

# Romanian Propaganda and Diplomacy in France at the End of the Great War

---

ADRIAN VIȚALARU

## Introduction

**D**URING THE years of the Great War, as well as during the Paris Peace Conference, propaganda was a tool frequently employed by representatives of both parties involved in the conflict in an attempt to influence outcomes. ‘Propaganda offices’ and ‘press bureaus’ were created, university missions were sent abroad, books, brochures, pamphlets, atlases, petitions, reports and flyers were published with the purpose of convincing the decision makers of that time of the justness of the claims supported by various states, ethnic groups or political formations. In this framework in which propaganda seemed to be an important ‘weapon,’ the Romanian authorities and the Romanian citizens on French territory supported the interests of Romania through propaganda. They sought to show the world the sacrifices made by Romanians during the war and to support the territorial claims of Romania. Through the actions undertaken during the war, as well as during the Peace Conference, those who worked in the field of propaganda and cultural diplomacy played a part in the creation of Greater Romania.

This role was acknowledged by many contemporaries. Ion Rusu-Abrudeanu, for instance, wrote: “It is therefore appropriate, each time when one speaks of the actions of Romanians in Paris in 1917-1918-1919, to employ less light-heartedness, less pathos and to bare ourselves before it, for it was one of the loftiest examples of faith and love for one’s country”<sup>1</sup>. Others, however, did not regard the actions of Romanians in France with similar delight, criticizing them for their mistakes in the drawing-up of propaganda materials and also accusing them of fleeing the besieged country for quieter places. N. Iorga was one of the most critical voices against those carrying out Romanian propaganda abroad during the war and the peace negotiations towards the end of the conflict. He called the ones leaving abroad at the end of 1916 and in 1917 ‘fugitives’ and would not hesitate, whenever he had the chance, to analyse the errors they made. Here is a relevant example. In an article titled “Fac propagandă...” [Spreading propaganda...] published in the issue of 3 March 1919 of the newspaper *Neamul Românesc* [The Romanian People], N. Iorga spoke harshly about some of those who had left the country to spread propaganda abroad, claiming that professionalism and arguments were

wanting in the drafting of propaganda materials. Iorga ended his article thus: “In the difficult days in Iași, ‘propaganda’ would be spread by those who had managed to escape. I thought they were too many. What will happen, dear Lord, today, when the roads are open, and no less than 75000 people have registered to go to Paris? 75000 patriots, each with a brochure on his head for the victory of the national cause! Rid us, Lord, of Hungarians, Bolsheviks, Bulgarians, of whomever You know, but also rid us of propaganda spreaders! For they harm and embarrass us...<sup>2</sup>. Iorga was, evidently, too harsh on some of those involved in propaganda actions, especially on those who did not share his political ideas and scientific theories, but he himself admitted that careful propaganda was necessary to defend the interests of Romania abroad<sup>3</sup>.

On the other hand, we often find in Romanian historiography authors who are appreciative of the work of those who dealt with the external propaganda of Romania, despite the fact that they do underline the meagerness of financial resources and the fact that external propaganda was organized later than in other neighboring states of Romania<sup>4</sup>.

Starting from the above, our study analyses the main tendencies of Romanian propaganda in France in 1918 and at the beginning of the following year (until the beginning of the Peace Conference). Our main goal is to investigate the connection between propaganda and Romania’s foreign affairs objectives, to take note of the changes in this field after the establishment of the Marghiloman government, for instance, and after the coming into power of the government headed by the Liberal leader Ion I. C. Brătianu.

## Romanian Propaganda in France at the Beginning of 1918

**A**FTER ROMANIA entered the war there was a Romanian Press Bureau in Paris which seems to have acquired a more coherent structure at the beginning of 1918, through the involvement of the Romanian legation in the French capital led by the Liberal politician Victor Antonescu<sup>5</sup>. Dimitrie Drăghicescu, Sebastian Ierbescu and Elena Văcărescu were working for the Romanian Press Bureau at the time. The latter had an important role in introducing the new minister plenipotentiary of Romania in France, Victor Antonescu, to French society. Through the Press Bureau, which also had French collaborators, information about Romania was gathered and published in various publications, and articles favorable to Romania were written and placed in the French press. The legation in Bucharest and the Press Bureau also oversaw the correspondence with the authors of certain propaganda works and with French editors<sup>6</sup>.

*The Mission of the Romanian University Professors*<sup>7</sup> was also open in Paris starting with the autumn of 1917, and it worked together with the diplomatic representation and received subsidies from the Romanian state until the government led by Alexandru Marghiloman came into power (starting with April 1918, the Marghiloman government cut the University Mission’s funding)<sup>8</sup>. One of the University Mission’s goals was to publish a magazine in French and English, with a significant circulation, but the high costs of such a project, as well as the changes on the Romanian political scene, thwarted this plan<sup>9</sup>.

According to several sources, in 1914 the French-Romanian committee was founded in France, which carried out important activity in the following years as a structure that subsequently integrated the members of the Romanian University Mission led by Professor Ermil Pangrati<sup>10</sup>.

One of the most visible accomplishments of foreign propaganda was the publication of the newspaper *La Roumanie* on 17 January 1918. The publication's governing board consisted of Pavel Brătășanu, Constantin Mille, Constantin Banu and Emil Fagure<sup>11</sup>, noteworthy politicians and journalists. The initiative for the newspaper's publication belonged to Pavel Brătășanu, a politician from Take Ionescu's entourage<sup>12</sup>, with the support of the Paris legation, despite the fact that some of the collaborators (Emil Fagure) did not receive a stipend from Romania's diplomatic representation<sup>13</sup>. *La Roumanie* was a largely circulated newspaper in French milieus which copied, in fact, the model of publications such as *La Patrie Serbe*<sup>14</sup>, remaining the most influential newspaper published by Romanians in Western Europe.

Consequently, at the beginning of 1918, an institutional framework for Romanian propaganda and a group of intellectuals dedicated to this goal were already in place. Documents that helped draft the propaganda materials had started to be brought into the country and connections with some French editors and the representatives of some newspapers had already been forged. The level of the propaganda, however, was below that of other states, from both the institutional and the financial point of view.

## The Marghiloman Government and Propaganda in France

**A**FTER THE Marghiloman government came into power in March 1918 a series of changes occurred at the top of some diplomatic missions, including the replacement of Victor Antonescu<sup>15</sup>. The leadership of the diplomatic mission was relegated to Gheorghe Cretzianu, who would manage, for a few months, both the diplomatic mission in Madrid and the one in the French capital. In reality, the one who took charge of the legation on several occasions was Charles-Adolph Cantacuzino. Despite his position as a representative of the Marghiloman government, Cretzianu sought to maintain good relations with the members of the Romanian colony in Paris and supported—with the resources at his disposal—the mission of the university professors, facilitating the acquisition of some propaganda papers published by Bulgarians and other nationalities<sup>16</sup>. Such initiatives were taking place as the Marghiloman government was suggesting the modification of the peace treaty stipulations concerning Dobruja<sup>17</sup>.

Thus, after the establishment of the Marghiloman government and the signing of the peace of Bucharest, “the state of the Romanian propaganda became more difficult, but also easier,” as the historian Ivan Ilcev underlined<sup>18</sup>. “On the one hand, from a formal point of view, there was no one to authorize, organize and finance the propaganda,” and, on the other hand, the Romanian intellectuals and politicians in France, as well as those who had come with Take Ionescu (in the summer of 1918), “deprived of other means by which to influence the course of events... and obsessed by the idea of the

Entente forgetting about the sacrifices made by Romania for the common cause, began an active propaganda campaign.”<sup>19</sup>

It should be noted, in this context, that the former head of government, Ion I. C. Brătianu, charged his brother-in-law, Radu R. Rosetti, who had left for France in the summer of 1918, with conveying a message to Victor Antonescu, the former minister of Romania in Paris, demanding that the latter get involved in supporting the propaganda. Brătianu told Antonescu that the Romanians in the West had to act like the Romanian expatriates of 1848, supporting the Romanian cause and denouncing the Treaty of Bucharest<sup>20</sup>. Brătianu suggested that Romanian propaganda should not not spare Austria-Hungary and act towards the unification of all Romanian provinces<sup>21</sup>.

Consequently, the Romanian propaganda in France, supported by the Romanians on the territory of the French Republic’s and those who had arrived there with Take Ionescu—organized by the Romanian Colony in Paris’s Committee<sup>22</sup>—criticized the Peace Treaty of Bucharest, highlighting the fact that the Romanians had remained close to France and the allies and continued to support the rights of Romanians over Dobruja, Banat<sup>23</sup>, Bukovina, Transylvania and Bessarabia.

## Echoes of the Peace of Bucharest in the French Society

**T**AKING INTO account the fact that Romania signed the Peace of Bucharest (7 May 1918) which seemed to destroy the objectives with which the Romanian authorities had entered the war in August 1916, the presence in the Western European space and in the United States of America of news referring to the tragedy faced by Romanians, as well as their national aspirations, was meant to consolidate certain opinions favorable to Romania put forth in the political, diplomatic and cultural media. Support for the interests of the Romanian state through propaganda campaigns, therefore, became increasingly important for the foreign affairs actions of the pro-Entente Romanian politicians. In other words, as the army had been eliminated from combat, Romanians continued to be active in the field of foreign propaganda, transforming the trench war into a veritable war of words. At the same time, the propaganda was amplified when the end of the war could be envisaged. Under these circumstances, France, Romania’s closest ally up to that point, sheltering an important Romanian colony on its territory, was a privileged zone for foreign propaganda. The Romanians in France, especially in Paris, and the Romanian political leaders who were against a collaboration with the Central Powers, sought to maintain the connections with France after the signing of the Peace, counting on the fact that the Allied and Associated Powers would win the war and the fate of Romania would change.

The protest against the Peace of Bucharest, signed by 66 Romanians belonging to the Committee of the Romanian Colony in Paris, the Committee of Romanians in Transylvania and Bukovina and Romanian delegates from the Committee of Oppressed Nationalities, on 23 May 1918<sup>24</sup>, was particularly impactful. The protest published by the Romanians in France drew attention to the fact that “After the signing of our ill-fated armistice [...] there followed, as is well-known, the Peace treaties of Bucharest and Bufta, over-

seen by a Parliament of aliens. The Romanians in Paris, flabbergasted by what was happening in the country, would often gather at the Colony quarters and meet with French ministers and generals, especially Mr. Clemenceau, Pichon and Foch. The peace treaties in Bucharest were shaping up to be as unfavorable to us as possible. Through the newspaper *La Roumanie* we ran a lively campaign which, of course, was not echoed in the stony hearts of our enemies and of German-lovers in our country<sup>25</sup>. The text was carefully drafted. Romania's contribution to the war and the sacrifices of the Romanian people were underlined. "Romania entered the war alongside the Entente Powers for the cause of liberty and democracy. Its aspirations towards independence and unity for the entire Romanian people gave it strength. For this idea, thousands of hundreds of Romanians shed their blood. The Romanian people will never agree to renounce its national reason for being. Romania was set free as a nation due to Tsarist betrayal, Bolshevik betrayal, and Ukrainian betrayal."<sup>26</sup> The protest's signatories were very vocal about the fact that "Free Romanians living on the land of noble France are raising their voices in protest against this heinous crime. The Act of Bucharest is not a peace treaty, it is a flagrant contradiction of the notion of peace as understood by the civilized world, the clauses of the treaty obviously exclude the free consent of Romania, it is an act of the most extreme violence, imposed by a ruthless enemy"<sup>27</sup>.

The authors of the protest of the Romanians in France against the Peace of Bucharest were expressing hope in the allies' victory, stating that, from their point of view, Romania was still a member of the Entente and its national claims should not be abandoned: "In the name of the Romanian people, we declare ourselves today, as we did yesterday, allies of the Entente Powers and declare the Treaty of Bucharest, with all its clauses and additional consequences, null and void. At the same time, in the name of the Romanian people, we extend an appeal to the allied governments not to abandon Romania and its just requests"<sup>28</sup>. At the same time, they underlined another element which would become very important in the Romanian external propaganda of the following period—the idea of the outpost, of the defensive bulwark. If this time the question of the bulwark was asked in relation to the German threat ("Romania is, at the gates of the Balkan Peninsula, the only obstacle against the German invasion of the U.S.A and Asia"<sup>29</sup>), later on it will be closely tied to the threat of Bolshevik expansion.

Besides the protest, the Peace Treaty of Bucharest was published in the newspaper *La Roumanie*, which was one of the most interesting acts of propaganda by Romanians in France, in the opinion of some publicists of the time<sup>30</sup>. The members of the Romanian French emigration also published articles about the Bucharest treaty in important newspapers. Dumitru Drăghicescu, for instance, signed an article in *Le Temps* in which he deemed the Treaty of Bucharest "a declaration of war on the entire Romanian people"<sup>31</sup>. Some French personalities, too, such as the French historian Georges Lacour-Gayet, the president of the French-Romanian Committee, joined the campaign concerning the presentation of the peace conditions imposed on Romania by the Central Powers to the French public<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, the French press was constantly publishing articles about the Peace of Bucharest and the state of Romania<sup>33</sup>, which proves, on the one hand, the finality of the actions undertaken by the Romanians in France and the interest of the French authorities and press in matters concerning the Romanian state, on the other.

## Propaganda channels

AS ALREADY mentioned, the newspaper *La Roumanie* was one on the main channels for the dissemination of Romanian news by those desiring the materialization of Romanian national aspirations. *La Roumanie* was issued weekly in 5000–6000 copies and was “sent for free in France to all members of Parliament and politicians, all publicists, all university professors and members of the Academy, all newspapers and magazines”<sup>34</sup>. The newspaper was also sent to other countries: England, the United States of America, Switzerland, Italy, or Sweden. According to the report of one who penned articles constantly for *La Roumanie*, Professor Orest Tafrali, the newspaper’s contributors, members of the Romanian colony in Paris, university professors who were part of the Mission of Romanian University Professors, former ministers and members of Parliament tried to approach topics as closely related to their expertise and province of birth as possible. Some wrote about the question of Transylvania, others of Dobruja, Bessarabia, Banat or Bukovina<sup>35</sup>. The newspaper was still printed during the German bombing of Paris, when excerpts of articles published in *La Roumanie* were republished by daily French newspapers<sup>36</sup>.

Propaganda through lectures given by Romanians and by French political and cultural personalities was also taking place at this time. Among the latter, there were Ernest Lavisse, Paul Deschanel, Emmanuel de Martonne, Emile Picard, and Louis Barthou<sup>37</sup>. The lectures took place in Paris, as well as in other French cities. These series of lectures redoubled towards the end of 1918 and during the Peace Conference<sup>38</sup>.

Another aspect was the inclusion of Romanian news in French newspapers. One author claims that there were approximately 300 articles, notes, commentaries and interviews about the situation in Romania, Transylvania, Banat, Bukovina, Bessarabia and Dobruja in the French press between October and December 1918<sup>39</sup>.

Besides articles, the Romanians in France also edited a series of propaganda books and brochures meant to inform the public opinion about the aspirations of the Romanians. According to some, there were about 40 volumes and brochures printed in France in 1918<sup>40</sup>.

## The Reorganization of Romanian Propaganda in France at the End of the War

THE CREATION of the National Council for the Unity of all Romanians in October 1918, headed by Take Ionescu and later acknowledged by the allied Great Powers<sup>41</sup> subordinated part of the activity of Romanian propaganda to this organization. Take Ionescu, for instance, spurred propaganda actions by financially supporting the publication of some works and the making of maps of Romanian territories<sup>42</sup>.

Starting with 1 November 1918, Victor Antonescu was reappointed as head of the diplomatic mission in the capital of France<sup>43</sup> by the government led by General Constantin

Coandă. Shortly after his return to Paris in December 1918<sup>44</sup>, he started reorganizing the Romanian propaganda. Antonescu contacted a French journalist, who proposed that, in exchange for 1.5 million francs a year, the Romanian legation gain access to some of the most important French newspapers (*Le Temps*, *Le Matin*, *Le Petit Journal*, *Echo du Paris*). This “media affair” was enticing to the representative of Romania in France, since the press was the main means of public information and thus a very important channel to disseminate positive news about Romania. Financial matters, however, were far from being solved. At the same time, Antonescu estimated he would need about 150.000/200.000 francs for the Romanian Press Bureau in Paris, money used to publish brochures and other propaganda materials<sup>45</sup>.

Victor Antonescu was also paying attention to the steps taken by Take Ionescu’s people, allegedly in possession of significant propaganda funds<sup>46</sup>. A member of the National Liberal Party and trusted by Ion I. C. Brătianu, who returned as head of government on 14 December 1918, Antonescu was also the representative of the Romanian Liberals’ interests in Paris. This is why, in the context of deepening dissensions between Take Ionescu and I.I.C. Brătianu towards the end of 1918 and the beginning of the following year regarding the government’s leadership and Romania’s representation at the Peace Conference<sup>47</sup>, the minister plenipotentiary of Romania in France was closely following the propaganda carried out by “Take Ionescu’s group”<sup>48</sup>.

For an active Romanian propaganda in France, Antonescu proposed the creation of an Intelligence bureau for the French press in Bucharest that would send daily reports about Romania<sup>49</sup>. At the same time, the head of the Paris legation was asking for funds to support the Romanian propaganda in France, mentioning the fact that the Serbians and Hungarians were enjoying propaganda resources vastly superior to those of the Romanians<sup>50</sup>. V. Antonescu’s repeated demands eventually bore fruit, since at the end of December I.I.C. Brătianu announced the unblocking of propaganda funds<sup>51</sup>. At the beginning of January 1919, Antonescu was in possession of a sum of money in the Dreyfus Bank, where a Paris-bound “special fund” amounting to 376.183 francs was created<sup>52</sup>. At the same time, the Romanian government approved the sum of 1 million francs, to be used by the Paris legation to support propaganda activities<sup>53</sup>. Thus, shortly before the beginning of the peace conference, the Romanians had important propaganda funds, a Press Bureau, as well as connections built over time with French politicians, journalists and professors. All these elements were useful in the promotion of Romanian interests in France, bearing in mind the fact that the Peace Conference was held in Paris.

## Conclusions

**P**ROPAGANDA WAS an important factor in Romanian-French relations in 1918. Taking into account Romania’s political and military situation in the latter part of the war and immediately after the conflagration’s end, one can discern three stages in the organization of Romanian propaganda and cultural diplomacy in France.

A first stage, characterized by the Romanian Press Bureau and the founding of the newspaper *La Roumanie*, ended in March 1918, when the government headed by Alexandru Marghiloman replaced Victor Antonescu as head of the Paris legation and decided to cut funding for the *Mission of University Professors*.

The second stage began in March and ended with the appointment of General Constantin Coandă as head of government in October 1918. During this period, Romanian propaganda in France did not cease, but became more organized, being carried out independently from the Marghiloman government. A decisive role was played by the Romanians on French territory, who formed various structures (The Committee of the Romanian Colony in Paris, the National Council of Romanian Unity) which offered financial and logistic support to the Romanian propaganda in France and in Western Europe. They were trying to show that although Romania had signed a peace treaty with the Central Powers, it had not abandoned the Entente and Romania had not relinquished its national objectives. There had been timid attempts at propaganda campaigns made by the Marghiloman government, too, focusing especially on Bessarabia (which had joined Romania on 27 March 1918) and Dobruja (under German and Bulgarian occupation), thus placing the situation of Romanians in the Austrian-Hungarian Empire in the background.

During the third stage, which began in October/November 1918, the Romanian leaders' intention was to obtain the status of allied country and to prepare for the Peace Conference. In this new context, the impetus of Romanian propaganda in France was renewed. Reappointed as the head of the diplomatic mission in Paris, Victor Antonescu was actively involved in the organization of the propaganda, with the political and financial support of the government headed by Ion I. C. Brătianu. A deliberate involvement in the field of propaganda can also be seen, however, on the part of the group surrounding *La Roumanie*, a group led by Take Ionescu, who was hoping to obtain the position of prime minister of Romania at the end of the war by capitalizing on the political connections he had forged in France and in other Entente countries.

The rivalry between Ion I. C. Brătianu and Take Ionescu was also felt at the level of Romanian propaganda in France, but these political disputes did not interfere with the national objectives to be accomplished by Romanians at the Peace Conference. Although the Liberals' adversaries criticized Victor Antonescu for the way in which he coordinated the Romanian propaganda in Paris, documents show that the legation chief in the French capital showed interest in the field, looking to identify financial resources and channels through which to promote the best possible image for the Romanian state in the French milieu.



## Notes

1. Ion Rusu Abrudeanu, *România și războiul mondial. Contribuții la studiul istoriei războiului nostru* (Bucharest, 1921), 464.
2. *Neamul Românesc*, year XIV, no. 50, 3 March 1919, 1.



3. See, N. Iorga, "Propaganda externă," in *Politica externă a României. 19 prelegeri organizate de Institutul Social Român* (Bucharest, 1926), 259-276.
4. See, for instance, Constantin I. Stan, *Luptători sub steagul Marii Uniri. Activitatea românilor aflați în străinătate 1916-1920* (Bucharest, 2010).
5. See details about the Romanian Press Bureau in Paris, in the Romanian National Archives, Bucharest, collection of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (PCM), file 34/1920, 1-4.
6. For example, the Romanian legation in Paris had links with the Payot and Cie Publishing House.
7. Paul P. Brătășanu, *Propaganda națională de la Paris. Cuvântare rostită în ședința Adunării Deputaților de la 15 și 17 decembrie 1923* (Bucharest, 1924), 9-10.
8. Rusu Abrudeanu, 442; Romanian National Library, coll. Saint Georges, XCVIII, file 8; Orest Tafrali, *Propaganda românească în străinătate* (Craiova, 1920), 42.
9. Archives of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (AMAE), coll. Paris, file 370, Petition of the university professors addressed to Victor Antonescu. The university professors accused V. Antonescu of not sufficiently supporting their project, but his decisions were made after consulting with I.I.C. Brătianu. See also Tafrali, 11-12.
10. V. Vesa, *România și Franța la începutul secolului XX. Pagini de istorie diplomatică* (Cluj-Napoca, 1975), 56.
11. Brătășanu, 13-14.
12. *Ibid.*, 13-14. Among those who contributed to the newspaper and wrote brochures we find Toma Ionescu, Ermil Pangratti, I. Găvănescul, G. G. Mironescu, V. Dimitriu, D. Hurmuzescu, Traian Lalescu, C. Sipsom, O. Tafrali, I. Ursu, S. Mândrescu, G. Murnu, N. Dănăilă, G. Aslan, C. Xenii, Dr. V. Demetrescu-Brăila, N.P. Comnen, Dr. N. Lupu, Ion Al. Pangal, N. S. Russenescu, A. Honigman, Ernest Cananău, Vasile Lucaci, Octavian Goga, Sever Bocu, A. Atanasiu, M. Cireșanu, Anghel Niculescu, G. Borcea, Scarlat Demetrescu, Take Popescu.
13. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 370, the receipt which certifies that Emil Fagure received money from the Romanian legation in Paris.
14. Ivan Ilcev, *Are dreptate sau nu, e patria mea! Propaganda în politica externă a țărilor balcanice 1821-1923* (Bucharest, 2002), 106.
15. AMAE, coll. 77/Personal files, A 36, Victor Antonescu, Telegram no. 1838 of 24 March 1918, C.C. Arion to V. Antonescu, sheet 13. His mission officially ended on 25 March 1918.
16. With Cretzianu's help, Romanian university professors obtained, through the Bern legation, several works published by Bulgarians.
17. Mircea Mușat, Ion Ardeleanu, *De la statul geto-dac la statul român unitar*, vol. I (Bucharest, 1983), 547.
18. Ilcev, 120.
19. *Ibid.*
20. Radu R. Rosetti, *Mărturisiri (1914-1919)* (Bucharest, 1997), 233-234, 238-239.
21. *Ibid.*, 239.
22. Ilcev, 120.
23. The newspaper *La Roumanie* supported the idea that the entire Banat region should become part of Romania (Tafrali, 44).
24. *Ibid.*, 55.
25. Luchian Deaconu (ed.), *Franța și România unite în comunitatea de sacrificiu în anii 1916-1918. Documente externe din Arhivele Consiliului Național al Unității Române de la Paris redacției ziarului La Roumanie Coloniei române din Paris*, vol. I (Craiova, 2009), 229.
26. *Ibid.*, 230.
27. *Ibid.*

28. *Ibid.*, 231.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Rusu Abrudeanu, 463.
31. C. I. Stan, "Atitudinea românilor din străinătate față de pacea de la Buftea – București (24 aprilie/7 mai 1918)," *Analele Universității "Dunărea de Jos" din Galați*, Istorie ( XI, 2012), 185.
32. *Ibid.*, 190.
33. See, for example, the article published in *Le Gaoulois*, 19 June 1918 (Deaconu, 241-242).
34. Tafrafi, 31.
35. Tafrafi, 30-31.
36. *Ibid.*, 31.
37. Sherman David Spector, *România la conferința de pace de la Paris. Diplomația lui Ion I. C. Brătianu* (Iași, 1995), 52.
38. Tafrafi, 47-50.
39. Gheorghe I. Bodea, *Octavian Goga. O viață, un destin*, I (Cluj-Napoca, 2004), 324.
40. Constantin I. Stan, *Luptători sub steagul Marii Uniri*, 255.
41. Traian Sandu, *Le système de sécurité français en Europe centre-orientale. L'exemple roumain 1918-1933* (Paris, 1999), 37-38.
42. Adrian Vițalaru, *Nicolae Petrescu-Comnen – diplomat* (Iași, 2014), 50.
43. AMAE, coll 77/ Personal files, A 36 - Victor Antonescu, Document no. 08889 of 4 November 1918, V. Antonescu's Decree of appointment in Paris.
44. He arrived in Paris on 8 December 1918 (AMAE, coll. 77/Personal files, A 36, Victor Antonescu, No. 3597 of 15 December 1918, V. Antonescu to the President of Romania's Council of Ministers.
45. AMAE, coll. Paris, vol. 370, Telegram no. 5 of 24 December 1918, V. Antonescu to Ion I. C. Brătianu, Bucharest.
46. *Ibid.*
47. See details on the topic in Sherman David Spector, 89-92.
48. Victor Antonescu was criticized by his political adversaries and by some professors from the University Mission for his bias towards the members of his own political entourage when he initiated various propaganda campaigns instead of working openly with those from Take Ionescu's circle (Tafrafi, 11-14).
49. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 370, Telegram no. 11 of 24 December 1918, V. Antonescu to Brătianu.
50. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 370, Telegram no. 364 of 16 December 1918, V. Antonescu to C. Coandă, the president to the Council of Ministers.
51. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 370, Telegram no. 964 of 28 December 1918, I.I. C. Brătianu to V. Antonescu.
52. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 805, Telegram of 7 January 1919, Dreyfus Bank to V. Antonescu.
53. AMAE, coll. Paris, file 805, Telegram no. 1949 of 15 April 1919, V. Antonescu to I.I.C. Brătianu.

### **Abstract**

#### Romanian Propaganda and Diplomacy in France at the End of the Great War

Propaganda was an important factor in Romanian-French relations in 1918. Taking into account Romania's political and military situation in the latter part of the war and immediately after the end of the conflagration, one can identify three stages in the organization of Romanian propaganda and cultural diplomacy in France. A first stage ended in March 1918, when the government headed by Alexandru Marghiloman replaced Victor Antonescu as chief of the Paris legation and decided to cut funding for the Mission of University Professors. The second stage began in March and ended with the appointment of General Constantin Coandă as head of the government in October 1918. In the third stage, which began in October/November 1918, the Romanian leaders' intention was to obtain the status of allied country and to prepare for the Peace Conference. In this new context, the impetus of Romanian propaganda in France was renewed.

### **Keywords**

propaganda, diplomacy, Great War, Romania, France

### **Acknowledgement**

This work was supported by a grant of Ministry of Research and Innovation, CNCS - UEFIS-CDI, project number PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2016-1477, within PNCDI III