

Universitatea „Babeş-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca
Facultatea de Istorie și Filosofie
Catedra de Istoria Filosofiei Antice și Medievale

**STATE MODERNIZATION IN THE ROMANIAN LIBERAL
DOCTRINE
SUMMERY**

Scientific coordinator:

Prof. Univ. dr. Liviu-Petru Zăpârțan

Ph.D. Ture Ioan

Cluj-Napoca

2011

Table of contents

Table of contents	p. 2
Chapter I. The meaning established for the concept of modernization in the liberal thinking	p. 5
1. Determining the concept of modernization	p. 5
1.1. Controversies over the theory of modernization	p. 5
1.2. The theory of modernization.....	p. 8
1.2.1. Smelserian theory of structural differentiation.....	p. 9
1.2.2. T. Parsons' theory.....	p. 9
1.2.3. W.W. Rostow's theory.....	p. 10
1.2.4. McClelland's theory.....	p. 10
1.2.5. The emancipative theory of democracy.....	p. 13
1.3. Defining modernization.....	p. 14
1.4. Models which stand at the bases of modernization.....	p. 24
1.4.1. The model of the wise leader.....	p. 24
1.4.2. The model of the social contract	p. 26
1.4.3. The model of the pensioned reason of the state organization	p. 27
1.4.4. The nationalist model.....	p. 29
2. Paradigms of modern political thinking	p. 30
2.1. Individualist paradigm.....	p. 30
2.2. Particularistic paradigm.....	p. 33
2.3. Comunitarist paradigm.....	p. 36
3. Modernization and political life	p. 39
3.1. Political doctrines.....	p. 39
3.2. Liberal doctrine.....	p. 43
3.2.1. The complexity of determining the liberal doctrine.....	p. 46
3.2.2. The actuality of liberalist positions vs. the idea of modernization.....	p. 49
3.3. Political development.....	p. 52
3.3.1. Normativism.....	p. 57

3.3.2. Juridical positivism.....p. 58

Chapter II. Romania's modernization.....p. 61

1. Building Romanian modernity between 1800-1914.....p. 61

1.1. The beginnings of the Romanian economic modernity.....p. 62

1.2. The origins of Romanian liberalism.....p. 64

1.3. Liberals under Al. I. Cuza.....p. 73

1.4. Liberals between 1866-1868.....p. 75

1.5. The Constitution from 1866.....p. 78

1.6. Building National Liberal Party.....p. 84

1.7. Liberals and the independence of Romania.....p. 86

1.8. „By ourselves” concept and the „accomplished fact” policy.....p. 88

1.9. The period of moderate liberalism.....p. 92

1.10. Reformist liberalism.....p. 96

2. Political modernization and systems of political parties in Romania.....p. 108

2.1. Political modernization of the Romanian society.....p. 108

2.2. Neoliberalism.....p. 126

2.3. The new Liberal doctrine.....p. 130

Chapter III. Romania's Constitution from 1923.....p. 133

1. Introduction.....p. 133

2. The position and role of political parties in the elaboration of the Constitution from 1923.....p. 135

3. R. Boilă's project.....p. 136

4. The Constitution from 1923.....p. 141

4.1. The principles provided by the Constitution from 1923.....p. 145

4.2. Rights and Liberties.....p. 150

4.3. Other important provisions.....p. 152

5. The Constitution from the 27th of February 1938.....p. 153

Chapter IV. Actual doctrinal debates.....p. 156

1. The concept of tradition and the Romanian Liberalism.....p. 156

2. Romania and the post communist modernization.....p. 167

3. The political dimension of the Romanian Liberalism.....p. 171

3.1. The step of the post communist transition.....	p. 174
3.2. Liberal solutions for the modernization of the political life in post communist Romanian.....	p. 177
3.2.1. The economic dimension of the liberal project.....	p. 178
3.2.2. Social and cultural dimension of the liberal doctrine platform.....	p. 180
4. Liberalism in Romanian society after 2000.....	p. 183
5. Liberalism today.....	p. 186
5.1. National Liberal Party – a European liberal party.....	p. 187
5.2. Social balance, the individual and the society.....	p. 189
5.3. Teaching, research, culture, youth and civil society.....	p. 193
5.4. Health.....	p. 195
5.5. Public administration and justice.....	p. 196
5.6. Economy and politics.....	p. 201
5.7. Liberal ethic.....	p. 201
5.8. Liberal actual objectives.....	p. 208
Conclusions.....	p. 213
Bibliography.....	p. 228

Summery

Key words: modernization, progress, political party, doctrine of National Liberal Party

The objective of the present paper is to analyze of Romania's modernization in the Romanian liberal doctrine. In order to accomplish this analyze we had first of all, to present the definitions given by the literature of sociality to the concept of modernization, but also to present the debates which were born regarding the theory of modernization. The importance of the chosen theme can be seen in the fact that, as Robert Corneiro wrote, the theory of modernization is based on the idea of the human progress¹. In the literature of specialty have been identified three senses which can be associated to the concept of modernity. The first sense is a general one, and is synonymous with any type of social progress, but it is also relative because it is applicable for any historical period. The second sense represents the concept of modernity defined as totality of social, political and cultural transformations which have appeared in the occidental society from the XVIth century. From this point of view, modernity implies a series of characteristics as: industrialization, urbanization, rationalization, birocracy, capitalism, individualism and others, representing the process by which a society becomes modern. This way, modernity and modernization are complementary, the first one defining a status, and the second a process. The third sense of the modernization concept has as a starting point the underdeveloped societies and describes the process through which they reach the same level with the developed and modern societies, with which they are going to share the same space².

The origins of modernization have been found in the Enlightenment Era, when the idea of the technological progress appeared and which will give humanity a greater control over the nature. Among the first who have explicitly tied the economical development and the cultural change was Antoine de Condorcet. He considered that the technological progress and the economical development will inevitably bring changes in humans' moral values³. The idea of human progress had a great impact over the social philosophers, but was opposite to the notion of „social decline”, according to which the humanity is directing itself to a dark age. Those anti-modern visions have been characterized by Edmund Burke in the paper called

¹ Robert Corneiro, *Evolutionism in Cultural Anthropology*, Westview Press, Boulder, 2003.

² P. Sztompka, *The Sociology of Social Change*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1994, p. 129.

³ Jean-Antoine Condorcet, Nicolas de Caritat, (1795), *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of Human Mind*, Hyperion Press, Westport, 1979.

*Reflections on the Revolution in France*⁴, but also by Thomas R. Malthus who has developed a theory of demographic disasters which find their echo in the contemporaneous conceptions about the ecologic risks and the limits of growth⁵.

Modern state is the product of a unique civilization. This product is still in a developing process in which the old and the new fights about the social order. In order to understand the new we must see the old, we must understand which was the old social structure that, under the influence of liberal ideas, gave birth to a new civic state. The old structure was not a primitive one, because man has always lived in „societies” organized in different forms. Today, in the most part of the world seen from the historical point of view, we can distinguish two forms of social organization, which are variable. On one hand, we can find the small „kingdoms”, but on the other hand, we can find the big societies which are variable from the point of view of their spread and degree of civilization⁶.

The versions over the theory of modernization have renewed after the Second World War, when the superpowers – capitalist and communist – have exposed opposite ideologies concerning the principal lines to follow in order to reach modernity⁷. More than that, the opinion that any simple theory of modernization has a short existence appeared. This is why the theory of modernization must be always reviewed. To this aspect we also add the fact that, even though the classic theories of modernization – in West, but also in the East – believed that religion and ethnic traditions will come to an end, those assumptions have proved to be unreal, and Huntington believed that the political disputes will always have cultural bases, reflected in the religious traditions of the society⁸.

It is very important to distinguish between sociological classic theories concerning social change and the theories of modernization. The first are the ones which tried to understand the transformation process of the European societies from the end of the XIXth century, and the second ones began to appear at the middle of the XXth century. Although the main theme of both types of theories is the change, they are different by their starting point, by the categories used as a model for transformation and its role as main target⁹. In the present paper we considered that we must remember some of the most important theories of

⁴ E. Burke, (1790), *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.

⁵ Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society*, Ed. Sage, Londra, 1992.

⁶ L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, Oxford University Press, London, 2009, p. 4.

⁷ Vicky Randall, Robin Theobald, *Political Change and Underdevelopment*, 2nd edition, Duke University Press, Durham, 1998.

⁸ *Remaking of the World Order*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1996.

⁹ Dan Chiribucă, *Tranziția postcomunistă și reconstrucția modernității în România*, Ed. Dacia, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2004, pp. 49-52.

modernization, as for example: *the smelserian theory of structural differentiation* – which concentrated on the effects of the economic development over social structures¹⁰; *T. Parsons's theory* – which considered that modernization represents the passing from a particularistic social life to a universalist one¹¹; *W.W. Rostow's theory* – according to which the societies can be placed in one of the five categories or stages of economic development that he author identified at that time – traditional society, the preparing, the over passing of the development barriers, the reinvestment of the national product on international markets and the „mass consume”¹²; *McClelland's theory* – which referred to the intensity of the need of development which is different from one person to another and which corroborates with the persons' need of doing well and of progressing from the point of view of the efficiency and of results¹³; and *the emancipative theory of democracy* – according to which, the birth of free expressing values can ensure the social force which operates in favor of democracy, helping to its implementation where it does not exist, but also to its consolidation where it already exists, improving this way the efficiency of democratic institutions¹⁴.

We considered that in order to determine the meaning given to the concept of modernization by the liberal doctrine we must present the models which stood at the base of modernization. This way, we identified some models, as for example: *the model of the wise leader* – elaborated by Niccolo Machiavelli, whose work stands, as Viorel Cernica observed, at the bases of the politic and of the theory of modern politics. The main significance of this work which produces the detachment from the medieval political thinking is tied to the idea of separating politic from moral, of the different normatively of the two stages of the human existence. We have seen that the modern political thinking, has structured around the authority, making it its main problem and accepting as a model the excessive distinction between politics and moral, opening a new evolution line whose objective, detached from the old political thinking, was to research the political phenomenon. Before Machiavelli, the Fortress and the Man (Leo Strauss) have been considered, together, the object of the political thinking, but through its work, the man disappears and the state subsists. The consequence of this disappearing is the „aneantyzation” of the purpose of the „ideal fortress” as a base for any

¹⁰ N. J. Smelser, *Mechanisms of an Adjustments to Change*, in T. Burns (edit.), *Industrial Man*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969, pp. 43-68.

¹¹ Dan Chiribucă, op. cit., pp. 57-58.

¹² Ibidem, pp. 60-61.

¹³ D. McClelland, *The Impulse to Modernization*, în Myron Wiser (coord.), *Modernization, The Dynamics of Growth*, pp. 29-39.

¹⁴ Ronald Inglehart, Christian Welzel, op. cit., p. 299.

fortress (Platon), or conceived as an ideal starting from the real fortress (Xenophon, Aristotle, Thomas de Aquino, Thomas Morus)¹⁵.

Then, we have referred to the *model of the social contract* which is based on the idea delivered by H. Grotius. The politologiccal reconstruction of H. Grotius is based on the idea that man as is a social and rational being. As a social being, man lives in „communities”, and as a rational being man is forming „political” forms of cohabiting based on laws. This way, the configuration of human nature is determined by sociability and rationality. From the juridical point of view, this configuration is named „natural law”. „The rule of the right reason, which also serves as a natural rule, after its appropriation with natural reason”¹⁶ represents the content of the natural law.

Third, we have referred to *the model of the pensioned reason of the state organization*, which is based on the social ontology of Thomas Hobbes, and which is dominated by a politologiccal type of discourse whose object is the political phenomenon – the state and the citizen – and its construction in human nature. Th. Hobbes refers to the norms which institute state authority – which cannot be represented outside its relation with the rights and functions of the citizen. State’s authority must be absolute in order to exercise its function of maintaining peace in the relations between people who have given up their natural state, characterized by war. Although absolute, the authority is instituted by a contract between people, and it responds to a human need, and its main purpose must be the satisfaction of the human need: of peace, generated by fear „for a violent death”. This way, the authority is under the norm, the state is sovereign, and the sovereign’s functions are exercised by a representative, whose acts are governed by law¹⁷. The direct or representative democracy means that the action of the political body has its source in the will of each person¹⁸. Th. Hobbes is one of the thinkers who have established the bases of the modern political thinking, his work being qualified by the literature of specialty as being one of the „fundamental instances of the political thinking from the beginning of the modern era”¹⁹.

At last, the *nationalist model* of Baruch Spinoza, that was created starting from the system thought by H. Grotius. The main object of the philosophy of Baruch Spinoza is represented by the rationality of the human environment, whose expression is the society. The

¹⁵ Viorel Cernica, *Cetatea sub blocada ideii*, Schița fenomenologică a istoriei gândirii politice, Institutul european, Iași, 2005, pp. 142-143.

¹⁶ Hugo Grotius, *Despre dreptul războiului și al păcii*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1968, p. 108.

¹⁷ Viorel Cernica, op. cit., p. 177.

¹⁸ Pierre Manent, *Istoria Intelectuală a Liberalismului*, Humanitas, București, 1992, pp. 51-52.

¹⁹ Viorel Cernica, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

reason of the human state organization is the reason. This is the bases of the citizen duty of respect for the civil law. In the literature of specialty it is considered that if we must deal with rationality and sociality, then we can also discuss about o political philosophy which is based on the idea of the possibility of the human condition to be in agreement with the rules of reason. Among the significant problems for the history of the political thinking implemented by Spinoza we recall: human nature, the state, the liberty; the social contract, private civil law and justice; religion and state²⁰.

As a plus to the presented aspects, the present paper also refers to the paradigms of modern political thinking. Those paradigms must be identified by the way we understand the concepts of „public” and „private”. For the *individualist paradigm*, „private” is the dominant feature, with the meaning of life and individual property. The *particularistic paradigm* does not benefit of either of those terms: the private – understood as individual will – is in balance with the public – understood as a general will. At last, the *universalist paradigm* puts the accent on the public identified with human universal – being understood differently by the thinkers who accept this paradigm – human universe appears as humanity at Kant, and as power will at Nietzsche²¹.

The references to the liberal doctrine have been made in the last part of the *first chapter* from the present paper, when we approached aspects related to the politic theory²², to the definition of the ideology²³, but also aspects related to the complexity of determining the liberal doctrine and to the actuality of the liberal positions vs. the idea of modernization. Regarding the *political doctrine*, we have adopted the same position as L.-P. Zăpârțan, who believes that any political doctrine must, built itself as a theoretical image of a society, of the social, political, cultural and geopolitical structures which define it. More than that, any doctrine must contain a conception about the identity of a certain society and about the ways it conserves itself in its fields of activity, and also to contain a set of ideological sentences in which the theories and conceptions are subordinated to the promotion of the interests and ideals of a certain social group. Finally, the political doctrine must contain a set of sentences through which are provided practical and efficient ways to accomplish its project in society²⁴.

Basing on the fact that the fundament of the modernity is essentially liberal, V. Naumescu names *liberal doctrine* as „the modern world doctrine”. In addition, the author

²⁰ Pierre Manent, op. cit., pp. 191-192.

²¹ Viorel Cernica, op. cit., p. 195.

²² L.-P. Zăpârțan, op. cit., 1994, pp. 10-11.

²³ D. L. Seiler, Introduction à la Science politique, Ed. U-L-B, Bruxelles, 1992.

²⁴ L.-P. Zăpârțan, op. cit., 1994, pp. 25-26.

recalls that the liberals refer themselves to a common set of values and principles, to a minimal nucleus of understanding social, economic and political life²⁵. The author goes for an unifying approach of the liberalism, in the detriment of the pluralist one, citing a series of classic schools and consecrated authors who pointed that it is not the content of the ideas that distinguishes them from the supporters of other modern political doctrines, but is the style, the mode and the approached method which is specific liberal. Individual approachement of the life is rationale, based on experimenting, on free investigation and critique. Liberalism is characterized by a constant presence in the space of European thinking, which explains the distinct steps that it followed in its historical evolution. The formulated theses in the phase of classic liberalism are still the nucleus of the liberal current. In the literature of specialty, classic liberalism is presented as the product of „spiritual unrest of Occidental Europe, of the inside tensions that have marked its evolution, and which are in tide connection with social – political – real dynamism, with the evolution of facts which, in a certain continuity, have led to the discontinuity which characterize modern era”²⁶.

In the chapter entitled *Romania's modernization*, we have referred strictly to the building of the Romanian modernity, but we have presented a certain historical period, between 1800-1914. The beginnings of Romanian modernity were placed by the Romanian historians to the beginning of the XIXth century, at the same time as the movement led by Tudor Vladimirescu. This aspect is founded on an „ideology of a synchronic evolution”, and not on the identification of some characteristics which define modernity. According to D. Chiribucă, from a sociologic point of view, we can identify two types of the beginning of Romanian modernity. First of all, there is the beginning of the modernization process, when the hole attention is directed over the identification of the factors which produced modernization, as for example the economical transformations which took place after Romania's entrance in the European economic circuit by The Adrianople Treaty and The downier Convention with Austria, but also the „import of the liberal ideology”. Second, there is the establishment of the reference picture at the moment the first signs of modern institutions appeared²⁷.

Modern state has, as we showed, its beginning in the authoritarian order and in the religious, political, economic, social and ethic protest over this order, which has represented the beginning of liberalism. Although liberalism initially appears as a critique with negative

²⁵ V. Naumescu, „Despre liberalism în România” – Realități, dileme, perspective, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2001, pp. 11-33.

²⁶ Liviu-Petru Zăpârțan, op. cit., 1994, pp. 87-88.

²⁷ Dan Chiribucă, op. cit., pp. 73-74.

aspect, whose purpose is to destroy the obstacles towards human progress, according to L. T. Hobhouse the modern state means more than incorporating liberal elements²⁸.

The problem of the origins of liberalism in Romania was debated in the Romanian literature of specialty, and the conclusion that imposed was that liberalism appeared in Romania as a consequence of the extinction of feudalism and as an effect of ascension of the bourgeoisie. From this point of view, liberalism is presented in opposition with absolutism which conceives the rule of the society in relation to the exclusive interests of a single dominant class – noblemen. Repressing any contestatory spirit and refusing any direct communication with society and being founded on dogmatic norms, absolutist political regime in contradiction with liberal thinking „anchored in the social and economical reality” of a people. According to Apostol Stan the liberal model of political thinking is definitely related to the enlightenment²⁹. In this sense, he talks about „scientific and cultural enlightenment, on different degrees and among many people”. The „cultural enlightenment” appears firstly at the level of the political leading class of the noblemen. This aspect allows a better understanding of the social and economic mechanisms. But the essential condition for the „cultural enlightenment” is the development of the public teaching and of the national culture. Through culture, the social classes understand better individual interests and the general imperatives of development. From this point of view, liberalism is seen as being dependent of the enlightenment, which in order to determine the development of the society must always accompany the political thinking³⁰.

In the time of Al.I.Cuza, there were distinguished two periods of liberalism. The first one was during the political regime under the Convention from 1858, and the second after 1864, during the system of Cuza – imposed with the purpose of reformation. By the end of this second period, due to the control over the liberal political aspirations, political liberalism found itself in the impossibility of an opened affirmation. The literature of specialty has identified the liberal objectives during Cuza’s ruling, which were for the restoration of the political regime based on political parties. In the paper dedicated to this certain historical period, Apostol Stan, has showed that the evolution of liberalism had recorded a period of stagnation in its affirmation in the Romanian society³¹.

²⁸ L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, Oxford University Press, London, 2009, pp. 6-7.

²⁹ Pi re Caunu, *La civilisation de l’Europe des Lumi re*, Paris, 1971, p. 504.

³⁰ Apostol Stan, *Originile liberalismului*, in Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic  n Rom nia, de la origini p n  la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 1996, pp. 11-13.

³¹ Apostol Stan, *Grup ri  i curente politice  n Rom nia  ntre Unire  i Independen a*, Bucure ti, 1979, pp. 37 – 49.

Another aspect to which we have concentrated in the second chapter of this paper is the elaboration of the *Constitution from 1866* – whose bases can be traced back in the legislative tradition of the period when took place the Revolution of Tudor Vladimirescu, but also in the programs from 1848 whose ideas were included in the Constitution Project of the Central Commission from Focșani, and also in the constitutional accomplishments during the ruling of Al. I. Cuza³². Gh. Iacob shows that the Constitution was corresponding to the development necessities of Romania in its path towards modernization³³. The Constitution contains provisions referring to: the Romanian territory; the Romanian right; the state powers; finances; army; the constitutional revision; general, transitory and additional dispositions. It also contained a series of principles, as for example: the principle of national sovereignty, the principle of hereditary monarchy; the inviolability principle of the monarch, the principle of representative governing, the principle of power separation in state, the principle of ministerial responsibility, and others; and guaranteed the equality of laws, the liberty of conscience, of press, of education, of meetings, the inviolability of residence and of person, the right to associate; prohibiting the reintroduction of the death penalty, of censure, of class privileges and of monopolies, etc.

Other essential points were represented by the consolidation of the Liberal National Party, the „by ourselves” concept and the „accomplished fact” policy, but also the references to the liberal efforts for winning the independence of Romania, the period of moderate and reformist liberalism. „By ourselves” concept was expressed by I.C. Brătianu after the independence war, in relation to the country’s economic necessities and it was „the axe of the entire politic of the party during its existence”. According to I. G. Ducal, the concept represents „the unlimited trust of the liberal national party in the power of life of the Romanian people”; significance that, in practice, has realized by the promotion of a politic meant to contribute to the country’s economic development. This concept referred to all activity sectors, and also to the external politic which meant, among others, the adoption of economic structures for Romania’s modernization. By the application of the „by ourselves” concept was realized the development of the small peasant property, and beginning with 1881, along with the Law which provided peasant’s property and a system of selling the work land

³² Ioan C. Filitti, *Izvoarele Constituției de la 1866 (Originile democrației române)*, București, 1934; Angela Banciu, *Rolul Constituției de la 1923 în consolidarea unității naționale (Evoluția problemei constituționale în România interbelică)*, București, 1988.

³³ Gh. Iacob, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

which belonged to the state³⁴. In the literature of specialty concerning the modern history of Romania, referring to the period between the Great Union and the Independence, it speaks about the „*accomplished fact*” policy³⁵. In this context, we presented the opinion of Cavour who believed that: „The union of the Participates and the consulting of the people’s vote is the beginning of a new era in the political system of Europe”³⁶. On the other hand, we also found opinions according to which the „*accomplished fact*” policy is an overreaction or a speculation of historians. According to C. Rădulescu-Motru „The real truth is other. The authority of the accomplished fact in 1866 comes from the fact that the ones who could have prevented the fact did not desire or could not do so. This is always the case of the accomplished fact in history, as it is in human life in general. What is desired and it is not stopped, is always accomplished”³⁷.

Liberalism needs a robust thinking opened towards individuals and groups which lead them and it must enjoy the legitimacy of the first ones. This is the formula expressed as a principle of liberty of expression. This principle means the creation of a certain space where individuals and groups can live their lives and where public institutions are needed³⁸. As it is shown in the literature of specialty, the main elements of liberalism are: civil liberty, fiscal liberty, personal liberty, social and economic liberty, domestic liberty, local, racial, national and international liberty and popular sovereignty³⁹. The accomplishment of the Great Union has put Liberal National Party in front of the necessity to adapt its doctrine to the new conditions of life of the Romanian society. Defining, in 1923, liberal doctrine, I. Gh. Duca showed that it is based on four pilons: order, democracy, nationalism and social harmony. In what concerns the concept of nationalism, it was defined as „the progress (...) founded on the development of national forces”. Gh. Iacob’s conclusion was that Liberal National Party was close to the real necessities of the society, having a determined role in the establishment of the strategy for the development of the country, in opposition with the conservatives who, although agreed with the modernization, have followed it according to their own conception

³⁴ Mircea Iosa, Conceptul „prin noi înșine”, in Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996, pp. 207 -211.

³⁵ Leonid Boicu, Diplomația europeană și triumful cauzei române (1856-1859), Iași, 1978; Dan Berindei, Epoca Unirii, București, 1979; Gh. Cliveti, România și Puterile Garante. 1856-1878, Iași, 1988; Gh. Platon, Istoria modernă a României, București, 1985.

³⁶ Dan Berindei, Epoca Unirii, București, 1979, p. 95.

³⁷ C. Rădulescu-Motru, Regele Carol I și Destinul României – Discurs ținut la Academia Română, 26 mai 1939, in Din viața Regelui Carol I. Mărturii, București, 1939, p. 273.

³⁸ William A. Galston, Liberal Pluralism, The implications of Value Pluralism for Political Theory and Practice, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2002) 2004, p. 3.

³⁹ L. T. Hobhouse, op. cit., pp. 8-14.

about the evolution of the society. In the consideration of this aspect, for liberals, the conservatives were a party „of control prepared, at need” to govern the country⁴⁰.

In the Romanian literature of specialty it was considered that from certain points of view, liberal doctrine resembles the conservative one. The elements that lead to this conclusion are: the promotion of nationalism, of constitutionalism and of pluralism. Although conservatism contains a small dose of liberalism, the three mentioned aspects are used by the liberals for the transformation of the entire society by economic and political development, while the conservatives are using them for the rich and educated population. So, we must show that the main purpose of the liberal doctrine, in opposition with the conservative one, was an opened one, from the political point of view, toward the whole population. For this reason, liberalism confronted with conservatism, especially under the ruling of Cuza. The main point of this confrontation is represented by the conception about social reform which, from the liberal point of view, meant multiple structural changes, related to the property and agrarian relations⁴¹.

Classic liberalism refers to the freedom of spirit and mind so that we deal with reasonable facts' interpretation and not with the obedience to the authority. For this reason, the literature of specialty believes that classic liberalism is the product of Enlightenment⁴². Classic liberalism was born as an ideology of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries, ideology which referred to the rights of the individual of engaging in the sphere of the behavior free from the governmental control or of the one exercised by the religious authorities. In its *Leviathan* (1651), Th. Hobbes was talking about the tyranny of the central authority towards the individual, while in *Wealth of Nations*; A. Smith was providing us with a positive vision over the following of the individuals' own interest in the economic operations defined by minimal state rules. Although he saw the difficulties imposed by *individual liberalism* for the maintenance of the social unity, as he shows in the paper *A Theory of Moral Sentiments*, the author saw the liberalism's interest in producing „the greatest good for the many”⁴³. So, liberalism has represented a, emancipation of the enlightenment towards the tyranny of the mercantilist monarchy and towards the aristocracy. This classic conception over liberalism is

⁴⁰ Gh. Iacob, op. cit., pp. 239, 242

⁴¹ Apostol Stan, *Liberalii sub domnia lui Al. I. Cuza*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996, pp. 77 – 79.

⁴² Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

⁴³ A. Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2002.

different from the usual meaning given today to the term „liberal”⁴⁴, which also got the name of „neoliberal perspective”, which, in turns, got the name „neocon” (or „neoconservative”)⁴⁵.

In the opinion expressed by Valentin Naumescu we can talk about a real doctrine of the modern world, as far as the bases of modernity is liberal. The author believes that passing over the „variants” of liberalism, „the solution is that all liberals have a common set of values and principles, a minimal nucleus of understanding politic, economy and social life”. In his analyze, the author identifies two major attempts of defining liberalism: the minimalist or essentialist vision – which searches a common point for the liberal expressions, and the pluralist vision – which has identified a veritable „family of liberalisms”, of theories and schools appreciated as being liberal⁴⁶.

A special chapter of the present paper was consecrated to the *Constitution of Romania from 1923*. In connection with it we have presented the role of political parties to the elaboration of the Constitution, the project presented by Romul Boilă, but also the principles, rights and liberties provided by it. There were identified three main ideas which were common to all political groups: the national idea, the idea of democratic evolution and the idea of the constitutional monarchy. The necessity to readjust the orientations and strategic directions, according to the new objectives imposed by the social, economic and cultural transformations, has determined some parties and political personalities to elaborate different constitutional projects. This way, the Constitution from 1923 had four projects. The project of the Liberal National Party, created at the studies circle of the party and published by D. R. Ioanițescu, contained the basic ideas of the neoliberal doctrine and of the liberal program. The debate of this project an important contribution was brought by V. Brătianu⁴⁷. There is also the project elaborated by Romul Boilă, which appeared at Cluj, in the Sumer of 1921, and which also represented the point of view of the Liberal National Party, because it had its own constitutional project, which considered the decision elected at Alba-Iulia, as a model for the organization of the Romanian state. This project is relevant for the importance and the significance of the decision from Alba-Iulia, but also for the attempt to include in it democratic ideas concerning the resolution of the problem caused by the minorities. Expressing the Transylvania bourgeoisie’s interests, the project of R. Boilă did not include the

⁴⁴ Gary Gutting, *Pragmatic Liberalism and the Critique of Modernity*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1999.

⁴⁵ Albert Hunter, Carl Milofsky, *Pragmatic Liberalism, Constructing a Civil Society*, Palgrave McMillan, New York, 2007, pp. xi-xii.

⁴⁶ Valentin Naumescu, op. cit., 2001, p. 11.

⁴⁷ Angela Banciu, op. cit., pp. 52, 55.

principle of the nationalization of the underground, accepting the necessity of the maintenance of the property right and fighting openly against the „communist conception of the property”⁴⁸.

The Constitution from 1923 has maintained the general principles expressed by the Constitution from 1866 and reproduced almost the entire text of that one. Unofficially, it was chosen the solution of the revision of the old constitution, but officially, it was said that it was a new fundamental law. More than that, in comparison with other revisions, when only the texts revised were published in the Official Gazette, this time it was published the entire Constitution, as a whole new text. „Formally it was a new Constitution; but in fact, it was the old Constitution revised”. In spite the fact that it was contested during its adoption, the Constitution from the 29th of Mars 1923 was finally accepted unanimously, being applied by all political factors⁴⁹.

The Constitution from 1923 has imposed itself due to the evident force of the liberals who, in their approach were supported by the king, but also due to the most of the principles and previsions included, serving the interests of the Romanian bourgeoisie, and integrating the idea of social progress and of national unity in one integrated conception, taken over by most parties which came to the governing of the state during the interwar period. It consecrated the domination in state and in society of the bourgeoisie class, offering the juridical frame for the evolution and the consolidation of its power in the interwar period. Most of the constitutional previsions referred to the social and political organization, to the rights and liberties of citizens, and to the formation and functioning of the state bodies, to the administration and justice. The constitution has expended the frame of emancipation and of participation of the citizens to the public life. At the same time, it contained a series of discrepancies between law and reality, between principles and the reality of their application, between „their recognition” and their guaranty, opening the path for their reconsideration in the process of evolution of the interwar Romanian society⁵⁰. More than that, as Ioan Scurtu showed, the Constitution from 1923 is the reflection of the development stage of the Romanian society⁵¹.

⁴⁸ Ibidem, pp. 56-57.

⁴⁹ Eleodor Focșeneanu, *Istoria Constituțională a României (1859-1991)*, Ediția a II-a revăzută, Ed. Humanitas, București, (1992) 1998, p. 60.

⁵⁰ Ibidem, pp. 75-77.

⁵¹ Ioan Scurtu, *Din viața politică a României (1926-1947)*. Studiu critic privind istoria Partidului Național Țărănesc, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1983, pp. 24-25.

The last chapter of the present paper contains references to the *actual doctrinal debates*, where we have analyzed the concept of tradition and Romanian liberalism in the post communist period and in present. The collapse of the communism in Romania, in December 1989, followed shortly by the submit disappearance of all structures of power of the communist regime did not represent but vaguely the end of the communism and the beginning of the period of transition. Institutional reform in Romania has begun by changing of the names of the institutions and of the uniforms, and had remained for a long time only at a symbolic level. As a consequence, on this hypocrite foundation, it began the building of the Romanian political spectrum. In the traps of this game were caught simple people who kept the frustrations produced by the disappearing of socialist egalitarianism. This is how the first electoral campaign from the Spring of 1990 was made, and we can clearly see the „democratic primitivism” and the „high hate accumulated in society in only a few months of political pluralism”. Unused with the diversity of options, people went to vote determined by the idea that political parties in opposition were nothing but the „enemies of the nation’s peace”. The division of the society in two political and cultural rival blocs: workers on the outskirts and intellectual elite, has profoundly and long termed marked Romania’s post communist transition⁵², which seems that is still developing today, at 21 years after the fall of communism.

The consolidation of the Liberal National Party has began only in 1995, after its request to come back in the Democrat Convention, and at the same time with the formation of the alliance with a parliamentary party from CDR, Civic Alliance Party led by the Senator Nicolae Manolescu, alliance which functioned a certain period of time under the name of ACL (Civic-Liberal Alliance). In the context of the electoral year 1996, the central body of the Liberal National Party has chosen victory in elections of CDR, aspect that has made the liberal party from extraparlamentar party a government party. This happened in the context in which the two smaller formations with liberal orientation (PAC and PL) did not pass the 3% line necessary in order to enter Parliament. But it seems that this failure of those two formations, and the success of the Liberal National Party have represented the ingredient necessary for the reunification of the Liberal National Party⁵³.

Along with the presentation of the post communist transition stage, we also presented the objectives of the Liberal National Party, imposed until 2000, but also the basic principles which qualifies it as a European liberal party, and the necessities imposed by the new social

⁵² Valentin Naumescu, op. cit., 2001, pp. 50-55.

⁵³ Ibidem, pp. 64-69.

conditions, whose implementation is imperative in order for us to talk about Romania – as modern and democratic state. Enrolling to the demands of the European liberalism concerning the fact that „liberty must be defined in relation with man as an individual, and not with social groups seen separately from the individuals that compose them”⁵⁴, the fields in which the National Liberal Party desires to bring essential changes are: education, research, culture, youth, civil society, health, public administration and justice, economy and politic. According to the new vision of the National Liberal Party, the liberty is more the a value, it represents a condition which makes possible the consecration of the values. The liberal ethique is composed of some essential values from the economic and politic point of view, as for example: tolerance, dialogue, trust, contract and property⁵⁵.

At the Extraordinary Congress from the 5th of Mars 2010, the National Liberal Party has established its future political objectives. Those express mainly the promotion of values and of national interests, of the political pluralism and the consolidation of the democratic system and of the national security, the defending the rights of man and his family, the protection, the guaranty, the consolidation and the expansion of private property, of the exchange of economical and cultural values, and of the free and equal access to the education. Within the Congress the National Liberal Party has declared itself liberal party, member of the Liberal, Democrat and Reformativ European Party and of the Liberal International. We must see that, in opposition with the attitude manifested after 1989, of denial its traditions, in 2010, within the Congress, the National Liberal Party assumed its history and tradition, the representation of liberal civic ideas and values, and of the Romanian democratic right. In this context, and in accordance with its political Program, National Liberal Party established different objectives for the period after 2010, according to the traditional principle „by ourselves”, but also according to the liberal democratic and capitalist values⁵⁶.

Liberal state is a democratic state. In the liberal vision, democracy represents the characteristic that makes possible adapting government to the demands of the governed⁵⁷. References to the democracy are relevant for states that choose a model of liberal democracy. Regarding the relevance of the liberal democracy, in general, or from an economic point of

⁵⁴ Elena Filip, *Liberalism și dezvoltare. Principii pentru o educație liberală*, Lumen, Iași, 2009, p. 43.

⁵⁵ Ludwig von Mises, *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*, third edition, tradusă de Ralph Raico, Cobden Press, San Francisco, 2002; Rich de Vos, *Capitalismul generos*, Ed. Almatea, București, 2001; Elena Filip, op. cit.; Alexandru Florian, *Fundamentele doctrinelor politice*, Ed. Universitară, București, 1998; Friedrich Hayek, *Dreptatea socială ca atavism*, în Adrian-Paul Iliescu (coord.), *Filosofia socială a lui Friedrich Hayek*, Polirom, Iași, 2001.

⁵⁶ Statului Partidului Național Liberal aprobat la Congresul Extraordinar din 5 martie 2010, Capitolul II, art. 6.

⁵⁷ Ludwig von Mises, *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition*, third edition, tradusă de Ralph Raico, Cobden Press, San Francisco, 2002, p. 42.

view, Sylvia Chan says that we must take into consideration its feasibility. In this context, she refers to the famous „end of history” presented by Fr. Fukuyama who refers to the fact that the triumph of liberal democracy is based on the collapse of the soviet bloc which confirmed that liberal democracy is the unique model of good and of effective government of the modern world⁵⁸. There are also references to a very popular opinion between 1950-1960, concerning the fact that the non-liberal democratic societies, undeveloped from a political point of view, needs „political modernization” by applying the model of „liberal democracy” – model on which the concept of „good governance” is based. Among the supporters of the sentence „all good things come together” there are some who constantly refer to the necessity of liberal democracy, while others see it as a „veritable acquisition”⁵⁹.

Determining the theoretical bases of the liberal democracy, C.B. Macpherson considers that their nucleus is made up by the conception and practices meant to materialize it concerning the role of the individual in the society, in his relation with it. This individualism was elaborated in the XVIIth century as an answer to the Christian tradition of the natural law, in order to affirm the belief in man’s liberty and in the progress of his condition which are eventually going to give the whole substance of the liberalism. „Rejecting the traditional concepts of society, justice and natural law, Hobbes will formulate his theory about political rights and obligations on the interest and life of individuals based on moral equality of all humans or, as the puritans say in their theory, on the centrality of man in politic, in the same way as J. Locke does”⁶⁰. According to J. Bentham utilitarianism represent a reaffirmation of the individualist principles elaborated especially by Hobbes.

Even thought, later, to this individualism was added the idea of morale value of the community and then of the actual pluralism, its substance is given by the idea that the individual, by his nature, is owner of his own capacities and he is free to engage in exchange reports with other owners. In this conditions – Macpherson writes that – political society is nothing but an artifice destined to protect this property and to maintain order in exchange reports⁶¹.

The success of the democracy depends, greatly, of the way the electorate uses the opportunity to choose. The exercise of the popular government is, in fact, a way of education

⁵⁸ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, Penguin, London, 1993.

⁵⁹ Sylvia Chan, *Liberalism, Democracy and Development*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2002) 2004, pp. 22-23.

⁶⁰ C. B. Macpherson, *La théorie politique de l’individualisme possessif de Hobbes à Locke*, Ed. Gallimard, 2004, p. 16.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 19.

the population. Government must affect and must be affected by its relations with all those who are governed. For its good adjustment, it must take into consideration all social classes of population, otherwise we cannot talk but about an uninformed government. The democracy comes along with the internationalization process, within multilateral relations⁶².

The future of democracy is in close relation with the general progress of civilization. The organic characteristic of the society is an ideal one. Political progress cannot be mentioned without the progress of all parties. Nation, as a whole, cannot be entirely free as long as it fears from another nation. The social problem must be seen as a whole. This problem is one of the weaknesses which characterize the modern movements of reform. The spirit of the specialist has invaded the political and the social activity, and man dedicates his entire energy to a certain cause, „in an almost cynical manner, in comparison to other causes”⁶³.

⁶² L. T. Hobhouse, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

⁶³ Ibidem, pp. 63-64.

BIBLIOGRAPHE

A.

1. Almond, G., Powell, G., Comparative Politics, A Developmental Approach, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1966.
2. Almond, G.A., Verba, S., Cultura civică, Ed. Du Style, 1996.
3. Angelescu, N. C., Renta solului, Enciclopedia României, vol. IV, 1943.
4. Apter, D., Introduction to Political Analysis, Winthrop Publishers, Inc., Cambridge, 1977.
5. Argetoianu, C., Descentralizarea administrativă și regionalismul, în RDP, 1926, nr. 1.
6. Aricescu, C. D., Scrieri alese, ed. Dan Simionescu și Petre Costinescu, București, 1982.
7. Ashcraft, Richard, Political Theory and the Problem of Ideology, în The Journal of Politics, Univ. of Florida, vol. 42, august, 1980.

B.

8. Badie, B., Le Développement politique, Ed. Economica, 2e édition, Paris, 1980.
9. Ball, Terence, Dagger, Richard, Ideologii politice si idealul democratic, ed. a II-a, Polirom, 2000.
10. Banciu, Angela, Rolul Constituției din 1923 în consolidarea unității naționale (Evoluția problemei constituționale în România interbelică), Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1988.
11. Barnovschi, D. V., Originile democrației române: „Cărvunarii”. Constituția Moldovei de la 1822, Iași, 1922, în Apostol Stan, Originile liberalismului, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
12. Barro, J. Robert, Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study, MITTPress, Cambridge, 1997.
13. Barzun, Jacques, The Theory of democracy, Society, 2613, Transactions Publishers, 1989.
14. Beck, Ulrich, Risk Society, Ed. Sage, Londra, 1992.
15. Bedeschi, Giuseppe, Storia del pensiero liberale, Editori Laterza, Bari, 1992.
16. Bedeschi, G., Storia del pensiero liberale, Laterza, 1990.
17. Berindei, Dan, Epoca Unirii, București, 1979.

18. Berindei, Dan, Gavrilă, Irina, Mutații în sânul clasei dominante din Țara Românească în perioada de destrămarea a orânduirii feudale, în Revista de Istorie, tom. 34, nr.11, 1981.
19. Berindei, Dan, *Revoluția română din 1821*, București, 1991.
20. Berki, R. N., *The History of Political Thought: A Short Introduction*, Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, New Jersey, 1977.
21. Bernstein, J. W., *The Birth of Plenty*, McGraw Hill, New York, 2004.
22. Black, Cyril, *The Dynamics of Modernization. A Study in Comparative History*, Harper and Row, London, 1966.
23. Bobbio, Norberto, *Liberalismo*, în: *Dizionario di filosofia*, Edizioni di Comunità, Milano, 1957.
24. Bobbio, N., *Il futuro dela democrazia*, Einaudi, 1991.
25. Bocșan, Nicolae, *Liberalismul timpuriu în mișcarea națională din Banat*, în vol. *Statul, societate, națiune*, Cluj-Napoca, 1982.
26. Bodea, Cornelia, *Lupta românilor pentru unitatea națională 1834-1849*, București, 1867.
27. Boicu, Leonid, *Diplomația europeană și triumful cauzei române (1856-1859)*, Iași, 1978.
28. Boilă, Romul, *Principiile Constituției noi*, în *Constituția din 1923 în dezbaterile contemporanilor*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1990.
29. Borella, F., *Les partis politiques en Europe*, Ed. Seuil, Paris, 1984.
30. Boudon, R., Bourricaud, F., *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1990.
31. Bradshaw, W. York, Wallace, Michael, *Global inequalities*, Pine Forge, Thusand Oaks, 1996.
32. Brătianu, I. C., *Acte și cuvântări*, VIII, București, 1939.
33. Brătianu, Vintilă, *Nevoile statului modern și Constituția României Mari*, în *Noua Constituție a României (23 de Prelegeri publice organizate de Institutul Social-Român)*, Cultura Națională, București, f.a..
34. Bucur, Maria, *Eugenie și modernizare în România interbelică*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2005.
35. Burdeau, G., *Le liberalisme*, Ed. Seuil, Paris, 1991.
36. Burke, E., (1790), *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999.

C.

37. Cardoso, F. H., Faletto, E., *Dependență și dezvoltare în America Latină*, Ed. Univers, București, 2000.
38. Caunu, Pièrre, *La civilisation de l'Europe des Lumières*, Paris, 1971.
39. Căzan, Ileana, *Societatea Românească văzută de occidentali: între modernitate și tradiție (1800-1829)*, în Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Paula Bolovan (coord.), *Schimbare și devenire în Istoria României*, Academia Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2008.
40. Cernica, Viorel, *Cetatea sub blocada ideii, Schița fenomenologică a istoriei gândirii politice*, Institutul european, Iași, 2005.
41. Chan, Sylvia, *Liberalism, Democracy and Development*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2002) 2004.
42. Châtelet, F., Pisier-Kouchner, E., *Les conceptions politiques du XX-e siècle*, P.U.F., Paris, 1981.
43. Chiribucă, Dan, *Tranziția postcomunistă și reconstrucția modernității în România*, Ed. Dacia, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2004.
44. Cliveti, Gh., *România și Puterile Garante. 1856-1878*, Iași, 1988.
45. Condorcet, Jean-Antoine, Nicolas de Caritat, (1795), *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of Human Mind*, Hyperion Press, Westport, 1979.
46. Constantiniu, Florin, *Relațiile agrare din Țara Românească în secolul al XVIII-lea*, București, 1972.
47. Cornea, Paul, *Originile romantismului românesc*, București, 1972.
48. Corneiro, Robert, *Evolutionism in Cultural Anthropology*, Westview Press, Boulder, 2003.
49. Cutright, Philipps, *National political Development, Its Measurement and Social Correlates*, în vol. *Politics and Social life*, (ed.) N. Polsby, R. Dentler, P. Smith, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

D.

50. Dahl, Robert. A., *La democrazia e i suoi critici*, Bompiani, 1991.
51. Deflem, Mathieu, *Habermas Modernity and Law*, Sage Publications, London 2002.
52. Dostaler, Gilles, *Le libéralisme de Hayek*, Edition de la Découverte & Syros, Paris, 2001.
53. Drăganu, Tudor, *Începuturile și dezvoltarea regimului parlamentar până în 1916*, Cluj, 1991.
54. Drăghicescu, Dumitru, *Partidele politice și clasele sociale*, Tipografia Reforma Socială, București, 1922.

55. Duca, I. G., Doctrina liberală, în Doctrinile partidelor politice (19 prelegeri publice organizate de Institutul Social – Român), Cultura Națională, București, 1922-1923.
56. Dussel, Enrique, Fundamentación de la etica y filosofia de la liberación, Mexico, Siglo, XXI, 1992.
57. Duțu, Al., L'image de la France dans les Pays Roumains pendant les campagnes napoléoniennes et le Congrès de Vienne, în Nouvelles Etudes d'Histoire, vol. III, București, 1965.

E.

58. Egyed, Péter Libertatea în filosofie, Ed. Grinta, Cluj - Napoca, 2008.
59. Egyed, P., Liberalismul ca filozofie politică în: Libertatea în filozofie Ed. Grinta, 2008.
60. Eliade, Pompiliu, Influența franceză asupra spiritului public în România, București, 1982.
61. Eliade, P., La Roumanie au XIX-e siècle, II, Paris, 1914, pp. 188-189, în Apostol Stan, Originile liberalismului, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
62. Engerman, David C., Staging Growth: Modernization, Development and the Global Cold War, University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.
63. Estes, J. Richard, "Trends in World Social Development, 1970-1995: Development Challenges for a new Century", Journal of Developing Societies, nr. 14, 1998.
64. Eyal, Szeleny, Townsley, Capitalism fără capitaliști, 2001.

F.

65. Featherstone, Mike, Lash, Scott, Robertson, Roland, Global Modernities, Sage Publications, Londra, 1992.
66. Fiedman, Milton, Confronting Ideas, The American Enterprise, nr. 69, 1990.
67. Filip, Elena, Liberalism și dezvoltare. Principii pentru o educație liberală, Lumen, Iași, 2009.
68. Filitti, Ioan C., Izvoarele Constituției de la 1866 (Originile democrației române), București, 1934.
69. Firebaugh, Glenn, "Growth Effects of Foreign and Domestic Investment", American Journal of Sociology, nr. 98, 1992.
70. Florian, Alexandru, Fundamentele doctrinelor politice, Ed. Universitară, București, 1998.
71. Focșeneanu, Eleodor, Istoria Constituțională a României (1859-1991), Ediția a II-a revăzută, Ed. Humanitas, București, (1992) 1998.

72. Freidson, E., *Professional Powers: A study in the institutionalization of formal knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1986.
73. Fukuyama, Francis, *Trust: Social Virtues and the creation of Prosperity*, Free Press, New York, 1995.
74. Fukuyama, Francis, *Sfârșitul istoriei?*, Ed. Vreamea, București, 1994.

G.

75. Galston, William A., *Liberal Pluralism, The implications of Value Pluralism for Political Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2002) 2004.
76. Gastil, Raymond D., *What about democracy ?* The Atlantic, 1990.
77. G. d'Estaing, V., *Démocratie française*, Ed. Fayard, 1976.
78. Ghiorghiuță, Eugen, *Industrializare și comerț exterior în România interbelică*, Ed. Fundației România de Mâine, București, 2002.
79. Giddens, Anthony, *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Oxford, 1991.
80. Giddens, A., *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991.
81. Giddens, A., *Les conséquences de la modernité*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1994.
82. Gilman, Nils, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in the Cold War America*, Baltimore, 2003.
83. Goldiș, Vasile, „Discursuri rostite în preajma Unirii și la Asociațiunea Culturală „ASTRA””, *Cultura Națională*, București, 1928.
84. Grassi, Lauro, *Per una storia della penetrazione dei „lumi” nei Principati Danubiani (1740-1802)*, în *Nuova Revista Storica*, Milano, I-II, 1979.
85. Gray, J., *Liberalismul*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1986.
86. Gray, John, *Liberalism: essays in political philosophy*, Routledge, London, 1991.
87. Gray, John, *Liberalism*, second edition, Opne University Press, London, 1995.
88. Gray, John, *Post-liberalism: studies in political thought*, Routledge, London, 1996.
89. Gray, John, *Two Faces of Liberalism*, The New Press, 2002.
90. Gray, John, *Cele două fețe ale liberalismului*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2002.
91. Gray, John, *Enlightenment's wake: politics and culture at the close of the modern age*, Routledge, London, 2007.
92. Griffin, Keith, *Stratégies de développement*, C.D.O.G.D.E., Economica, Paris, 1989.
93. Grotius, Hugo, *Despre dreptul războiului și al păcii*, Ed. Științifică, București, 1968.
94. Gruia, I. V., *Descentralizarea administrativă și organizarea regională a țării*, în *RDP*, 1926, nr. 1.

95. Gusti, Dimitrie, Partidul Politic, în Doctrinile partidelor politice (19 prelegeri publice organizate de Institutul Social – Român), Cultura Națională, București, 1922-1923.

H.

96. Habermas, J., *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1996.

97. Hayek, F. H., *The Constitution of Liberty*, Oxford University Press, 1960.

98. Hayek, Friedrich, *Dreptatea socială ca atavism*, în Adrian-Paul Iliescu (coord.), *Filosofia socială a lui Friedrich Hayek*, Polirom, Iași, 2001.

99. Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies, Second Edition, An Introduction*, New York, 1998.

100. Hitchens, K., *Romania*, *The American Historical Review*, vol. 97, nr. 4, 1992, p. 1064, <http://www.jstor.org>

101. Hobhouse, L. T., *Liberalism*, The Echo Library, Teddington, 2009.

102. Hobhouse, L. T., *Liberalism*, Oxford University Press, London, 2009.

103. Holcombe, Randall G., *Public Goods Theory and Public Policy*, în Jan Narveson, Dusan Dimock (edit.), *Liberalism, New Essays on Liberal Themes*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.

104. Hughes, B. Barry, *International Futures: Choices in the Face of Uncertainty*, 3rd edition, Westview Press, Boulder, 1999.

105. Hunter, Albert, Milofsky, Carl, *Pragmatic Liberalism, Constructing a Civil Society*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2007.

106. Huntington, S., *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven, Yale, 1968.

107. Huntington, Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1996.

108. Huntington, S., *Viața politică americană*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1994.

109. Hurezeanu, D., *Civilizația română modernă și problema tranziției*, în R. Florian, D. Hurezeanu, A. Florian, *Tranziții în modernitate*, Ed. Noua Alternativă, București, 1997.

I.

110. Iacob, Gh., *Modernizare – Europeanism, Ritmul și Strategia Modernizării*, vol. I, Ed. Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 1995.

111. Iosa, Mircea, *Conceptul „prin noi înșine”*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.

112. Iosa, Mircea, Epoca liberalismului moderat (1891-1907), în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
113. Iosa, Mircea, Epoca Liberalismului reformist (1907-1918), în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
114. Inglehart, Ronald, Welzel, Christian, Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy, The Human Development Sequence, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
115. Inkeless, A., The Modernization of Man, în M. Weiser (edit.), Modernization, The Dynamics of Growth, Basic Books, New York, 1966.
116. Inkeles, Alex, Making Man Modern, în American Journal of Sociology, Nr. 75, 1969.
117. Inkeles, Alex, Becoming Modern, New York, 1974.
118. Iscru, G.D., Contribuții privind învățământului la sate în Țara Românească, până la jumătatea secolului al XIX-lea, București, 1975.
119. Iscru, G. D., Revoluția din 1821 condusă de Tudor Vladimirescu, București, 1982.
120. Iscru, G.D., Introducere în studiul istoriei moderne a României, București, 1983.
121. Ivan, Marcel, Evoluția partidelor noastre politice 1919-1932, Ed. Kraft, Sibiu, în D. Hurezeanu Civilizația română modernă și problema tranziției, în R. Florian, D. Hurezeanu, A. Florian, Tranziții în modernitate, Ed. Noua Alternativă, București, 1997.

J.

122. Jelavich, Barbara, History of the Balkans. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, vol. I, Cambridge, 1983.
123. Johnstone, Keneth, Locul românilor în istoria europeană, în Lupta românilor pentru făurirea statului național unitar în istoriografia contemporană, București, 1983.
124. Jones, L. Eric, The European Miracle: Environments, Economies and Geopolities in the History of Europe and Asia, 3rd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

K.

125. Kekes, John, Against liberalism, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1999.
126. Kelly, Paul J., Liberalism, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2005.
127. Kegley, Jr., Charles, W., Wittkopf, Eugene R., World Politics. Trend and Transformation. St. Martin's Press, New York.
128. Konrad, G., hance Wandering, în Dissent, 1990.

129.Koselleck, R., Future Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1985.

130.Kumar, K., The Rise of Modern Society: Aspects of the Social and Political Development of the West, Blackwell, Oxford, 1988.

L.

131.Locke, J., Scrisoare despre toleranță, în *Tratat despre cărmuire*, Ed. Nemira, București, 1999.

132.Lomasky, Loren E., Liberalism Beyond Borders, în Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller jr., Jeffrey Paul (edit.), *Liberalism: old and new*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

133.Luckes, Steven, Zolo, Danilo, *Marxismo e liberalismo alla soglia del terzo millennio*, Studi storici dal Medioevo all'Eta Contemporanea, Roma, 1992.

134.Lungu, Ion, Școala Ardeleană, București, 1978.

M.

135.Machen, J. Gresham, *Christianity and Liberalism*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Michigan, (1923) 2009.

136.Macpherson, C. B., *La théorie politique de l'individualisme possessif de Hobbes à Locke*, Ed. Gallimard, 2004.

137.Madgearu, Virgil N., *Agrarianism, Capitalism, Imperialism*, Ed. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.

138.Manent, Pierre, *Istoria intelectuală a liberalismului*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1992.

139.Manent, Pierre, *A liberalizmus helyzete*, Századvég, 1991.

140.Maniu, I., *Discursul-expozeu rostit de I. Maniu, președintele PNL la Congresul Partidului din 24 aprilie 1920*, Tipografia Libertății, Orăștie, 1929.

141.Manoilescu, Mihail, *Neoliberalismul, în Doctrinile partidelor politice (19 prelegeri publice organizate de Institutul Social – Român)*, Cultura Națională, București, 1922-1923.

142.Marion, J. Levy, *Modernization and the Structure of Societies. A Setting for International Affairs*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966.

143.Marino, Adrian, „Luminile” românești și descoperirea Europei, în *Revista de Istorie și Teorie Literară*, 1, 1979.

144.Martinelli, Alberto, *Global Modernization. Rethinking the Project of Modernity*, Ed. Sage, Londra, 2005.

145. Matteotti, Piero Gobetti, Una storia di libertà, în: La rivoluzione liberale, Torino, Einandi, 1983.
146. McClelland, D., The Impulse to Modernization, în Myron Wiser (coord.), Modernization, The Dynamics of Growth.
147. McNeill, William, The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1990.
148. Michelson, Paul E., Conflict and crisis Romanian Political Development, 1861 – 1871, New York, 1987.
149. Milani, Lorenzo, Un muro di foglio edi incenso, Stampa Alternativa, Viterbo, 1994.
150. Mises, Ludwig von, Liberalism in the Classical Tradition, third edition, tradusă de Ralph Raico, Cobden Press, San Francisco, 2002.
151. Montesquieu, Despre spiritul legilor, vol. II, Cartea a XXV-a, Ed. Științifică, București, 1964-1970.
152. Moore, E. W., Order and Change: Essays in Comparative Sociology, Wiley, New York, 1967.
153. Müller- Armack, A., Le liberalisme moderne, PUF, Paris, 1984.
154. Mușat, M., Ardeleanu, I., România după Marea Unire, vol. II, Partea I, București, 1986.
155. Mușat, Mircea, Agrigoroaiei, Ion, Viața politică în România. 1918-1921, Ed. Politică, București, 1976.

N.

156. Naumescu, Valentin, Despre Liberalism în România. Realități, dileme, perspective, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.
157. Naumescu, Valentin, Politici sociale în Europa post-belică – Spre un model neoliberal global?, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2000.
158. Negulescu, Paul, Constituția României, în Enciclopedia României, vol. I, București, 1938.
159. Nestorescu-Bălcești, Horia, Ordinul masonic român, București, 1993.
160. North, C. Douglas, Structure and Change in Economic History, W. W. Norton, New York, 1981.
161. Nozick, Robert, Anarchy, State and Utopie, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1990.

O.

162. Oțetea, A., Tudor Vladimirescu și revoluția din 1821, București, 1971.

P.

163. Pohoată, Ion, *Doctrine economice universale. Contemporani*, Fundația „Gheorghe Zane”, Iași, 1993.
164. Pohoată, Ion, *Capitalismul. Itinerare economice*, Polirom, Iași, 2000.
165. Parsons, T., *Religion in Postindustrial Society, în Action, Theory and the Human Condition*, New York, 1978.
166. Parsons, Talcott, *The Social System*, Londra, 1951.
167. Parsons, T., Shils, E., *Towards a General Theory of Action*, Free Press, 1951.
168. Păun, Nicolae, *Viața economică a României 1918-1948*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2009.
169. Persell, C. H., *Understanding Society*, Harper and Row, New York, 1987.
170. Platon, Gh., *Istoria modernă a României*, București, 1985.
171. Platon, Gh., *Ecoul Internațional al Unirii, în Cuza-Vodă. In Memoriam*, Iași, 1973.
172. Platon, Gh., Russu, V., Iacob, Gh., Cristian, V., Agrigoroaiei, I., *Cum s-a înfăptuit România modernă*, Iași, 1993.
173. Pop, Viorel, Vâtcă, Gh., Dumescu, F., Cherecheș, C., *Modernizare – Mondializare – Globalizare*, Ed. Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.
174. Popescu, Eufrosina, *Din istoria politică a României. Constituția din 1923*, Ed. Politică, București, 1983.
175. Popescu, Livia, *Structura Socială și Societate civilă în România interbelică*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.
176. Preda, C., *Modernitatea politică și românismul*, Nemira, București, 1997.
177. Przewoski, Adam, *Some problems in the Study of the Transition to democracy*, in: Guillermo O'Donwell – Philippe Schmitter – Laurence Whitehead (eds.) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1986.
178. Pușcaș, Vasile, Vesa, Vasile, (coord.), *Dezvoltare și modernizare în România interbelică 1919-1939. Culegere de studii*, Ed. Politică, București, 1988.
179. Putnam, D. Robert, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993.
180. Pye, L., *Aspects of Political Development*, Little Brown, Ed. Boston, 1967.
181. Pye, W. Lucian, “Political Science and the Crisis of Authoritarianism”, *American Political Science Review*, nr. 84, 1990.

R.

- 182.Radu, Andrei, *Cultura franceză la românii din Transilvania până la Unire*, Cluj-Napoca, 1982.
- 183.Randall, Vicky, Theobald, Robin, *Political Change and Underdevelopment*, 2nd edition, Duke University Press, Durham, 1998.
- 184.Raskin, Marcus G., *Liberalism: the genius of American ideals*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., Maryland, (2004) 2005.
- 185.Rastow, W.W., *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- 186.Rawls, J., *A theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, 1971.
- 187.Rawls, John, *Political Liberalism*, expanded edition, Columbia University Press, New York, (1993, 1996) 2005.
- 188.Rădulescu-Motru, C., *Regele Carol I și Destinul României – Discurs ținut la Academia Română, 26 mai 1939 -*, în *Din viața Regelui Carol I. Mărturii*, București, 1939.
- 189.Rădulescu-Zoner, Șerban (edit.), *Istoria Partidului Național Liberal*, Institutul de Studii Liberale, 2000.
- 190.Reitan, Earl A., *Liberalism: Time-Tested Principles for the Twenty-First Century*, iUniverse Inc., Lincoln, 2004.
- 191.Roger, Antoine, *Fascistes, communists et paysans, Sociologie des mobilizations identitaires roumaines (1921-1989)*, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, 2002.
- 192.Rosselli, Carlo, *Socialismo liberale e altri scritti*, Torino, Einaudi, 1973.
- 193.Rostow, Walt W., *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge, 1960.
- 194.Roth, Andrei, *Modernitate și Modernizare socială*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2002.
- 195.Roussellier, Nicolas, *Europa liberalilor*, trad. Daniela Irimia, Institutul European, Iași, 2001.
- 196.Rowen, S. Henry, "World Wealth Expanding: Why a Rich, Democratic, and (Perhaps) Peaceful Era is Ahead", în Ralph Landau, Timothy Taylor, Gavin Wright (edit.), *The Mosaic of Economic Growth*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1996.
- 197.Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Stephens, Evelyn Huber, Stephens, John D., *Capitalist Development and Democracy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.
- 198.Ruggiero, Guido de, *Storia del liberalismo europeo*, Bari, Gius, Laterza Figli, 1925.
- 199.Ruggiero, Guido de, *Storia del liberalismo europeo*, Garzanti, Roma, 1984.

200. Russu, V., Instituirea și organizarea regimului politic al burgheziei și moșierimii (februarie – iunie 1866), în *Analele Științifice ale Universității „Al.I. Cuza” din Iași*, Secțiunea III, Istorie, tom. XVI, 1970.

S.

201. Saizu, Ioan, *Modernizarea României Contemporane (Perioada Interbelică) – Pas și Impas* -, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1991.

202. Salvany, Félix Sardá Y., *What is Liberalism?*, General Books LLC, (1899 – retipărită) 2010.

203. Sandu, Dumitru, *Sociologia tranziției. Valori și tipuri sociale în România*, Ed. Staff, București, 1996.

204. Sandu, Dumitru, *Spațiul social al tranziției*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 1999.

205. Schelkle, Waltraud, et. al., *Paradigms of Social Change: Modernization, Development, Transformation, Evolution*, St. Martin's Press, 2000.

206. Schmitt, Carl, *Les trois types de pensée juridique*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1995.

207. Schwartzemberg, R. G., *Sociologie politique*, Ed. Montchrestien, Paris, 1971.

208. Scurtu, Ioan, *Din viața politică a României (1926-1947). Studiu critic privind istoria Partidului Național Țărănesc*, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1983.

209. Seiler, D. L., *Introduction à la Science politique*, Ed. U-L-B, Bruxelles, 1992.

210. Seiyama, Kazuo, *Liberalism: Its Achievements and Failures*, (tradusă de L. R. Stickland), Trans Pacific Press, 2010.

211. Sestov, Lev, *Dosztojevszkij ès Nietzsche*, Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1991.

212. Shils, E., *Tradition*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1981.

213. Smelser, N. J., *Mechanisms of an Adjustments to Change*, în T. Burns (edit.), *Industrial Man*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.

214. Sorokin, P. A., *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, vol. I, American Book Company, New York, 1937.

215. Stan, Apostol, „Propaganda revoluționară la sate în revoluția de la 1848 din Țara Românească”, în *Revista de Istorie*, tom. 31, nr. 5, 1978.

216. Stan, A., *Grupări și curente politice în România între Unire și Independență (1859-1877)*, București, 1979.

217. Stan, Apostol, „Ion C. Brătianu – rolul său în revoluția de la 1848 și în exil”, în *Studia et acta Musei Nicolae Bălcescu*, V-VI, Bălcești pe Topolog, 1979.

- 218.Stan, Apostol, Originile liberalismului, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 219.Stan, Apostol, Liberalii sub domnia lui Al. I. Cuza, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 220.Stan, Apostol, Liberalii sub domnia lui Al. I. Cuza, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 221.Stan, Apostol, Liberalii la putere (1866 – 1868), în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 222.Stan, Apostol, Constituirea Partidului Național Liberal, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 223.Stan, Apostol, Liberalii proclamă independența României, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
- 224.Strat, G., Curs de istoria doctrinelor economice, I, Cluj, 1946.
- 225.Sztompka, P., The Sociology of Social Change, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1994.

Ș.

- 226.Șerban, Stelu, Elite, partide și spectru politic în România interbelică, Ed. Paideia, București, 2006.
- 227.Șotropa, Valeriu, Proiectele de constituție, programele de reforme și petițiile de drepturi din țările române, București, 1976.
- 228.Șotropa, Valeriu, Proiecte de constituție, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.

T.

- 229.Teleagă, Cristian, „Mea culpa”: The Social Production of Public Disclosure and Reconciliation with the Past, în vol. Discourse and transformation in central and eastern Europe, edited by A. Galasinska, M. Krzyzanowski, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2009.
- 230.Thelen, Peter, Sozialdemokratie und Liberalism heute, in Friderich Elbert Stiftung's hefte, 1992, 12.

231. Thompson, J. B., Tradition and Self in a Mediated World, în P. Helas, S. Lash, P. Morris (coord.), *Detraditionalization*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1999.
232. Tipps, D. C., *Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective*, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 15, nr. 2, martie 1973, pp. 199-202, <http://www.jstor.org>
233. Tobin, James, *Confronting Ideas*, *The American Enterprise*, nr. 69, 1990.
234. Touchard, J., *Histoire des idées politiques*, Tome, PUF, Paris, 1978.
235. Trăsnea, Ovidiu, *Probleme de sociologie politică*, Ed. Politică, București, 1975.
236. Turliuc, Cătălin, *Modernizare și/sau occidentalizare în România sfârșitului secolului al XIX-lea și începutul secolului al XX-lea*, în Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Paula Bolovan (coord.), *Schimbare și devenire în Istoria României*, Academia Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2008.
237. Tuverson, E. L., *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress*, Harper, New York, 1964.

U.

238. Ungureanu, Ion, *Paradigme ale cunoașterii societății*, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1990.
239. Urechia, V. A., *Istoria românilor, seria 1800-1834, tom. IV (XI)*, București, 1900, pp. 24-27, în Apostol Stan, *Originile liberalismului*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.

V.

240. Valade, B., *Schimbarea socială*, în *Tratat de sociologie*, coord. R. Boudon, Ed. Humanitas, București, 1997.
241. Vârtosu, E., *Napoleon Bonaparte și dorințele moldovenilor la 1807*, în *Studii*, tom. 18, nr. 2, 1965.
242. Viscount, Herbert Louis Samuel Samuel, *Liberalism: an Attempt to State the Principles and Proposals of Contemporary Liberalism in England*, BiblioBazaar, (1902 - retipărită) 2010.
243. Vlăsceanu, L., *Politică și dezvoltare; Premise pentru o nouă politică a dezvoltării României*, manuscris (text nepublicat).
244. Vos, Rich de, *Capitalismul generos*, Ed. Almatea, București, 2001.

W.

245. Wagner, Peter, *A Sociology of Modernity*, 1994.

246. Wagner, Peter, *Theorizing Modernity, Inescapability and Attainability in Social Theory*, 2001.
247. Wallerstein, Immanuel, *Modernization: Requiescat in Peace*, în Lewis A. Coser, Otto N. Larsen (edit.), *The Uses of Controversy in Sociology*, Free Press, New York, 1976.
248. Wallerstein, Immanuel, în William Bloom, *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*, Cambridge, New York, 1990.
249. Weiner, Myron (edit.), *Modernization. The Dynamic of Growth*, New York, 1966.
250. Wendt, A., *Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics*, *International Organization*, vol. 46, nr. 2.
251. Williams, Raymond, *Keywords. A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana, London, 1984.

X.

252. Xenopol, A.D., *Epoca fanarioșilor 1711-1821, Iași, 1892*, în Apostol Stan, *Originile liberalismului*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
253. Xenopol, A.D., *Istoria partidelor politice în România. De la origini până la 1866*, vol. I, București, 1910, p. 42, în Apostol Stan, *Originile liberalismului*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
254. Xenopol, A. D., *Primul proiect de constituțiune a Moldovei din 1822*, *Originile Partidului Conservator și a celui Liberal*, București, 1898, pp. 43-45, în Apostol Stan, *Originile liberalismului*, în Apostol Stan, Mircea Iosa, *Liberalismul politic în România, de la origini până la 1918*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996.

Z.

255. Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Idéologie politique et conscience politique*, în *Studia Univ. „Babeș-Bolyai”*, philosophia, XXVII, 1, 1982.
256. Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Repere în Știința Politicii. Schița unei teorii generale a politicii*, Ed. Chemarea, Iași, 1992.
257. Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Doctrine politice*, Ed. Fundației Chemarea, Iași, 1994.
258. Zeletin, Ștefan, *Neoliberalismul, Studii asupra istoriei și politicii burgheziei românești*, Ed. Pagini agrare și sociale, București, 1927.
259. Zeletin, Șt., *Burghezia română. Originea și rolul ei în istorie*, Nemira, București, 1998.

Diverse documente.

1. Chestiunea națională în viziunea Partidului Național Liberal, Document adoptat la Consiliul Național al PNL din 8 iunie 2001, în Valentin Naumescu, Despre Liberalism în România. Realități, dileme, perspective, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.
2. Constituțiunea din 29 martie 1923, adnotată, în CODEX ROMANIAE.
3. Strategia politică a PNL în perioada 2001-2004 – PNL, Partid Liberal al mileniului trei – o nouă viziune politică, în Valentin Naumescu, Despre Liberalism în România. Realități, dileme, perspective, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.
4. Tratatul de Pace de la Berlin din 1/13 iulie 1878, în M. Of. Nr. 151 din 11/23 iulie 1878.
5. http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~myrde/ite_data/constructivism.html
6. Statului Partidului Național Liberal aprobat la Congresul Extraordinar din 5 martie 2010.