through overt drama but via an abstract, almost meditative style that invited readers to confront the regime's distortions of truth. Her poetry, often described as a "symbol of a moral consciousness that refuses to be silenced by a totalitarian government," transformed personal observation into a broader critique, using

imagery to peel back the layers of propaganda (Deletant 2008). In pieces like "I Am Watching Myself," she doesn't assault the system head-on; instead, she performs a subtle moral inquiry, compelling readers to participate in reclaiming an alternative reality from the state's grip.

Blandiana's strategy hinges on what critics have termed "moral intransigence," a refusal to bend ethical values amid societal decay or, as she puts it, the world's "entropic aspect" (Acta Philologia 2017). This intransigence manifests in her use of abstract imagery and allegory, which subvert the regime's "wooden language" that rigid, propagandistic rhetoric designed to enforce ideological clarity (Vianu 2010). Consider "I Am Watching Myself," a poem where the speaker positions herself as an observer of "the anomalies of the world," inviting a similar vigilance from the reader. Lines like "I am watching myself / As if from the side" evoke a dissociated gaze, one that mirrors the surveillance state's invasive eye while simultaneously resisting it through self-reflection (Blandiana 1987, trans. 2015). Here, the performative element lies in the poem's demand for active decoding: the "anomalies" aren't spelled out as political oppression but implied through philosophical tensions, such as the "antinomic tension between the cognisable and the unknowable" (Acta Philologia 2017). One could debate whether this abstraction dilutes urgency, after all, it risks being read as mere existential musing, but in Blandiana's hands, it becomes a deliberate counter to the regime's project of forging a "new man," reclaiming the "subterranean depths of the soul" from surface-level dogma.

This moral performance extends to her broader oeuvre, including works like *My Native Land A4*, where she critiques pervasive surveillance through metaphors of confinement and observation. In one poignant passage, Blandiana reflects on poetry's role: "When the last molecules of freedom were concealed in poems, people who had been choked by repression would search for them, find and inhale them in order to survive" (Blandiana 2015). Such statements underscore how her writing functioned as a "sacred ritual," not just for the poet but for the reader, who must engage in a participatory act of interpretation to uncover the ethical subtext (Vianu 2010). Weighing this against Sorescu's approach, Blandiana's seems more introspective, perhaps reflecting gender dynamics in dissident literature, women writers often navigated repression through personal, lyrical forms rather than public spectacle (Wachtel 2006). Yet, both share a reliance on the audience: just as *Iona*'s absurdity required recognition of everyday parallels, Blandiana's poetry demands a "well-trained" reader to bridge the abstract and the political, turning passive reading into an act of spiritual survival.

Critically, Blandiana's work challenges the notion that resistance under totalitarianism must be explicit to be effective. Her emphasis on "unstructured sincerity" as a means to construct "another reality" free from fear aligns with performance theory's view of art as processual, where meaning emerges collaboratively (Benamou 1977). In a regime that sought to monopolize narrative, this poetic intransigence preserved not only aesthetic value but also political agency, proving that subtlety could erode authority from within. Of course, this came at a cost. Blandiana faced bans and harassment, her works

often circulating underground, but it highlights literature's enduring power to foster communal resilience.

5. The Theoretical Framework of Reader-as-Performer

As we delve deeper into the mechanics of coded performance, it becomes clear that the act of reading in Romania's repressive 1960s and 1970s was far more than a passive exercise, it evolved into a collaborative, performative act that completed the writer's resistance. This dynamic hinges on the interplay between text and reader, a relationship shaped by the oppressive environment itself. Where the state sought to control every narrative, writers like Sorescu and Blandiana crafted works that depended on an audience trained to decipher hidden meanings, turning literature into a shared ritual of survival. This section explores this phenomenon through the lenses of metaliterature and reader participation, drawing on theoretical insights to illuminate how meaning was co-constructed under censorship's shadow.

Metaliterature, or writing that reflects on its own creation, emerges as a cornerstone of this resistance strategy. By foregrounding the act of writing as an act of defiance, Romanian authors disrupted the regime's attempt to dictate reality. The Optzecişti generation, emerging later but influenced by the experimentalism of the 1960s and 70s, exemplified this approach with figures like Mircea Nedelciu, whose prose blended autofiction and intertextuality to "deconstruct a pre-existing ideological or narrative reality" (Wachtel 2006). Earlier, Sorescu's *Iona* and Blandiana's poetry mirrored this self-awareness, using absurdity and abstraction to question the very language imposed by the state. Norman Manea, another key voice, described his style as a "negotiation with the official 'wooden' language," a process that reclaimed linguistic fluidity from propaganda's rigidity (Manea 2013). This meta-literary stance wasn't just aesthetic flair; it was an ethical stance, asserting that art could resist by exposing its own construction as an alternative to the regime's monolithic truth. One might wonder, though, if this self-referentiality risked alienating readers less versed in literary theory, yet in a society where subtext was a survival skill, it likely strengthened the bond with a discerning audience.

Central to this framework is the reader's role as a co-performer. Manea's reflections offer a telling insight: he relied on an "implicit connection with the virtual reader" who had become "well trained to read between the lines" (Manea 2013). This training wasn't accidental, it was forged by the omnipresent Securitate and the state's relentless propaganda, which forced citizens to seek meaning in whispers, jokes, and art (Deletant 2017). A book, in this context, was expected to harbor something "beneath the surface," transforming reading into a participatory act of decoding (Vianu 2010). For Sorescu's *Iona*, this meant recognizing the whale as a metaphor for the regime; for Blandiana's "I Am Watching Myself," it involved tracing the "anomalies" to political surveillance. This process turned each reader into a conspirator, silently constructing a counter-narrative with the writer. It's a dynamic that recalls performance theory's emphasis on the audience as active participants, where the text's meaning emerges through their engagement (Benamou 1977). Some might argue this reliance on the reader's interpretation made the critique fragile

misreadings could dilute intent, but in a censored society, this ambiguity was its strength, evading the censor's grasp while fostering communal resilience.

This reader-as-performer model also carried a spiritual dimension. Blandiana herself framed poetry as a "means of salvation," a way to "construct another reality" free from the regime's fear and hatred (Blandiana 2015). Reading, then, became a "sacred ritual," a private act of defiance that the state couldn't police (Vianu 2010). This communal construction of meaning preserved not just intellectual freedom but human dignity, offering a psychological refuge amid repression. Compared to Western literary traditions, where reader response often enhances appreciation, here it was a matter of survival that literature became a lifeline, its performance enacted in the mind rather than on a stage. This nuance underscores a key difference: while Western theorists like Roland Barthes celebrated the "death of the author" for creative freedom, in Romania, it was a necessity born of coercion (Barthes 1967).

In sum, the theoretical framework of reader-as-performer reveals coded performance as a dynamic process, where writers and readers together undermined the regime's epistemic control. This collaboration preserved aesthetic, ethical, and political values, proving that resistance could thrive even in silence. As we move to comparative strategies, this interplay will offer a lens to contrast Romania's approach with other Eastern European contexts.

6. Comparative Resistance Strategies

To fully appreciate the uniqueness of Romanian coded performance, it's illuminating to place it alongside parallel strategies in Eastern Europe, where writers and artists grappled with similar repressive regimes yet forged distinct paths of resistance. The Romanian approach which was subtle, publication-bound, and reliant on reader decoding contrasts sharply with the theatrical provocations of Václav Havel in Czechoslovakia and the clandestine samizdat networks of the Soviet Union. These comparisons not only highlight the adaptability of literary dissent but also underscore how local political contexts shaped artistic responses, offering a broader perspective on how culture can challenge authoritarianism (Wachtel 2006).

Václav Havel and the Metaphysics of Censorship

Václav Havel, the Czech playwright and later dissident leader, shares an absurdist lineage with Sorescu, using theater to expose the absurdities of totalitarian systems. Works like *The Memorandum* (1965) and *Audience* (1975) wield bureaucratic nonsense and surreal dialogue to critique the dehumanizing machinery of state control, inviting audiences to reflect on their complicity (Shapiro 2016). In *Audience*, a brewery worker faces a Kafkaesque interrogation by a party official over trivialities, the absurdity mirroring the regime's obsession with ideological purity. Havel termed this an exploration of the "metaphysics of censorship," probing how power distorts reality rather than just attacking it directly (Havel 1986). His plays, performed semi-clandestinely after the 1968 Soviet invasion banned them, became acts of provocation, with audiences attending in unconventional spaces as a visible sign of dissent (York University E-Theses 2016).

The contrast with Sorescu is striking. While both used absurdity to critique entrapment, Havel's resistance was more public and performative, relying on the physical act of gathering to defy the state. Sorescu, constrained by the Securitate's pervasive brutality, opted for a subtler dance, publishing *Iona* through official channels before its ban forced underground circulation (Deletant 2008). Havel's approach, with its "appellative theater" aiming to stir collective action, suited Czechoslovakia's relatively less repressive climate post-1968, where cultural resistance had some breathing room (Shapiro 2016). In Romania, the risk was higher, public acts could trigger immediate retribution, so Sorescu's reliance on intellectual subterfuge within the system reflected a pragmatic adaptation. One might ponder whether Havel's bolder stance amplified impact or if Sorescu's caution preserved longevity; both, however, turned performance into a mirror of societal truths.

The Contrast with Soviet Samizdat

Turning to the Soviet Union, the samizdat movement offers another foil to Romanian strategies. Samizdat literally "self-published" and involved clandestinely typing and distributing banned manuscripts, often on flimsy paper with carbon copies, creating a parallel literary ecosystem (Kind-Kovács & Labov 2013). Writers like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn circulated works like *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1962) through these networks, bypassing state censors entirely. The medium itself became the message: the "wretched" manuscripts, with their typos and faint ink, symbolized defiance, a "forbidden fruit" cherished for its illicit nature (Kind-Kovács & Labov 2013). Audio versions, known as magnitizdat, further spread dissent via taped readings, evading print controls.

Romanian writers, by contrast, often sought to infiltrate official publishing houses, as Sorescu did with *Iona* and Blandiana with her early poetry collections. This "dance of bitter frustration" with censors allowed temporary legitimacy before bans, relying on readers to decode subtext rather than on physical circulation of contraband (Vianu 2010). The Soviet approach, driven by the KGB's tighter grip on publishing, necessitated a separate world of dissent, whereas Romania's less absolute control coupled with the Securitate's epistemic surveillance encouraged subversion from within. One could argue that samizdat's physicality fostered a tangible community of resistance, while Romania's method leveraged existing cultural infrastructure, though it risked co-optation by the state. Both, however, highlight how context dictated form: Romania's strategy preserved a semblance of normalcy, while Soviet dissidents built an alternative reality.

Comparative Table

Author/ Movement	**Literary/ Theatrical Technique**	**Primary Target of Critique**	**Mode of Resistance**	**Key Characteristic**
Marin Sorescu (Romania)	Absurdism, Allusive Metaphor (*Iona*)	Psychological entrapment, ideological dead-end	Coded performance via sanctioned (then banned) works	Wry humor to "cheat the censor"

Ana Blandiana (Romania)	Abstract Imagery, Allegory	Surveillance, moral corruption	Subtextual moral performance	Ethical intransigence, reader ritual
Václav Havel (Czechoslovakia)	Absurdism, Bureaucratic Dialogue (*The Memorandum*)	Metaphysics of censorship	Public/semi-clandestine theater	Provocation through collective act
Soviet Samizdat	Clandestine Reproduction	State control over narrative	Illicit text circulation	Medium as message, physical defiance

This comparison reveals that Romanian coded performance was a tailored response to Ceauşescu's unique blend of nationalism and repression, distinct from Havel's public defiance or samizdat's underground networks. It underscores literature's adaptability, proving that resistance could thrive through subtlety as much as overt challenge.

As we reflect on the intricate tapestry of Romanian literature under Ceauşescu's regime in the 1960s and 1970s, a powerful narrative emerges not of capitulation, but of resilient resistance woven through coded performance. Writers like Marin Sorescu and Ana Blandiana, constrained by the Securitate's omnipresent gaze and the state's ideological chokehold, transformed censorship into a creative crucible. Through absurdism, allegory, and metaliterature, they crafted works that performed dissent subtly, embedding critiques within layers that demanded active interpretation. This essay has argued that their literature was performative not in a public theater but in the private, participatory act of reading, where a "well-trained" audience decoded hidden meanings, preserving aesthetic, ethical, and political values against a system bent on erasure.

The historical context, marked by the fleeting thaw of the 1960s and the abrupt clampdown of the 1971 "mini-cultural revolution"set the stage for this ingenuity. The Securitate's role as both enforcer and epistemic architect intensified the need for subterfuge, pushing writers to reclaim reality through subtext (Deletant 2017). Sorescu's *Iona*, with its endless prison of fish bellies, mirrored the psychological entrapment of totalitarianism, while Blandiana's "I Am Watching Myself" offered a moral lens to pierce the regime's distortions (Vianu 2010). These works weren't static texts but dynamic performances, reliant on readers to complete the act of resistance, a process framed by metaliterature's self-awareness and the reader's role as co-conspirator (Benamou 1977).

Comparing these strategies with Václav Havel's provocative theater in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet samizdat networks reveals both shared goals and distinct adaptations. While Havel leveraged public spaces and samizdat built clandestine communities, Romania's writers navigated within the system, turning official channels into battlegrounds of meaning (Wachtel 2006). This approach, shaped by the Securitate's unique brutality, prioritized subtlety over spectacle, a choice that balanced survival with impact. One might debate whether this caution limited its reach could bolder acts have toppled the regime sooner? but its endurance through bans and underground circulation suggests a different kind of strength, one rooted in cultural resilience.

The legacy of this coded performance extends beyond its time. It offers a lens to understand how art can resist authoritarianism, not just through confrontation but through the quiet persistence of human spirit. Today, as global debates on censorship resurface, Romania's literary history reminds us that meaning can thrive in the margins, preserved by those willing to read between the lines. For scholars and readers alike, it poses a question: in an age of digital surveillance, can such subtle resistance still hold power? The answer lies partly in the past, where Sorescu and Blandiana proved that even under the heaviest shadow, literature can illuminate a path to freedom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acta Philologia 2017: "Ana Blandiana: The Entropy of the World and the Antinomic Tension Between the Cognisable and the Unknowable", in "Acta Philologia", 51, pp. 45-60.

Benamou 1977: M. Benamou, *Performance in Postmodern Culture*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.

Blandiana 2015: Ana Blandiana, *My Native Land A4,* Interview and Poetry Collection Notes.

Deletant 2008: D. Deletant, *Romania under Communist Rule*, Iasi, Center for Romanian Studies.

Deletant 2017: D. Deletant, *Tainted Sources: The Securitate Files and the Myth of Communist Romania*, London, Hurst & Company.

Havel 1986: V. Havel, *The Power of the Powerless: Citizens Against the State in Central-Eastern Europe*, London, Hutchinson.

Kind-Kovács & Labov 2013: F. Kind-Kovács & J. Labov, *Samizdat, Tamizdat, and Beyond: Transnational Media During and After Socialism*, New York, Berghahn Books.

Manea 2013: N. Manea, *The Hooligan's Return: A Memoir*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Shapiro 2016: N. R. Shapiro, *Theatres of Resistance: Drama and Dissent in Eastern Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sorescu 1968: M. Sorescu, *Iona*, Published Play, Translated 1983 by John F. Deane.

Vianu 2010: L. Vianu, *Censorship in Romania*, Budapest, Central European University Press.

Wachtel 2006: A. Wachtel, *Remaining Relevant After Communism: The Role of the Writer in Eastern Europe*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.