

**„BABES-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA UNIVERSITY  
THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY FACULTY  
THE INSTITUTE FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES**

**ȘTEFANA DĂNĂLACHE, married ROTARU**

**Romanian People’s European Identity Mirrored by the Romanian  
Diplomatic Discourse**

**- Summary of the Doctoral Thesis -**

**Scientific Coordinator  
Prof. dr. Nicolae EDROIU  
Corresponding Member of the Romanian Academy**

**CLUJ - NAPOCA  
2011**

## **Contents:**

Introduction

Chapter 1. 1. Historical Exordium. 2. Historical and diplomatic sources.

Chapter II. Roots of Romanian diplomacy European identity assertion – the Middle Ages and the Pre-modern period

Chapter III. The Beginning of Romanian Diplomacy – The Romanian people’s European Identity as a prerequisite of diplomatic activity in the second half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century

Chapter IV. Connection to European values of inter war Romania (1918-1939). Discourse innovations and diplomatic practice.

Chapter V. Continuity and discontinuity of Romania’s involvement in the European Post-War and Cold War conditions (1947-1989)

Chapter VI. The rediscovery of Romania’s continental vocation and post revolutionary diplomacy contribution to European and international identity

Conclusions

Bibliography

Attachments

**Key words:**

Discourse  
Diplomacy  
Europe  
Foreign affairs  
Romania  
Ministry  
History  
Integration

## Summary of the main chapters:

### Introduction

This research paper submitted as a doctoral thesis at the Faculty of History and Philosophy of the University "Babes-Bolyai" in Cluj-Napoca originates in questions and feverishness which characterized the early years of our diplomatic career. During the period 2000-2002, I was part of cabinet structure of the Romanian foreign minister and as a young diplomat we always hit hard issues in those years of Romania's accession to the European Union and NATO.

The diplomatic documents feverish preparations and Romania's position documents through the voice and the person of the foreign affairs minister had to compile, and to present, respectively, we were always confronted with the impact of the stereotypes that came as a feed-back from western offices, welcoming many times, distressingly scattered with common places and stereotypes, some more or less fueled by Romania's recent developments in the world.

Anxieties caused reflection, reflections encouraged documentation and without having anything planned, taking advantage of a series of institutional coincidence which led me to decide that my meditations should be channeled in a more coherent way. This was the way the project of my research papers was born. I managed to bring this project to its final end by making out between two diplomatic missions in which I represented the interests of Romania, to the Holy See and in Dublin.

We initially estimated that it is going to be rather easy to perceive the recent evolution of Romanian constants under a European context of, but I was to find out that, as I was making progress with my readings, that in order to demolish many of the stereotypes that fuel public consciousness in our country, that matter also for us, "the elsewhere " a serious inclination meant to reflect the multi century becoming trend is highly needed, and that just a century or two of epidermal troubles cannot suffice. It is quite obvious that diplomatic strategies have made us believe that it is worth dedicating research to trends familiar to us from the professional point of view, which actually led to the title provided to the present research. The instruments which are being used by diplomacy are being nourished more than in other field of central administration by the historical past which also represents Romania's connection within official contacts with third parties. It is for this precise reason that Romanian diplomacy through its specific mechanisms related to the art of representation, but also by what is defined as being the most recent public diplomacy is based on the Romanian DNA historically built as being fed up by vital lymph which is fueled by national history.

Romanian diplomacy is a rather recent reality, born under a liberal-secular context which characterized the nineteenth century, but what we call the diplomatic discourse that has become Romanian paladin even when it was a multi party one in the historical provinces, it sometimes functioned inorganic, sometimes organic, but not always under a political key it is much older. Whether messengers noted in history for having protected the ancestral land by risking their lives, nuncios and even popes who Apostolic bound that aggregate Romanian countries under a global unit overlapping Europe (Western Christianity it is known as Christianitas), the princes who pay with their life the identification with national values in an international context (Orthodox Brâncoveni) the so called "diplomacy" *avant la lettre* is nevertheless being visible and incentive for those who today would still have doubts or doubt about a project typical of Romania. True enough, currently, in the present context such a vision is relatively upset by economic issues, but there is a tectonic becoming of the Romanian nation that diplomacy will reflect and certainly record in the future destiny to really serve the Romanian cause.

Therefore we chose to give our research work a diachronic aspect in order to catch the trend of our becoming statehood by reference to other political and institutional forms of association in Europe. Therefore, diplomatic discourse did not merely consist of the high society rhetoric as a cliché of the nineteenth century, but it mattered also in the sustainable construction made by mutual accommodation between the political structuring and small or large states of a political position taken by ambition and solidarity based on the aggregation of linguistic and cultural homogeneity and anthropological destiny. Taking advantage of an updated bibliography I realized that during the millennial building the Romanian statehood, there have been countless moments when this statehood, whether in embryo at the beginning and then as a politic body and more stable state, even if tripartite, it was confronted with positive or negative elements friendly or aggressive around our territories, or with publicly assumed sovereignty entities over the entire known world.

All these moments are being defined under the term diplomacy, peace or war diplomacy for the term diplomacy originates in the Greek verb *diplôn* (a doubt) referring to folding parchment and then further on used for all written instruments known as diplomatic sources which have sanctioned political collision between them and the peace contrasting results reached.

In so far as the term discourse is concerned, we meant to it to be used as close as possible to the Latin wording *discursus* – *discurrere*, with the meaning of flowing, of passing by. It is about the content of the present thesis that passes through the entire number of reports of our country in its difficult history from the point of view of the political and legal content typical of our continent.

### **Exordium historiographical**

Our country's qualification as a member of the European Union is an event that looked at from a short-term perspective, can be seen as a result of a negotiation process carried out with skill and dedication on the basis of historical and cultural baggage with social and economic reverberations that Romania has owned and activated when it stated its desire to be reattached to the proto- family structure of nations which the European Union is. The urging approach almost close to identification, between the European Union and Romania in the long run, mention must be made of some differences from the point of view of the degree of civilization reached, where the coexistence of asynchronic civilization was the hardest obstacle for our country becoming mainland, be it political, religious, economic or cultural.

We mean to evaluate and interpret this trend of becoming just in the long term, in which, as the aggregation and then modernizing the Romanian state, political actors have felt the increasing need to become attached to a co-natural form of existence and operation which is our continent. Definitely, what we say is beyond a geographical convention. Our continent is not a simple sum of landforms of conventional uniform qualifications, but it is proposed as one of the most sophisticated, if not the most sophisticated civilization historically speaking polycentric structure and multinational in the last half century, that tends to weld a functional corpus of political aspirations, achievements civilization and economic progress under the dimension of mutual accommodation.

We shall therefore use our research resources for the interpretation and evaluation of the European dimension of belonging to the European aspirations of Romanian diplomacy. We shall take into account the fact that although the modern concept of diplomacy was generated during the definition of international relations (the XVI<sup>th</sup> century) and that the component parts of the present Romania have not had a topical determination to settle them in Central Europe, yet they have registered with the continent's eastern edge tensions and very often they were the crucible of the

most exciting experiments for the one who is willing to read the real history of Europe and not only compendia summarizing what has happened schematically. For the purpose of the above stated aspects, I should like to mention professor's Cesare Alzate plea that, in a European context, not very favorable for the Romanian institutional route, published in 1998 in Cluj-Napoca, the book entitled "At the Heart of Europe". Religious history studies regarding the Romanian space unquestionably demonstrate how the Romanian space in all its local expressions represented a microcosm in which all European experiences of XVIth and XVIIth centuries, defining these areas as the heart of Europe are found. Quite relevant is the fact that while all Europe was ravaged by religious wars, and even the Romanian Countries and Transylvania with their rigid system of political and religious nations from which Romanians were excluded, managed to be and to provide a fertile conceptual ground for confrontation for various political and religious experiments. In fact both professor Alzate and other foreign authors (I would mention here the illustrious Romanian modern American historian Keith Hitchins) highlighted how although politically divided, economically exploited, treated with ease on the political map of the European powers during pre-modern and modern periods, but even in the contemporary one, the Romanian Countries and their elites despite contextual deviations, have always emphasized substantive commitment to European civilization model (in its many versions, aspects and mirrors). Hence, the modern era with its well known appetite for nations' consolidation made it possible for the elite in Transylvania, Wallachia or Moldovia to "drink" from European ideologies aimed at overcoming the previous structuring and classification within a generous nation concept of all those using the same language, constantly and consistently living the same space and building life projects with similar aspirations. Out of this period, the Romanian diplomacy constantly followed according to the various regimes in Europe, the trend of Romania's state becoming a member of the European states, which by the mechanism of civilization are being defined as such. The turnover was not an easy one and it was strewn with obstacles of various kinds. The evolution of the past 150 years finally placed Romania on Europe's orbit and Romanian diplomacy has sought resources and has fought for profiling our country among other nations with the potential on the continent. Since Mihail Kogălniceanu, passing on to Nicolae Titulescu, Grigore Gafencu and reaching to the past two decades of foreign affairs portofolio holders, Romanian diplomacy at the level of public discourse asserted beyond any doubt Romania's European profile and the need to share the set of European values and also to actively and creatively contribute to maintaining and developing a project that has become common to the family of nations that find in the peaceful cooperation, their mutual understanding and the most profound root of their state construction.

Permanently, the arguments and ideas in store that the Romanian diplomacy could turn to were treasured by its history. Gradually, as the historiography advanced, the diplomatic argumentation lost its initial schematization and became increasingly ever more documented and incisive supporting the connection of Romanian territories to the European circuit of values and exchange values with practical matters that can not be tainted by artificial theoretical constructions. For this reason we shall endeavor on a trip to the field of the springs that underlie and certify the connection between Romania's history and the development of the material and spiritual culture of other European nations.

### **Roots of Romanian diplomacy European identity assertion – the Middle Ages and the Pre-modern period**

The Romanization process is defined as the process of symbiosis and ethno-linguistic and cultural synthesis between natives and newcomers, by means of which Roman civilization permeates all departments of life of a province, and finally results in replacing the language spoken by the

subject population with the Latin language. The process of the institutionalization of the Roman structures, their being translated on Dacia's the territory is an important step in a fundamental and irreversible process, unfolded held in the Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic land which underlies the formation and emergence of the Romanian people on the history arena.

As a whole, the indigenous peoples' Romanization was a large-scale historical process and huge consequences, comparable in its significance to the third - second millennium BC indo-European one and to the one of peoples' migrations in the first millennium AD.

In general, the Romanization removed the differences between natives and Romans in the field of material culture, of political and religious life, and Latin emerged as the only language of communication in an ethnically very diverse environment. The more advanced stage of historical evolution of some European populations, significantly influenced the Roman culture and civilization, greatly facilitated the assimilation of Roman provincial way of life.

Just like in the case of other provinces, also in the case of Dacia, the notion of "Romanization" includes two fundamental sides of the same single process:

- 1) Colonization of Geto-Dacian territory with Latin-Romanized population, coming from all over the Roman Empire, i.e. the colonization Romanization.
- 2) Assimilation of natives Geto-Dacians, to the extent in which they adopted the Latin language, have learned how provincial Roman life, customs and Roman civilization took over, thus changing their ethnic mentality and very being.

In Dacia, the Romanization process, under both aspects above mentioned, was fully possible to become a reality documentary demonstrated and demonstrable reattaching these territories to a unit with political-religious institution represented by the Emperor and Capitoline triad.

Roman Dacia relied on a homogeneous and responsive ethno-cultural background, on local people, who reached a high level of civilization, fact which facilitated the assimilation process. The Romans, thus managed to introduce, although somehow somewhat unevenly across the entire Dacian territory, the social relations conceived in Latium, their own forms of political, military and administrative organization, their culture and their civilization, the Latin language, in a word the whole system of organization and provincial Roman way of life.

Regarding the issue of Christianity spread and its forms of organization adopted in Romania, (the way they may be encountered today in the light of the new historical archaeological and epigraphic research), we want to mention, from the very beginning that the Romanian Christianity is very old: it has been a truism quite well reflected in the tradition of our Church, that according to traditions transmitted by ecclesiastical historian Eusebius, in our parties, in Scythia Minor (Dobrogea) St. Andrew, the Apostle himself, preached. Secondly, we should like to emphasize that the research made on Romanian origins of Christianity has been a constant concern of our laymen and Ecclesiastes historians because it was closely related to demonstrating our ethnic continuity on the land on which we are today, one of the arguments in favor of Romanism, in sui generis diplomacy for the past 300 years and more. For us to be able to prove our uninterrupted existence on this territory during the period of peoples' migrations has become a crucial and important scientific task since Hungarian or German or Slavic historians from the former Habsburg Empire claimed that Romania was cleared of domestic inhabitants, that an empty space (vacuum) had been produced and this very "vacuum" was filled with ethnic Slavs, Huns, Avars and other nations, and later was to be filled by the Hungarian and the German peoples. This biased theory has been a battle horse of many pre-war , interwar, postwar and even current generations of diplomats (when

requested by the extremist trends in various countries in Central and Eastern Europe) when they are looking for explanations for the occupation of large parts of Romania's territory by the Slavs, Hungarians and Germans. The Christianity adopted by Daco-Romans became an argument in favor of the ethnic continuity, because it occurred at a certain moment as a feature of Greco-Roman world and civilization, and in this respect, it also became a characteristic of the Daco-Roman population, that received this civilization in its very early days. Therefore any trace of Christianity in our country may be attributed, first, to the native population, not to migrants, because they were more difficult and much later Christianized. Thirdly, we want to emphasize that the spread of Christianity on Romanian territory and its preservation over time was made in close connection with the Byzantine Empire. The Empire Capital transferred to Constantinople became a few decades after the withdrawal of military authority and the late Roman Dacia III (year 275), the only political force that could impose the East to the migrants. Taking himself to be de jure the heir of the former Roman Empire, the Constantine's Empire, and then Justinian's Empire inquired about the Lower Danube region which had, in fact, of great strategic importance for the fate of the provinces in the Balkan Peninsula and even for the capital itself. The Danube border breakthrough meant the penetration inside the empire of the wave of migrating populations and the endangering of the inhabitants' peaceful life.

In fact, Christianity, as Nicolae Iorga put it was a rescue and a replacement for the Roman Empire onto the Dacian-Roman lands, thus preserving the essential elements of Romanism: its spirituality, language, way of life.

If developments of the I<sup>st</sup> - V<sup>th</sup> centuries have forged proto-Romanian characteristics with its Daco-Roman DNA, the Middle Ages represents the historical stage in which are being built the institutions which characterize the living and the organization structures of the Romanian communities. If we were to speak in terms of human ages, the Middle Ages merges childhood, adolescence and early maturing stage, forming the clot of what will be the Romanian that in the dawn of modernity will know to gather its forces together with the other peoples of Europe in order to claim a place in the concert of European nations.

If there is Europe today and if today it is claimed to be a unitary matrix for many diverse families as national way of expression, it is so, because it was formed in the Middle Ages. It is not by mere chance said that French Emperor Charlemagne made the first European coordination of the various families of the populations dwelling in Europe. He may have made spontaneously, without much meditation, but that spontaneity had risen from a humus which means the primitive array of European civilization. The fact that the subjugation of the churlish reached as far as the western border of Romania today shows that the bowing of civilization has spread to these areas and the attempts aimed at Renovatio Empires also took into account the western Romanian border. Besides, we must also add that if the Roman Empire had turned the Mediterranean into "*Mare Nostrum*", the core of their structure of civilization, after Catholic or Orthodox missions, Charlemagne will rethink the center of gravity of the Empire at the navel of Europe, from now onwards actually starting the political career of the concept of Europe which for a millennium will be seeking to expand politically up to the political correspondence with geography.

What we customarily, but improperly, call *Middle Ages*, that so called" during the middle" (expression used by Italian humanists for the first time in the second half of the fifteenth century, in order to designate the interim period between Antiquity and Renaissance) is in our history the period of about a millennium long, during which names feudal organization feudalism, the medieval era are still being used. The most comprehensive, most flexible and appropriate formula is the medieval times, which designates all terms used for the Romanian civilization during the



period of the VIII<sup>th</sup>–XVIII<sup>th</sup> centuries: structures, institutions, spirituality, daily life on all social scales and foreign relations.

According to a generally accepted opinion of our historiography, it is the eighth century that stands for Romania's early medieval period. This initial limit could be approximated by the results provided by the archaeological research, which proved the existence of a unified civilization in the Carpatho-Danubian-Pontic area. Starting with the eighth century, another social image was outlined, the private property arises, and fortified building settlements show up and stand to be associated with the existence of local leaders, raised within brotherhoods. Broadly speaking, a new historical era is about to be foreshadowed.

In keeping with the most judicious opinion, the end of the Romanian medieval times is considered to be placed in the second half of the sixteenth century, when from a political point of view, the first coherent and palpable elements of Romanian conscious are looming (self or national names are less relevant) in the sense of solidarity and not just based on the conceptual elements of material routine or for the sake of the balance of the war. From other points of view that, of course, correspond to the Marxist vision, the Middle Ages melts into modernity when the issues of the abolition of feudalism and the old regime arise and the prospects are for a new social order in the Romania are being suggested but it is an economic and sociological way of motivation that can not strike so strong the continuous trend in Romanian's solidarity built on linguistic-cultural and political bases.

In fact, today's Europe long-way towards its present identity begins with the dissolution of its Christianity of Roman origin, whose echoes have survived to this day. Among Christianitas, the Medieval Empire further transformed into Roman - German Empire, and in modern times into the Habsburg Empire and the Byzantine Commonwealth it is being detached with normative value and personal identity, Europe not only geographically, but also as an anthropological and civilization horizon.

It is in this crucible of aspirations and forms of organization that stands out little by little, the Romanian political organization, marginal when compared to the above grandiose formulas mentioned above and therefore subject to great labor, practically permanently crushing an institutional structure of formulas and external means of reporting. The X<sup>th</sup>–XIII<sup>th</sup> century Romanian society was confronted with the last (third in chronological order) wave of migratory peoples: the Hungarians (Magyars), the Pechenegs, and the Tatar-Mongols Cumans. If the Hungarians mainly influenced the situation in Transylvania, others have influenced the evolution of Romanian society in the southern Eastern Carpathians.

The most obvious pressure exerted by the Hungarian kingdom (in fact the toughest diplomatic disputes of the Roman world was always in Hungary) that since the XI<sup>th</sup> century begins a slow leak, led by tribal heads and then by the aristocracy autonomous central power towards Transylvania, with more serious implications in the XIV<sup>th</sup> century in the Romanian Country and in Moldavia.

There was a force that opposed the unscheduled but permanent outpouring of Hungarians towards Transylvania. That was Rome, the Rome of popes' jurists in the thirteenth and fourteenth-centuries who have claimed parts of Transylvania and parts of institutions in their own benefit. In fact mention must be made of one thing, that recent diplomacy forgets, but which must not be forgotten, i.e. that if the Romanians enter the history of medieval Europe, this is due also to the interest the above mentioned have shown to Romanians.

Even though indirectly, not to mention it by an ethnonym, Innocent III refers to the Principality Belle (probably Bâlea) in 1205 and we may state that we also owe it to him when it comes to the famous episode of the Teutonic people coming to the Country of Birsha, a point that some consider to be the stimulating element of Transylvania's colonization by the Saxons.

Having reached this far, we should dwell a little more on a fact of great importance, which shows how our country came into the sight of the most important actors of the time, thus attaching itself to Christianity, and to Europe, respectively, by, practical legal means specific to what was known at that time as the pontifical formula. This is the first trial in an international court that bears an effect upon the current territory of Romania. It is a trial that was carried out at the Pontifical Court of Rome in 1235. The trial that had as defendant priests the bishop of Transylvania and the dean of Barsa, had two stages the ordinary hearing and the call. We know only the ordinary hearing but we do not know the call because some documents were not kept. However on the occasion of the ordinary hearing we make a record of an extraordinary new nature so far unreported till 2009 in our historiography. The ordinary hearing was blocked as Richwinus, the solicitor-procurator of Catholic Church who ruled in favor of winning the rights by the dean of Barsa Country, a structure directly dependent on the Holy See, Richwinus noting that "according to documents in the Church archive that land belongs to the Holy See". Here is an extraordinary information irrelevant for the large Romanian public, that the Romanian territory appears to have been claimed directly by the Holy See.

It is not by chance that in this regard, two elements are being raised, one of narrative structure and another one of a diplomatic type, confirming that the Romanian structure: it is a statement made somewhere in a mercantile manual in the Siena region (Italy), which describes the realities of the world known by these traders. When they come to mention the Hungarian province they speak about "two great generation" who are Romanians (brown) and Vlachs (valathi) with two ruling powers. The document may be dating back to 1314 and sets back with more than a century the date of the humanist term Romanian (brown) belonging to Pope Pius II (Enea Silvio Piccolomini). The text in itself is fabulous since before there was a diplomatic body meant to represent Romanian people's interests, there existed this mercantile diplomacy who speak in a laudatory way about the Romanians and about their institutional achievements: "La settima prouincia si e Vngaria, e anche a reame, sono molta giente, non u'a contadi grandi, confia colla Magnia e dall'altra sono cristiani Vngheri. In quella medesima prouincia sono i Rumeni e i Valacchi, e quali sono due grandi gienerazioni, e anno reame e sono paghani." The other diplomatic document is a letter from Pope Clement VI in 1345 which in its turn tells about the Olathe-Roman (Olathe = Valachi = Romanian). Let us also contextually remind the fact that what defines our European characteristic is being transposed also under a religious dimension, when, without mistake, in a document dated June 6th, 1574, Transylvanian orthodoxy is defined in terms of romanam religionem. Hence, therefore, trade diplomacy or the pure, pontifical diplomacy record and report the Romanian realities highlighting their Roman origin. These are the signs of the testimony about the synchronism of Romanians' the development affecting them as a nation with impact upon their fellows and who provide written testimony about the former.

We have insisted upon the deployment of forces in the XIV<sup>th</sup> – XV<sup>th</sup> centuries on the Romanian territory, since it is the time that establishes the tripartite pattern of the Romanian political and cultural action which is going to be treasured as such until 1859, despite all the developments in European society and the change of the forms of organization the world, including the dissolution Christianitas, the balance between the empires, the imposition of capital, the Reform, the Counter Reform or the appearance of economic relations based on capital, value accumulation etc.

Speaking about the tripartite matrix in which Romanians' institutional fate will unfold, but we must emphasize, as it has become obvious from the material written above, often, despite the fragmentation of the state, all three Romanian Countries up to a certain point to, then Transylvania less, coordinated their movements rather well, worked on the big issues with the religious motivation as an underlying reason, but probably the nation's solidarity reason as well. It is a fact that until the dissolution of Christianity, in the context of the progress made by the policies for the establishment of centralized monarchies within more or less national boundaries, immediately after resulting in the birth of the international relations system, the Romanian Countries acquire by means of their diplomacy rather relevant of its boldness and state self defense gained in the XIV<sup>th</sup> century a status that does not immediately provide parity, but gives them responsibility for what we call the defense front of Christianity, and the configuration of the geopolitical map of pre-modern Europe. This is the interpretation that we provide regarding some moments in the history of the fifteenth century which reveal the minor power status, but useful and respectable in the context of the present European age (discovery of America in 1492 will lead to retrieving symbolic geographical contours of Europe and points out that despite its centrality and topical decision is part of a whole).

These moments mark Iancu de Hunedoara's career. His humanist taste for metaphor beyond the well-established context (we are at the dawn of the third humanism) is obvious also from the words carved on his grave stone "faded out the light of the world" as a tribute of the Christian "world" that he defended from the threat of the Ottoman invasion and whose role should be overrated when talking of late medieval European solidarity, then a great responsibility of Stephen the Great for the fate of the late Europe crusade. Stefan the Great was the only Romanian prince who has been openly and honestly recognized the contribution to stopping the Ottoman invasion many years after the death of Iancu de Hunedoara by the most authorized public authority - Pope Sixtus IV. When he defines Moldova as: "This Gate of Christendom" he publicly sanctioned the place and the role Moldova played in the European architecture of solidarity and unanimity against the Ottomans. To place Stephen's Moldavia in Christianitas means to assign it the role of Christian peoples' family member with a common European destiny, until today an aggregation source of integration policies towards a coherent common destiny. Finally one last argument (but one may invoke a lot of them) that may be invoked is encountered during the period of Orthodox Moldova before Stephen, when it participated at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437-1439) having a fully representative status. This is the first well-documented, direct and unmediated participation, of the representatives from a Romanian country to a structure with political-religious, "international", decision-making level, anyway at a secret meeting of political powers at the dawn of the Middle Ages (the Holy See, Roman-German Empire, the Byzantine Empire). Although he takes part on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox region, Damian, the Metropolitan of Moldavia, endorses the document of religious Union not only as an expression of obedience to the ecumenical patriarch, but as an expression of wish of the Moldovan state authority. We find ourselves actually many centuries before the European aggregation process, as participants by means of Moldova's mediation to one attempt to overcome the political and religious censorship that has tormented our continent since the post Roman period until a few decades ago. Here is a reason to be quantified in the dynamic relations between Romania and the Western countries and that also testifies about the Western pressure that not infrequently characterized the political development of the Romanian Lands.

What is important for the diplomatic discourse, this time relying on the principle of otherness, are the press reports built on diplomatic information sent by specialized agencies. For the year 1600-1601 the so-called "avisi" - brief information sent by the representatives of the Roman Church in the territory, by the various Catholic missionaries, etc. - provide very interesting data regarding the

figure of Michael the Brave and the manner in which he and his political plans were perceived at the level of the Pontifical Curia exponents. From this point of view, even the religious connotations accompanying the events analysis are relevant for the reception of the developments in the then Transylvania of the Catholic world. Michael the Brave's Greek belief is being underlined, and consequently, the lack of confidence - on this basis - on behalf of the Catholic world and Vatican authorities in Michael's actions. Also, some data from the spring of 1600 insists on certain social issues - Michael the Brave was loved by the common people in Transylvania - and the use of such solutions for acquiring military and political rule in the principality was considered by representatives of the Roman Church as a dangerous example in the fight against the Ottoman Empire in the area. In fact, most of the documents reveal the diplomatic efforts of weddings in Poland and the Habsburg Empire meant to remove any misunderstanding between the two Christian powers - including disagreements over the management of the principality of Transylvania, that Poland did not want, as it was a neighboring province, under archduchy authority - so that the action against the Ottoman Empire sponsored by the papacy shall not suffer. Documents repeatedly underline Transylvania's strategic position in defense of Christianity, as a bastion of what was still retained in the Kingdom of Hungary, as well as for the principality economic and territorial value („la Transilvania è grande, fertile et abbondante, et il propugnacolo di tutto il rimanente del Regno”. ”). It is in the same context that is emphasized the role of the Romanian Country, seen as „un antemurale della Transilvania et un propugnacolo contro il Turco”. The last assessment is congruent with the expression addressed to Moldova as ”questa porta della Cristianita” by Pope Sixt the IVth. So this is the way, like a spring over time that the Romanian countries by the discourse of courageous diplomacy managed to confirm by means of the foreign diplomatic agents voices their defending nature and their position as members of the family of nations, states and European interests, one of the most debated issues in Romanian historiography, a problem actually showing the road itself, i.e. the question of origins. This problem, dating back in the humanist period will permanently have a diplomatic reflex, at first understood in a cultural key, but further on as Romanian national conscience aggregated, has become an element with political conscience which will cause political reactions the most evident of which is the roeslerian theory. The situation is natural for a people with an old, but at the same time, enigmatic certification, with a language that is claimed by Rome, but with relatively late state organization. The origin of the Romanian people and of the Romanian language remains a controversial subject that developed in time two national myths from the cultural point of view that of Latin and of the Dacic origins. The Latin and the Dacic characteristics are concepts that represent the background of the Romanian language and of the Romanian people. Latin is a term that refers to the character of a nation, to its Latin origin and Dacianism is a domestic ideological trend expressing a set of specific characters of the Dacians. Both trends were born due to the fact that for centuries efforts were made to establish the origins of the Romanian people. The idea of the Latin origin attracts by means of the prestige of Roman history (military and political qualities, power), but also the Latin language, which was for centuries the foundation of the European culture. "This myth of the origin was quite obvious with us because it compensates for a series of inferiority complexes towards the power forces around us," said the historian Lucian Boia. The founding myth of our Latin origin was established by the Transylvanian School in the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century. It is from here that stemmed the idea that we are not only descendants of the Romans, but also the successors of their history. In the mythology of Romanian origins, the Romans have a strong competitor: the Dacians. Dacianism popularity is explained by the heroism shown by the Geto-Dacians and by the mystery of a civilization far too little known, but also by the fascination of what is archaic. "The other myth of our origins refers to our return to the domestic area, about our resorting to the Dacians as our ancestors. Just like in the case with the Romans, this persistent look back to the past showed up from the desire to rise in rank an unsatisfactory present ", says Lucian Boia. Several personalities such as: D. Cantemir, C-tin Cantacuzino, the Moldavian

chroniclers, the representatives of the Transylvanian School and of forty-eighties generation, philosophers and historians have argued in favor of either the Latin or Dacian character, being attracted by certain features of these concepts, but our people is not entirely Latin or Dacian, it is a synthesis between the two, achieved through a historical process of large-scale and with huge consequences, a social-political change and organizational structure with its features standing out at the same time, of place, time and ethnic basis that it was grafted upon.

From the scientific point of view, the Romanian ethno-linguistic genesis, developed three theories: the north-Danubian theory (D. Cantemir, P. Major, B.P. Hasdeu), the theory of the origin of the north and south Danube (N. Iorga, Al. Rosetti, ADXenopol, S. Puscariu) and north of the Danube or immigration theory (FR Sulzer, Robert Roessler). The immigration theory is outlined by the political nature of the allegations made by foreign researchers who say that the Hungarians and Germans provided the territorial stability in the north part of the Danube. The second one, contrary to the above mentioned one, supports the idea of people's unity and continuity on this territory due to the afore said Romanization process. Thus, the Danube is not a language or an ethnical barrier; it is just an administrative border. The north of the Danube theory plays just historical role, it does not benefit from a very convincing scientific demonstration. The first Romanian scholar to have written about the Latin origin, about the unity of nation and of the language of all Romanians was Nicolaus Olahus (1493-1568). Olahus spoke in Latin to the whole of Europe, about the Latin character of the Romanian people, about their unity as a nation and language use "at a time when in the Romanian country the culture was predominantly of Slavonic expression, for example, Neagoe Basarab's teachings towards his son Theodosius, and in Moldova, Macarie, Eftimie and Azariah wrote their chronicles using the same "language-boyar ruling." The Romanian ethno genesis was one of the major concerns of our first chroniclers who speak of our Roman origins, mentioning the existence of a dacic element. Grigore Ureche noted in "Chronicle of Moldavia": "The Romanian people, whether inhabitants of the Hungarian country or whether from Ardeal and Maramuresu are just like the ones from Moldavia, all descendents from Rome".

He also demonstrates the Latin origin of the Romanian language, in a chapter devoted to this issue, entitled "For our Moldovan language," which concludes with pride that "it is from Rome that we have all descended and it is with Rome's language that we mixed our language; in order to convince his readers of this truth, he gives a sample of Latin etymologies: from the so called ... rîmleni, whom we call Latins, for bread, they say, Panis, for chicken ... they said Galina, for woman ...they say mulier [...] and many other Latin words, that if consider in detail we may understand them all." Ureche makes a new remark about the unity of the origin of the Moldavian and Wallachian people. The "medieval Latin" writing about Moldova and Wallachia mention that they "used to be a same place and a same country." The idea about the Roman origin and about the Romanian's united language and nation is at the heart of Ureche's Chronicle and from now on will be permanent in the humanist historiography. Miron Costin, Ureche's intellectual successor, speaks and brings new evidence with ever more enthusiasm, regarding both the origin of the people and of the language. Miron Costin dedicated to the problem of origins a separate work – About the Moldavian nation, which nation did their ancestors come from (1686). This historical monograph represents the first overview of indigenous consciousness and unity of Latin Romania, present in the tradition of popular and scholarly items, and documents based on humanist historiography of that time. Unlike Grigore Ureche, who speaks only about Moldovan people, Miron Costin sees things in much wider scope. He is the first of Romanian scholars to explore the origins of the whole nation: "the thought to start this toil has overcome, to bring to light the way my people are, which roots and seeds have the inhabitants of Modavia, Wallachia and the Romanians from the Hungarian Country have spread from, as mentioned above, since we are all a nation". The scholar

is stimulated by a sense of duty to remove the "lack of knowledge about the beginning of this country" and to bring to light the truth, especially that "a bat writer" were forced to "clog with great shame" the Romanian people. Miron Costin, draws a synthesis of the structure of the Romanian language: "Where it should be Deus, or God we have Dumnezeu, al meu instead of Meuse, this is how the language broke down, what used to be coelum we have Ciera, homo - man; frons - forehead; Angelus - indzierul. Some remained even whole words: beard - beard, so did the month, and some very small differences. In addition, there were added later a few Hungarian words. Finally, taking the sacred from the Serbs, they added a few Slavonic words."

Late eighteenth century and early eighteenth century coincide with the Romanian Principalities rise to a new stage in international relations system, and the series of wars and Russian-Turkish negotiations or the Austrian-Russian-Turkish ones placed them at the forefront of European policy in this part of the continent, becoming - as Panin, Russia's Chancellor said, - "to the main pierre d'achoppment" [1].

Obviously, the series of Russian-Austrian-Turkish wars marked the evolution of the Romanian lands, including the territorial clippings that they have applied, but there were wars that did not take into account the aspirations and the motivations of the Romanian population. The eighteenth century beyond these war avatars that destroyed or imposed upon the Romanian principalities serious shortcomings, saw something being made up, something that will mean the true Romanian spirit and intellectual ascension under the form of national consciousness. Transylvania started and provided this trend and the significant are Ioan Inochentie, Micu Klein and Supplex Libellus Valachorum.

The Supplex moment represents the apogee of the Romanian enlighten movements in Transylvania. Started at Blaj, the Romanian enlighten movement has set its main objectives consequently to the most urgent necessities. The actors of this movement couldn't consider problems in an abstract way; they couldn't preach the Enlightenment principles as stand alone values. Instead, they were asking for the same legal statute, which all the other Transylvanian inhabitants had in the context of the major changes, which had happened by incorporating the province and the Partium in the Austrian Empire.

The European significance of Horea's uprising has been emphasized by the European historiography of the late eighteenth century, as an argument for the western public opinion that the servile and dependency times were finally over. This is a great synchronism between the eighteenth century Transylvanian Old Regime and the French Ancient Regime and this fact was proved by the French publicist and revolutionary Jacques Pierre Brissot.

We must emphasize that for the first time in the Romanian's history, Horea's uprising was common depicted topic in the pages of the weekly and half-yearly western journals, representing, without want, an anticipation of some sort of public diplomacy and a way of relating the non Romanian public opinion to the Transylvanian events.

### **The beginnings of the Romanian diplomacy – The Romanian's European Identity as a premise of the diplomatic activity between the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century**

The movement led by Tudor Vladimirescu represents the first affirmation of the Romanian's European identity in the nineteenth century. Concerning the European characteristics of Tudor

Vladimirescu's Revolution, we consider interesting to mention the fact that between June December 1814 – the moment coincides with Vienna Congress (which took place in the late 1814 and the beginning of 1815) - Tudor Vladimirescu was in Vienna, right in the middle of the decisions' melting pot which was about to change Europe. Although the nature of those decisions was conservative, the liberal ideas were present in the Viennese atmosphere. This is why it's not hard to presume that the liberal ideas that were preaching liberty and resistance against the oppressors – their nature depending from one country to another -, and which were common to both the American and the French revolution, represented the main inspiration source for Tudor Vladimirescu's revolution. Even the main document of the revolution "The wishes of the Romanian people" represents a clear example of the influence that the European events had over the Romanian leader.

The text of the document elaborated by Tudor Vladimirescu – that claimed the abolition of the nobility's privileges and the obligation of the ruler named by the Porte to respect the wish of the people; in order to become a state official one should worth it; a thorough reform in justice, administration, education, army (by establishing a permanent army force), and abolishing the internal custom houses – besides its inner value, represents a further proof of added value in comparison with the similar events that had taken place in Europe.

The moment of 1848 with all its bourgeois-liberal tumultuous, marks the opening of the European doors to the Romanian nation, even if at that time it was split in three.

For the Romanian nation, the historians consider that the revolution of 1848 represented the first true entrance in the world's big history not only because of its superior programs and actions quality, but also because of its simultaneity with all the other revolutionary movements that took place on the continent.

The revolutionary events of 1848 took place almost simultaneously in Moldavia, Transylvania and Walachia, and the programs contained a lot of common claims, fact that emphasizes the unitary development of the intellectual superstructure inside the three Romanian countries. The tempestuous year of 1848 has brought into light a lot of intellectuals such as Ion Heliade Rădulescu, Nicolae Bălcescu, Ion C.Brătianu, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Simion Bărnuțiu, Avram Iancu and many others, who were schooled in the European universities, exposed or not to liberal or Masonic ideas, with contacts in the diplomatic saloons of the époque and with natural or learned negotiation abilities.

After more that two centuries and as an expression of the Romanian national desideratum, the Revolution in Walachia and Moldavia has brought into question political unification and autonomy – an immediate premise of gaining independence from the suzerain and protective powers – The Ottoman Empire and Russia. In fact, these will represent the premises of the Romanian diplomatic activities in the next three decades and after 1878 until 1918. This is the moment in which the inefficient and clientage system of the Romanian diplomats at the Porte had to cease its existence and to give way to the new attitude of the pragmatic diplomacy philosophy, which besides the dull representative services had to work hard to safeguard the national interests. The historical act of 24<sup>th</sup> January 1859 represented the first step in the establishment of the unitary Romanian state. Imposed after a powerful popular pressure, especially in Bucharest, the election of Alexandru Ioan Cuza as ruler of Walachia was reconfirmed at the manifestation held in the honor of his arrival in the capital city. The Unification of the Romanian Principalities had a great relevance for the international relations, because of the special nature of this phase in which "the Romanian state was defending its national interests, its main representative for its foreign affairs

policy being the ruler himself', who acted through its permanent official representatives or special emissaries, or by himself whenever it was about the superior national interests. In this new phase, the foreign affairs policy of the Principalities gained new features: became common for the both provinces; was self-standing, belonged to the country and not to the ruler and all the internal problems had external implications.

At 9<sup>th</sup> of May 1877 (old style), the Romanian Principality, which was officially under Ottoman suzerainty had declared its independence. Mihail Kogălniceanu – foreign affairs minister – declared that “we are a free and independent nation”. It seemed that the whole Romanian history since the Medieval Age has been melted in this short declaration.

### **Connecting the inter-war Romania (1918-1939) to the European values. Innovations of speech and diplomatic practices**

In fact, leaving aside Romanian's tribulations during the First World War, when the weapons had spoken and the diplomats were silent, the most important result of this conflagration was the unification of the Romanian territories. The tribute paid in lost lives and material losses has been incredibly high, but the consequences for our country were positive: as Lucian Blaga was saying, the “great Romania” has been built, a country for the unified Romanian nation, which was a millenary aspiration if not multi-secular.

When the weapons went silent, the diplomats started talking and at least for Romania's concern, they proved a remarkable maturity and efficiency, emphasizing not only the fact that the Romanian diplomacy became more bureaucratic, but also that it became more efficient and rational in terms of Romanian national pragmatism. The Versailles Treaties system represented the political and legal signal of ending the first major world conflagration, which had involved more than 33 countries, with over 1 billion population, with millions of victims and unimaginable destructions and which had caused the disappearance of four empires: the Austrian-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires (both divided), the Tsarist and the German Empires.

In the Romanian case, the most significant was the Trianon treaty, which found Romania already as a united nation through the people's wish expressed directly in Alba Iulia on the 1<sup>st</sup> of December 1918.

The objectives of the foreign affair's policy, elaborated before the World War I, were successfully met at the peace conference that took place in the following years. The intangibility of the peace treaties, the strong relationships with the successors states of the Danubian monarchy, with France and England, maintaining normal relations with the neighbor countries, protecting suzerainty, independence and territorial integrity, the lack of involvement in other countries' internal affairs, the legal equality of all states provided in all the conferences in order to solve all European political and economical problems, were the main fields in which the Romanian diplomacy has distinguished itself, all these agreeing with the wishes of the Romanian people after the World War I.

“We want to be the friends of all nations, with no exception” – N. Titulescu declared – “but regarding our own affairs we accept no other master than ourselves”.

Among the ways discussed in the Romanian political and military circles, designed to insure and protect the national independence and territorial integrity, the most important role was held by the political and military alliances with the countries whose foreign affairs policy had similar objectives with the Romanian ones. As such, the political and military alliances signed by



Romania in the inter-war period met the purpose of maintaining the legitimate defense objectives imposed by the general policy of the unitary state, of rejecting any aggression, of maintaining the status-quo of peace and security in the South-East and Eastern Europe.

The Romanian political and diplomatic steps were taken considering the fact that in alliance with other small and medium European countries Romania could play an important role in counter-acting the aggressive war forces. The system of political and military alliances build by Romania in the inter-war period was build upon the bilateral defensive alliance with Poland, the collective security alliances with the states of the Small Agreement (Romania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia) and with the countries of the Balkan Agreement (Romania, Greece, Yugoslavia and Turkey), the political and diplomatic arrangement with France.

From the point of view of the military and political decision takers in Bucharest, the two regional alliances – The Small and the Balkan Agreement – united by Romania and Yugoslavia could work as a damn against the German and Italian march to the South-Eastern Europe. In the pre-war years the war potential of Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Turkey and Greece together with England's, France's and Soviet Union's support could insure a defense front against the revisionist and revanchist forces.

The giving up policy of the western powers in front of the revisionist and revanchist forces enabled the offensive of the revanchist forces toward the Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. The conquest of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland by the Germans, which took place between 1938-1939, had as a result the dissolution of the two regional alliances and with it the breakdown of Romania's inter-war political and military defense system.

### **Continuity and discontinuity of Romania's involvement in the European concert during the pos-war years and the Cold War (1947-1989)**

In the first phase of the Dej's leadership (1948-1956), the foreign affairs policy was dominated by a full obedience to the objectives imposed by Moscow, fact which determined some of the researchers to argue that in the case of the Romanian Popular Republic and the whole Eastern-European block, there never existed a self-standing foreign affairs policy. Some may say that the cultural background which has enabled Bucharest's position in the foreign affairs field until Stalin's death and the beginning of the "new start" was highly primitive one, centered on maintaining the power no matter the costs; and this was the same during the post-Stalinist period which has determined a long row of different intensity conflicts with the soviet authorities. One can easily observe the cultural precariousness that has saturated the foreign affairs policy of the Romanian communists in the following events, giving an adequate and ruthless diagnosis of the ideological profile of the Bucharest leaders and their behavior in those unsafe and risky circumstances.

The following decade was the witness of a surprising and even intrigue re-orientation of the Romanian foreign affairs policy. In the context of the recent disputes between the soviet and Chinese authorities regarding the socialist state's relations with the "Imperialist states", the Romanian Labor Party has managed to impose its point of view concerning the disputes inside CMEA (Council of Mutual Economic Assistance). Inside this organism, Moscow was trying to bring into credit the idea that the best economic direction for the socialist countries implies a high specialization of production, which meant that the most industrialized communist states (The German Democrat Republic, Czechoslovakia) would have continued to concentrate their resources

and production toward continuing the industrialization process, while the least developed states (Romania and Bulgaria) would have abandoned the development of their heavy industry for agriculture. In this way, Khrushchev assumed the optimization of the internal economy of the socialist group. The Romanian part disagreed with such direction and the conflict which appeared after the opposition of the Romanian economists against the soviet proposal of restructuring the CMEA, had three parts and represented a corner stone for the Bucharest-Moscow relations. First, and the most important, was the political dimension: a big part of the fragile legitimacy of the regime was mostly due to the forced industrialization. Transforming the peasants into workers – which the regime had developed in order to acquire a massive work force – brought them some undeniable benefits in contrast to their past life conditions. Moreover, radical redesign of the economic policy brings into question the insecurity and distrusts that were partly kept low with big sacrifices by the Bucharest leaders. Besides all these, the Romanian political elite was well aware of the fact that such economic change would require a new political effort, and such things were mandatory to be discouraged. The first years of Ceausescu's époque unfolded into a favorable international climate. On the internal side, the new general secretary changes the name of the party into the Romanian Communist Party, and at the tenth Congress Romania becomes a Socialist Republic, having a new Constitution and the first-secretary denomination being replaced with the general secretary.

On the outside, the RSR was continuing its autonomy policy initiated in the last years of Gheorghiu-Dej, upgrading its relations with the German Federal Republic in 1967 at embassy level (the commercial relations were initiated in 1963). In the same year, Romania adopts a different position from the rest of the communist block regarding the Six Days War, avoiding naming and condemning Israel as an aggressor state. As recognition and rewarding of the Romanian foreign affairs policy, the Foreign Affairs Minister Corneliu Mănescu was invited to preside the UN General Assembly (September 1967).

In 1968, Ceaușescu's Romania was opposing Czechoslovakia's invasion. A clear manifestation of the international sympathy toward the regime was the visit of the American president, Richard Nixon to Romania in the following year, the first visit of an American president to a member state of the socialist block. The capital of international sympathy won by Ceaușescu during Czechoslovakia's invasion, didn't wear out until the late 1970s and it is estimated that it was kept relatively constant until the beginning of the 1980s.

At the beginning of December 1989, Ceaușescu's regime was confronted with an 'isolated internationalism', pronounced not only by the hostility with which it was perceived in the west, but also by the distrust showed by the other members of the socialist block, with few exceptions from Albany and the German Democratic Republic.

### **Rediscovering Romanian's continental vocation and the contribution of the post-revolutionary diplomacy to the European and international identity**

The fall of the communist regime in Romania, the disintegration of the socialist system and the disintegration of the USSR brought the Romanian nation on the way of democracy, market economy and to those political and economical forms and structures confirmed by history as the most capable of insuring, at least at a theoretical level, the liberty and the prosperity of nations.

This was a short summary of the long distance covered by our country in order to enter the European family, a family with many problems but with lots of opportunities, which has

monitored Romania during negotiations and adhering process for its structural shortcomings. Thus, as the discussions concerning Romania's association and adherence to the European Economic Community/ European Union grew more intense, the discourse of the Romanians decision takers had to change, to become more technical, more appropriate to the European demands.

The phases after 1877, which was marked by achieving the independence statute, when the pre-modern powers were giving signs of exhaustion when confronted with the tumult of the nations, have established a diplomatic speech and thinking patterns subordinated to the need of achieving a final territorial reconfiguration for the countries that were under different suzerainties or administrations. The diplomatic discourse was mainly build upon the nationalist resources, on the primary solidarity elements that were emphasizing the family concept, and the relationship existing between family, local community and the nation.

After achieving national unity and the Great Romania, the diplomatic discourse has been focused on the purpose of insuring national security and stability of the unification and on gaining an equal and honorable place between the other nations in a Europe divided by vain glory. The diplomatic discourse was therefore balanced and had tried through the famous Nicolae Titulescu to avoid being shallow and double dealing. In fact, the evolution of the Romanian pre-war foreign affairs policy was highly coherent to the principles assumed with the Treaty of Versailles.

The communist regime has had some discourse and content fluctuations, which depended on numerous factors such as the soviet influence through its Stalinist and Khrushchev's manifestations, the moderate national communism policy marked by a slight preference for liberal cultural ideas of Europe and the continental unity feelings scattered by General de Gaulle's projections. The late communist period has been darkened by a rapacious and hyper-nationalistic dictatorship that had practiced a very technical diplomacy, on a superficial level and with a highly nationalistic discourse in which the proto-Chronics elements were excessively used.

The discourse inheritance of the Romanian diplomacy was therefore a varied one, but marked through the late communist period, both in content and in form, with several penetrations of the bureaucratic system by certain structures of EID (External Information Direction).

The new Romanian diplomacy had to fight against the distrust of other foreign offices and to play as transparent as possible with a new team during 1991-1992, the first electoral cycle. The discourse has changed radically especially on Romania's strategic direction of development: the European integration.

The first Romanian Foreign Affairs Minister after December '89 was Mr. Sergiu Celac. His mandate was short, but intense and he has made the transition form Romania's controversial and dry discourse during the late Ceausescu period, to a more modern, coherent and ambitious diplomatic discourse, but still highly declarative as there were little evidence to prove the transfer from the totalitarian to the democratic regime. In fact, for the foreign diplomacy, until the first democratic elections that took place after the communist period, Romania was still a country with high potential, but with little predictability concerning its future direction, due to the fluctuations characteristic to the ex-soviet space in that time.

The fluctuations mentioned above, correlated with the European Commission's new re-positioning after 1989 transformed the first contacts into mild diplomatic explorations.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the position of the European Economic Communities and then of the European Union, was not fixed nor structured, but always in accordance with the

evolutions that took place on the European stage, with the global changes, with the political changes of the border member states of EEC, and thus our country's means of connecting and integration had to permanently adapt, technically speaking, to update and to upgrade itself in order to provide a correct adjustment to the movements made by the other actors who were either encouraging Romania's integration, or being pessimist about it and giving Romania a cold shoulder.

As such the mandate of the first post-communist Foreign Affairs Minister consisted mainly of re-establishing diplomatic contacts and the low enthusiasm determined by the fall of the communist regime was quickly replaced by a cold and rational policy. The diplomatic discourse that has evolved during the '90s to the "politically correct" discourse, which is regarded by many analysts as state hypocrisy, had positive effects for Romania although some may say it was cautious, very cautious. The Romanian diplomacy which has rapidly passed through a purgation process that has eliminated some of the most controversial personalities, had to learn fast the pragmatism lesson needed to build the new positioning.

As I emphasized before, the uncertainty that was dominating the ex-soviet space regarding the evolution of USSR and its willing to neutrally observe the evolution to democracy beyond the concepts of "glasnost and perestroika", was dramatic at least in the beginning. The events that took place in August 1991 and the Moscow putsch represented an alarm bell.

We must not disregard Romania's positioning toward the United States of America and its European ambitions. We must underline the fact that these aspirations were closely observed by the USA, which has carefully considered Romania's inclination toward the EEC and then EU and their influence to come after completing the association and integration process, and therefore USA's economic influence could not be limited by such ambitions in terms of economic competition and the free flow of capital and should enjoy all the privileges that the Romanian market and government could offer.

That's why we should closely analyze the Romanian diplomacy in the first decade after December 1989, when it was forced by the occasions to develop between the tensions accumulated between its European orientation and the tensions created by the only superpower who could assign an important role in programming and planning its national security themes with the help of NATO. After the first free elections since December 1989, in May 1990 a new government was put into place with Petre Roman as Prime-Minister and Adrian Nastase as Foreign Affairs Minister. This government was a transitional one that has assumed the reform process of the centralized economic system and Romania's first concrete and dynamic positioning on the international stage. The fact that there had been some strategic mistakes in managing the economical transition would have a long term impact on the integration schedule that was based on the functional market economy. But this is an argument that we will not thoroughly discuss because it goes way beyond our current research theme.

From the government's external image point of view, Roman had to deal with many negative events, which were poorly managed at that time and therefore determined a harsh erosion of the government's image and generated a wave of mistrust in the administrative and political abilities of the new government, not only because of their incapacity of dealing firmly those accidents of transition, but mostly because their inability to prevent it by dialogue and concessions as the principles of participative democracy and popular inquiry would have demanded. In fact, the 1990's turbulences (the miner uprisings) had generated a wave of mistrust that persisted almost a decade and which in the end was dissolved not by the positive internal events (there was still a

second miner uprising in 1999) but by some fortunate changes in the foreign affairs policy that had abandoned sensitiveness and sentimentalism for pragmatism.

Between 1992 and 1996 the foreign affairs mandate was held by Teodor Meleşcanu, a professional from the Foreign Affairs Ministry. From the point of view of tightening relations with Europe those years were marked by stagnation because the European decisions makers were lacking trust in Romania's democratic direction and alliance policy.

The government built by the Democratic Convention and the UDMR, which has assumed Romania's administration between 1996 and 2000 was characterized by a relative fluidity in managing the Romanian diplomacy with 3 ministers – Adrian Severin, Andrei Pleşu and Petre Roman - assuming the Foreign Affairs mandate. Each of them had its own vision regarding Romania's adherence process to the European Union, and thus the mandate was divided although the general discourse coherence that was oriented on the two fundamental goals: European integration and NATO membership. The political difficulties which were the main features of this coalition, had been doubled on an administrative level by the newly formed Ministry of European Integration that theoretically had a technical purpose, but which in fact was competing with the role of Foreign Affairs Ministry in relationship with the European institutions.

The elections won by the Romanian Social Democracy Party in December 2000, had brought a new Foreign Affairs Minister. The new minister was Mircea Geoană. He was closely assisted by Prof. Vasile Puşcas, Romania's chief-negotiator with the European Union. During the social-democratic administration, Romania's orientation has been finally a rational and occidental one, marked mostly by Romania's adherence to NATO and then by finalizing Romania's adherence negotiations to the EU and by preparing the adherence treaty, which was signed by the new government and the new Foreign Affairs Minister, Mihai-Răzvan Ungureanu at Luxemburg on the 25<sup>th</sup> of April 2005. At the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2007, Romania officially became a member of the European Union.

With this research we wanted to emphasize the way in which the building of the Romanian community reflects its external orientation, its mostly positive and sometimes negative positioning toward the countries with which we had a relationship. We can't look over the fact, that in contrast with the other nations with which our country tried to unify its destiny solidarity (in the current context this means integration, unity being a way too far aspiration) we had some difficult times that marked us either in a direct or in a collateral manner. Despite all that, the European matrix that was the cradle of the contemporary civilization and the most popular civilizing formula in the history of the human kind, has remained the river bed to which the Romanian culture in its post-modern form confluences, bringing within a historical and anthropological heritage that the whole bureaucratic state apparatus exposes in its relationship with others.

In fact this vision it's in some way regulated by the modern political and legal science when one talks about "multilevel constitutionalism", which imagines Europe as integrated levels of governance with multiple institutions that form a decentralized and polyarchical structure of decision taking process.

Despite the excessive use of technical language and attitudes, the current diplomacy and the corresponding diplomatic discourse doesn't belong anymore to starched elite, but reflects, absorbs and assumes in a democratic context, the ambitions of the Romanian community that are being expressed simultaneously with the identities of other communities. Therefore, the Romanian community has as main reason and expression glory its national history that reflects the growth,

development and the Romanian nation's potential, which in certain conditions can be expressed through diplomacy.

## Selective Bibliography

### I. Sources

- Cowdrey, H.E.J., *The Epistolae Vagantes of Pope Gregory VII*, Oxford, 1972.
- Documente de baza ale comunitatii si Uniunii Europene*, Iasi, Ed. Polirom, 1999.
- Documente privind istoria Romaniei, Veacul XI, XII si XIII. C. Transilvania, Vol.I (1075-1250)*, Editura Academiei RPR, Bucuresti, 1951, p. 284-289, nr. 238-240.
- Documenta Romaniae Historica*, B.Țara Românească, vol XI, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Giurescu, Dinu C., *Cade Cortina de Fier. România 1947. Documente diplomatice*, București, 2002.
- Iorga, Nicolae, *Acte și fragmente cu privire la istoria românilor*, vol. II, București, 1896.
- Lupaș Ioan, *Lecturi din izvoarele istoriei române*, Ed. Cartea Românească, București, 1928.
- Popa-Lisseanu, G., *Românii în izvoarele istorice medievale*, București: "Bucovina" I.E. Toroutiu, 1939.
- Popa-Lisseanu G., *Limba română în izvoarele istorice medievale*, Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, București, 1940.
- Popescu, Emilian, Idem, *Inscripțiile grecești și latinești din secolele IV-XIII descoperite în România (Inscriptions intra fines Daco-Romaniae repertae graecae et latinae anoo CCLXXXIV recentiores)*, București, 1976.
- Relațiile româno-sovietice. Documente*, I, 1917-1934, București, 1999.
- Titulescu, Nicolae, *Discursuri*, Edit. Științifică București, 1967.
- Titulescu, Nicolae, *Documente diplomatice*, cu un Studiu introductiv de G. Macovescu, Editura politică, București, 1967.
- Tratatul Uniunii Europene. Tratatul de la Maastricht asupra Uniunii Europene*, Bucuresti, Ed. Lucretius, 1997.
- Tratatul privind aderarea Republicii Bulgaria și a României la Uniunea Europeană*, Editura Monitorul Oficial al României, București, 2005.
- Vese, Vasile, Ivan, Adrian, *Tratatul de la Nisa*, Editura Dacia, Cluj Napoca, 2001.
- Tudoroiu, Theodor, *Tratatul Uniunii Europene*, Ed. Lucretius, Bucuresti, 1997
- La secțiunea izvoare intră toate Buletinele diplomatice cu secvență trimestrială, emise de Ministerul Afacerilor Externe, precum și arhiva electronică a Ministerului Afacerilor Externe cu documentele cu caracter necsecret.

### II. Bibliography, Dictionaries, Enciclopedies, Synthesis

- Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 1 1944-1969, coord. Ștefan Pascu, Ioachim Crăciun, și Bujor Surdu, Ed. Academiei RSR, București, 1970
- Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 4 1969-1974, coord. Ștefan Pascu și Bujor Sârbu, Ed. Academiei RSR, București, 1975. *Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 5 1974-1979, coord. Ștefan Pascu și Hristodol Gheorghe, Ed. Academiei RSR, București, 1980 *Bibliografia istorică a României*, VI (1979-1984) sub coordonarea lui Ștefan Pascu. *Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 7 1984-1989, sub coordonarea lui Ștefan Pascu și Gheorghe Hristodel, Ed. Academiei Române, București 1990
- Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 8 1990-1994 coord. Gheorghe Hristodol, Ed. Academiei Române, București, 1996

*Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol. 9 1994-1999, coord. Gheorghe Hristodol, Ed. Academiei Române, Cluj Napoca, 2000

*Bibliografia istorică a României*, vol 10 1999-2004, coord. Gheorghe Hristodol, Ed. Academiei Române, București, 2005.

*Dictionnaire diplomatique* red. A.F. Frangulis, Titulescu, N., Pactul Societății Națiunilor și legătura sa cu Pactul Briand-Kellogg, t. II, Paris, 1937.

Ferréol, Gilles, *Dictionarul Uniunii Europene*, Ed. Polirom, Iasi, 2001

*Istoria românilor*, vol. III, *Genezele românești*, coordonator Răzvan Theodorescu., Ștefan Pascu, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2001.

*Istoria românilor*, vol. IV, *De la universalitatea creștină către Europa „patriilor”*, coordonator Camil Mureșanu, Ștefan Ștefănescu, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2001

*Istoria românilor*, vol. V, *O epocă de înnoiri în spirit european (1601 - 1711/1716)*, coordonator Virgil Cândea, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2003

*Istoria românilor*, vol. VI, *România între Europa Clasică și Europa Luminilor (1711 - 1821)*, coordonatori Nicolae Edroiu, Paul Cernovădeanu, Ed. Enciclopedică, București 2003

*Istoria românilor*, vol. VII, tom I: *Constituirea României Moderne (1821 - 1878)*; tom II: *De la independență la Marea Unire (1878 - 1918)*, coordonator Dan Berindei, Gheorghe Platon., Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2003

*Istoria românilor*, vol. VIII *România întregită (1918 - 1940)*, coordonator Ioan Scurtu, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2003

*Izvoarele istoriei românilor*, ediție de G. Popa Liseanu, București, 1934-1939.

Jinga, Ion, Popescu, Andrei, *Integrarea europeană - Dictionar de termeni comunitari*, Ed. Lumina Lex, Bucuresti, 2000.

Bianu Ion și Hodoș Nerva, *Bibliografia românească veche* vol 1. (1508-1716), 1903, vol 2 (1718-1808), 1910, vol.3 (1809-1817), 1912

Crăciun Ioachim, Domșa Ioan, *Bibliografia istorică a României pentru anii 1959 și 1960*, Ed. Academiei Republicii Populare Române, Cluj, 1964

Cristea Ovidiu, *Bibliografia istorică românească a Mării Negre*, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 1996

Sacerdoteanu, Aurelian, *Izvoarele istoriei românilor*, Ed. Fundației Culturale Mihail Kogălniceanu, București 1949

*The Encyclopedia Americana*. international edition, New York, 1964, vol. 3.

Turc, Lucia, *Bibliografia istorică a Transilvaniei, (1936-1944): bibliografie selectivă*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj Napoca, 1998

Urwin, Derek, *Dictionar, Istorie si politică europeană 1945-1995*, Institut European, Iasi, 2000.

### III. General Papers

Alzati, Cesare, *În inima Europei. Studii de istorie religioasă a spațiului românesc*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Fundația Culturală Română, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.

Armbruster, Adolf, *Romanitatea romanilor. Istoria unei idei*, Bucuresti, 1972.

Barbulescu, Iordan Gheorghe, *De la Comunitatile Europene la Uniunea Europeana*, Editura Trei, Bucuresti, 2001.

Bârzea, Cezar, *Politicile si institutiile Uniunii Europene*, Editura Corint, Bucuresti, 2001.

Berindei, Dan, *Constituirea statului național Român în context european, în Cuza-Vodaă, In memoriam*, Iași, 1973.



- Berindei, Dan, *Epoca Unirii*, Editura Academiei RSR, București, 1979.
- Berindei, Dan, *Din începuturile diplomatiei romanesti moderne*, Editura Politica, Bucuresti, 1965.
- Bibere, O., *Uniunea Europeana între real si virtual*, Bucuresti, Ed. All, 1999.
- Bino, Olivi, *L'Europa difficile. Storia politica dell'integrazione europea 1948-1998*. II Mulino, Bologna, 1998.
- Boicu, Leonid, *Geneza "chestiunii romane" ca problema internaionala*, Edit. Junimea, Iasi, 1975.
- Bolovan, Ioan, *Transilvania între Revoluția de la 1848 și Unirea din 1918. Contribuții demografice*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 2000.
- Brătianu, Gheorghe I., *O enigmă și un miracol istoric: Poporul român*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1988,
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, *Marele eșec*, Cluj-Napoca, 1993.
- Castaldini,Alberto , *Pentru Europa regăsită. Discursuri despre o Românie între Orient și Occident*, Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Bucarest, 2008.
- Câmpeanu, Remus, *Elitele românești din Transilvania veacului al XVIII-lea*, Presa Universitară Clujeană 2000.
- Ciachir Nicolae, Bercan, Gheorghe, *Diplomația europeană în epoca modernă*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1984 .
- Ciachir, Nicolae, *Istoria relațiilor internaționale de la pacea westfalică (1648), până în contemporaneitate (1947)*, Editura Oscar Print, București 1998.
- Ciachir,Nicolae, *Marile puteri și România (1856-1947)*, Editura Albatros, București 1996.
- Corivan, Nicolae, *Lupta diplomatică pentru cucerirea independenței României*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1977.
- Corivan, Nicolae, *Relațiile diplomatice ale României de la 1859 la 1877*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1984.
- Crișan,Gheorghe, *Piramida Puterii. Oameni politici și de stat din România, 23 august 1944-22 decembrie 1989*, București, 2001.
- Darie, Nicolae, *Uniunea Europeana. Constructie. Institutii. Legislatie. Politici comune. Dezvoltare*, Editura Matrix Rom, Bucuresti, 2001.
- Defarges,Philippe Moreau, *Institutiile europene*, Editura Amarcod, Timisoara, 2002.
- Deletant, Denis, *România sub regimul comunist*, Editura Academia Civică, București 2006.
- Delumeanu, Stefan, *Geneza Europei comunitare*, Bucuresti, 1999.
- Denize, Eugen, *Românii și cruciada târzie. De la Iancu de Hunedoara la Mihai Viteazul, în Nașunea română. Idealuri și realități istorice. Acad. Cornelia Bodea la 90 de ani*, Editura Academiei Române, București 2006, p. 151-165.
- Diaconu, Nicoleta, *Sistemul institutional al Uniunii Europene*, Editura Lumina Lex, Bucuresti, 2001.
- Dobrinescu, Valeriu Florin., *România și organizarea păcii europene. Alianțele sale politico-diplomatice și militare*, Iași, Institutul European, 1993.
- Epure, Emilian *România într-o Uniune Europeană extinsă*, Editura Tribuna Economică, Bucuresti, 2002.
- Georgescu,Vlad, *Ideile politice și iluminismul în Principatele Române, 1750-1831*, București, 1972.
- Giurescu, Dinu C., *Țara Românească în secolele XIV-XV*,Editura Științifică, București, 1973.
- Grigore, Georgiu, *Identitate si integrare*, Editura institutului de Teorie Socială, 2001.
- Gower, Jackie, Redmond,John, *Largirea Uniunii Europene. Perspective*, Editura Club Europa, 2001.

Gyemant, Ladislau, *Mișcarea națională a românilor din Transilvania 1790-1848*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1986.

Felezeu, Călin, *Statutul Principatului Transilvaniei în raporturile cu Poarta Otomană (1541-1688)*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 1996.

Ignat, Ion, *Uniunea Europeană. De la Piata Comuna la moneda unica*, Editura Economica, București, 2002.

Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomația*, Editura All, București, 2007.

Iorga, Nicolae, *Histoire des relations Russo-Roumaines*, Iassy, « Neamul Românesc » 1917.

Lambropoulos, Vassilis, *The Rise of Eurocentrism. Anatomy of interpretation*, Princeton University Press, 1993.

Le Bras, Gabriel, *Institutions eclesiastique de la Chretiente medievale*, Bloud&Gay, Paris, 1959.

Malița, Mircea, *Diplomația*, Editura didactică și pedagogică, București, 1970.

Marga, Andrei, *Filozofia unificării europene*, Apostrof, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.

Maxim, Mihai, *Țările Române și Înalta Poartă. Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în Evul Mediu*, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 1993.

Mureșanu, Camil, *Iancu de Hunedoara*, ediția a II-a, București, 1974.

Năstase, Adrian, (coordonator), *România și viitorul Europei*, Editura Monitorul Oficial, București, 2001.

Panaitescu Petre P., *Mihai Viteazul*, București, 1936.

Pearson, Frederic S., Rochester, J. Martin, *Relaciones internacionales -situacion global en el siglo XXI*, Colombia, 2000.

*Politică externă comunistă și exil anticomunist*. Vol. II, Iași, Ed. Polirom, 2004.

Pop, Ioan-Aurel, *Națiunea română medievală*, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 2001.

Popa, Radu, *Țara Maramureșului în veacul al XIV-lea*, ediția a II-a, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 1997.

Pordea, G.A., *Unificarea Europeană (Problematika Europei Unite)*, Ed. Europa Nova, 1995.

Post, G., *Studies in Medieval Legal Thought. Public Law and the State. 1100-1322*, Princeton, 1964.

Prodan, David, *Suplex Libellus Valachorum*, București, 1967, ediția a III-a *Supplex Libellus Valachorum. Din istoria formării națiunii române*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1984.

Pop, Ioan Aurel, *Din mâinile valahilor schismatici. Românii în regatul Ungariei medievale (secolele XIII-XIV)*, Editura Litera, București, 2011.

Prodi, Romano, *O viziune asupra Europei*, Editura Polirom, 2001

Pușcaș, Vasile, *România spre Uniunea Europeană. Negocierile de aderare (2000-2004)*, Institutul European, Iași.

Reynolds, P.A., *International Relations*, în *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, Edited by A. Kuper and J. Kuper, Routledge, London, 1996.

*România în relațiile internaționale 1699-1939*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 1980.

*România-Vatican. Relații diplomatice*, Vol .I, 1920-1950, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 2003, p. 334-336.

Rosetti, Alexandru, *Istoria limbii române*. București, 1968.

Rothschild, J., *Return to Diversity. A Political History of East Central Europe since World War II*, Oxford 1993.

Sacerdoteanu, Aurelian, *Izvoarele istoriei românilor*, Ed. Fundației Culturale Mihail Kogălniceanu, București 1949.

Spinei, Victor, *Universa Valachica. Românii în contextul politic internațional de la începutul mileniului al II-lea*, Editura Cartdidact, Chișinău, 2006.

Stroia, Marian, *Românii în contextul politic european. De la Unirea Principatelor la căderea lui Cuza-Vodă (1859-1866)*, Editura Semne, București, 2007.

Soulet, Jean Francois, *Istoria comparată a statelor comuniste din 1945 până în zilele noastre*, Iași, Editura Polirom, 1998.

Stefan, Gheorghe, *Formarea poporului roman*, București, 1973.

Stoicescu, Nicolae, *Continuitatea Românilor*, București, 1980.

Suciu, Dumitru, *Anul 1918 în Europa Centrală și Răsăriteană. Evoluția ideii de Europă Unită. Perspectivă și retrospectivă istorică*, Editura Argonaut, Cluj-Napoca, 2003.

Suciu, Dumitru, *Evoluția ideii de Europă Unită*, Editura Historia, București, 2007.

Suciu, Dumitru, *From the Union of the Principalities to the creation of Greater Romania 1859-1918*, Center for Transylvanian Studies. The Romanian Cultural Foundation, Cluj-Napoca, 1993.

Theodorescu, Răzvan, *Picătura de istorie*, Editura Fundației Culturale Române, București, 1999.

Titulescu, Nicolae, *Politica externă a României*, Fundația Europeană Titulescu, Editura Enciclopedică S.A., 1994

Țirău, Liviu, *Între Washington și Moscova: România 1945-1965*, Editura Tribuna, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

Vulpe, Radu, *Romanitate și creștinism. Coordonate ale etnogenezei române*, în "De la Dunare la Mare. Marturii istorice și monumente de artă creștină", Galați, 1979, pp.16-22.

Zăpârțan, Liviu-Petru, *Relațiile internaționale*, Editura Studia, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.

Zorgbibe, Charles, *Constructia europeana. Trecut, prezent, viitor*, Ed. Trei, Bucuresti, 1998

Zyberstein, J.C., Barendboom A., *Traité de Maastricht, mode d'emploi*, Paris 1992.

#### IV. Special Papers

Alzati, Cesare, *Le matrici religiose e culturali dell'identita nazionale romana tra storia e ideologia în Itinerari di idee, uomini e cose fra Est ed Ovest europeo. Atti del Convegno Internazionale. Udine, 21-24 novembre 1990*, Udine, 1991, p. 105-117.

Alzati, Cesare, *Etnia e universalismo. Note in margine alla continuita del termine romanus tra le genti romene*, în *La nozione di "romano" tra cittadinanza e universalita. Atti del II Seminario Internazionale di Studi Storici, "Da Roma alla Terza Roma". Campidoglio, 21-23 aprile 1982*, Napoli, 1984, p. 437-448.

Andreescu, Ștefan, *Restitutio Daciae III. Studii cu privire la Mihai Viteazul (1593-1601)*, București, Ed. Albatros, 1997.

Bacon, W., *Nicolae Titulescu and Romanian Foreign policy 1933/1934*, University of Denver 1975, University Microfilms International Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A., London, England.

Barnea, Ion, *Creștinismul în Scythia Minor după inscripții*, în "Studii Teologice", nr. 6/1954.

Barnea, Ion, *Les monuments paleochretiens de Roumanie*, Roma, 1977.

Basno, Cezar, Dardac, Nicolae, *Integrarea monetar-bancară europeană*, Editura Didactica si Pedagogica, Bucuresti, 2001.

Bârsan, Maria, *Integrarea economica europeana, vol. I, „Introducere în teorie si practica”*, Ed. Carpatica, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.

Bărbulescu, P., *România la Societatea Națiunilor*, Editura politică, București, 1975.

Berza, Mihail, *Haraciul Moldovei și țării Românești în secolele XV-XIX*, în "Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie", tom I, 1957, p. 121-132.

- Betea, Lavinia, *Convorbiri neterminate: Corneliu Mănescu în dialog cu Lavinia Betea*, Iași, Editura Polirom, 2001.
- Brădescu, Faust, *Europa unită*, Editura Majadahonda, București, 2000.
- Berindei, Mihnea, *La position singuliere de la Roumanie en 1968: Ceaușescu et le printemps de Prague* în *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, 1999, 38, nr. 1-4, p.183-198 .
- Boicu, Leonid, *Diplomatia europeana si triumful cauzei romane. 1856-1859*, Edit. Junimea, Iasi, 1978.
- Bozac, Ileana, *Semnificația europeană a răscoalei lui Horea în comentariul lui W.L.Wekhrin* în *AIIA Cluj-Napoca*, XVII, 1974.
- Bozgan, Ovidiu, *Opțiunea occidentală a României, în 1964 - Franța. Privind dincolo de Cortina de fier* în *Dosarele Istoriei*, 2003, 8, nr. 8, p.28-36.
- Idem, *Franța-România 1964-1968: Spre un parteneriat strategic?* în *Revista Istorică*, 2003, 14, nr. 1-2, p.41-74.
- Brezeanu, Stelian, *La continuité daco-roumaine. Science et politique*, Bucarest, 1984.
- Buchet, Constantin, *Reacții americane la "independența" comuniștilor români, 1964* în *Arhivele totalitarismului*, 2000, 8, nr. 1-2, p.128-137.
- Bucur, Marius, *Relațiile României cu Sf. Scaun la începutul războiului rece*, în *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Theologica V, 1 / 2007*, 1-14.
- Buga, Vasile, *Relațiile româno-sovietice în anii '80* în *Anuarul Institutului Român de Istorie Recentă*, 2003, 2, p.101-128.
- Burban, Jean Louis, *Parlamentul European*, București, Ed. Meridiane, 1999.
- Buta, Nicolae, *I ragguagli di Claudio Rangoni, Vescovo di Reggio-Emilia e Nunzio in Polonia dal 1599-1605*, *Diplomatarium Italicum*, 1, 1925, p. 259-377.
- Buta, Nicolae *I Paesi Romeni in una serie di "Avvisi" della fine del Cinquecento (1599-1603)* *Diplomatarium Italicum*, 2, 1930, Roma. P. 72-304.
- Cairns, Walter, *Introducere în legislația Uniunii Europene*, Editura Universal Dalsi, 2001.
- Campus, Eliza, *Mica Înțelegere*, Editura Științifică, București, 1968.
- Eadem *Le caractère européen des traités bilatéraux conclus par la Roumanie dans la décade 1920-1930*, în « *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* », t.XII, 1973, nr.6 .
- Eadem, *Nicolae Titulescu și politica pentru menținerea integrității teritoriale a României*, în „*Studii. Revista de Istorie*” numărul 2/1966.
- Eadem *Politica externă a României în perioada interbelică, 1919-1939*, Editura. Politică, București 1975.
- Capidan, Theodor, *"Basilica"* în vol. *Limba și cultura*, București, 1943, pp. 249-252;
- Capitani, Ovidio, *Gregorio VII e l'unità dell'Europa*, în “*Aevum*”, 1986.
- Cătănuș, Dan, *Criza din Marea Caraibelor și desatelizarea României*, în *Dosarele istoriei*, nr.2, 2001.
- Cătănuș, Dan, *Reacții moscovite la "Declarația" din aprilie 1964* în *Dosarele Istoriei*, 2004, 9, nr. 4, p.42-47.
- Cătănuș, Dan, *Relațiile externe ale României și influența factorului sovietic asupra acestora în primele două decenii postbelice* în *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Contemporană*, 2002, 1, p.201-236.
- Chiper, Ioan, Constantiniu, Florin, Pop, Adrian, *Sovietizarea României. Percepții anglo-americeane*, București, 1993.
- Chițimia, Ion. C., *Bazele istorice și izvoarele ideii originii latine a poporului și limbii române la Grigore Ureche și Miron Costin*, în “*Analele Universității București*”, seria Filologie, 1975, p. 23-59.
- Ciachir, Nicolae, *Războiul pentru independența României în contextul european (1875-1878)*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1977.
- Cialdea, Lilio, *La politica estera della Romania nel quarantennio prebellico*, Bologna, 1933.

- Ciobanu, Veniamin, *Proiecte și tentative de reorganizare politică a Europei Orientale la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea și la începutul secolului al XIX-lea, în Națiune și europenitate. Studii istorice în onoare magistri Camilii Mureșanu*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2007, p. 242-264.
- Cociuban, Aristide, *Extinderea Uniunii Europene și România*, Editura Apimondia, București, 2002.
- Corivan, Nicolae, *Politica externă a lui Alexandru Cuza*, în "Danubius", VI-VII, Galați, 1972-1973.
- Cowles, Maria, Smith, Michael, *Starea Uniunii Europene*, Vol. 5, „Risc, reforma, rezistență, relansare”, Editura Club Europa, București, 2002.
- Crainic, Nichifor. *Zile albe, zile negre. Memorii*, I, București, 1991.
- Daicoviciu, Constantin, *Le probleme de la continuité en Dacie. Observations et précisions d'ordre historique et archéologique*, Bucarest, 1940;
- Idem, *O senzațională descoperire arheologică în Transilvania*, în "Transilvania", 1941, t. 72, nr. 8, pp. 575-578.
- Idem, *Dovezile arheologice ale continuității*, în "Transilvania" 1943, t. 74, nr. 1, pp. 1-6;
- Idem, *La Transylvanie dans l'Antiquité*, București, 1945.
- Idem, *Au sujet de quelques monuments chrétiens de la Dacie Trajane*, in "Melanges Marouzeau", 1948, pp. 119-124.
- Idem, *Le probleme de la continuité sur le territoire de la Dacie*, Dacia N. S., 12, 1968, pp. 347-354.
- Idem, *Există monumente creștine în Dacia traiană în secolele II-III*, în "Anuarul Institutului de studii clasice", 2, 1933-1935, pp. 192-209.
- Daicoviciu, Constantin, Petrovici, Emil, Stefan, Gh., *Die Entstehung des rumänischen Volkes und der rumänischen Sprache*, Bukarest, 1964
- Dăianu, Daniel, Vrâncianu, Radu, *România și UE, Inflație, balanța de plăți, creștere economică*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2002.
- Dănila, Nicolae, *Euro - bipolarizarea monetară*, Editura Economică, București, 1999.
- De Launay, Jacques., *Titulescu et L'Europe*, Byblos, NYON – Suisse, 1976.
- Deleanu, Sergiu, *Drept comunitar al afacerilor*, Editura Servo-Sat, Arad, 2002.
- Deletant, Denis, *Communist Terror in Romania Gheorghiu Dej and the Police State 1948-1965*, Hurst, London 1999.
- Deletant, Dennis, Ionescu, Mihail E., *Romania and the Warsaw Pact 1955-1989*, București, Editura. Politeia-Snsa, 2004.
- Dobrinescu, Valeriu.F., *România și Ungaria de la Trianon la Paris (1920-1947). Bătălia diplomatică pentru Transilvania*, București, 1996.
- Dobrinescu Valeriu Florin, *Diplomația României Titulescu și Marea Britanie*, Editura Moldova, Iași, 1991.
- Dobrinescu; Valeriu Florin, Pătroiu, Ion, *Retragerea trupelor sovietice din România în documente diplomatice franceze în Omagiu istoricului Ioan Scurtu*, Focșani, 2000, p.675-685 .
- Duculescu, Victor Duculescu, Georgeta, *Justitia europeană, mecanisme, deziderate și perspective*, Editura Lumina Lex, București, 2002.
- Dumitru, Laurențiu-Cristian, *Dinamica relațiilor politico-militare în cadrul Tratatului de la Varșovia între 1959 și 1967. Particularizarea atitudinii adoptate de România față de tratat în Geopolitică și istorie militară în perioada războiului rece*. București, 2002, p.111-120.
- Duțu, Alesandru, *Convențiile interguvernamentale - motiv de divergență româno-sovietică în cadrul Tratatului de la Varșovia în Document*, 2002, 5, nr. 2, p.12-17.
- Duțu, Alesandru, *Propuneri românești pentru perfecționarea relațiilor din Tratatul de la Varșovia. 1966-1969 în Arhivele totalitarismului*, 2001, 9, nr. 3-4, p.207-230.

Edroiu, Nicolae, *Jacques Pierre Brissot (1754-1793) și românii transilvăneni. Studiu și anexe*, Editura România Press, București, 2006.

Eminescu, Yolanda, *Dreptul de autor - Directive europene*, Editura Lumina Lex, 1995.

Fabian, Gyula, *Curtea de Justiție Europeană. Instantă de judecată supranatională*, Editura Rosetti, București, 2002.

Feneșan, Costin, *Populația din Marele Principat al Transilvaniei într-o statistică din 1772-1773*, în *Istoria României. Pagini transilvane*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1994, p. 122-136.

Florian, Claudiu Mihail, Preda, Dumitru, *RSR-RFG. Primul an de relații diplomatice în Magazin Istoric*, 2002, 36, nr. 4, p.14-18.

Florian, Claudiu Mihail, *RSR-RFG. 12 ani de tatonări în Magazin Istoric*, 2002, 36, nr. 3, p.17-21.

Gafencu, Grigore, *Însemnări politice (1929-1939)*, Ediție și postfață de Stelian Neagoe, București, Editura Humantias, 1991.

Gafencu, Grigore, *Ultimele zile ale Europei. O călătorie diplomatică întreprinsă în anul 1939*, Editura Militară, București, 1992.

Georgescu, Ilie, *Viața creștină în vechiul Tomis*, în "Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei", nr. 1-2/1962.

Georgescu, Vlad, *Memoires et projets de reformes dans les Principautés Roumaines 1769-1830*, Bucharest, 1970.

Gheorghiu, I., *Relațiile româno-ruse în perioada neutralității României (1914-august 1916)*, în: „Studii și referate privitoare la istoria României”, vol. II, București, 1954, p.1445-1518

Ghișa, Alexandru, *România și Ungaria la început de secol XX. Stabilirea relațiilor diplomatice (1919-1921)*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2002, p. 185-223.

Grabar, Andre, *Martirium. Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chretien antique*, II, Paris, 1946.

Granfield, P., *Nascita e declino della societas perfecta*, în “Concilium”, 18, 1982, p. 955-964.

Graur, Alexandru, Stefan, Gheorghe, *Formarea limbii și a poporului roman*, în *Dictionar de istorie veche a României*, București, 1976, pp. 271-284

Grecescu, Ion, *Nicolae Titulescu – Concepție juridică și diplomatică*, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova 1982.

Gyemant, Ladislau, *Transilvania între anii 1690-1790*, în *Istoria României. Pagini transilvane*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1994.

Herwing Wolfram, *Geschichte der Goten. Von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des sechsten Jahrhunderts. Entwurf einer historischen Ethnographie*, München, 1979, pp. 18-53.

Hillgruber, Andreas *Hitler, Regele Carol și Mareșalul Antonescu. Relațiile germano-române (1938-1944)*, trad., București, 1994.

Howard, H.N., *Yugoslavia, the Little Entente and the Balkan Pact*, Yougoslavia, ed. By R.J. Kernerm C. Berkeley, California, 1949.

Hunger, Herbert, *Reich der Neuen Mitte. Der christliche Geist der byzantinischen Kultur*, Graz-Wien-Koln, 1965.

Iancu, Gheorghe, *Contextul internațional al pregătirii Marii Adunări Naționale de la 1 Decembrie 1918*, în *Istoria României. Pagini transilvane*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1994, p. 346-364.

Iancu, Gheorghe, *The Ruling Council. The Integration of Transylvania into Romania 1918-1920*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.

Ionescu Mihail E., *România 1964-1968. Autoexcludere din Pactul de la Varșovia în Magazin Istoric*, 2003, 37, nr. 8, p.9-15.

Ionescu Mihail E., *România, aliatul exclusiv al Pactului de la Varșovia în Magazin Istoric*, 2001, 35, nr. 11, p.34-38.

Ionescu, Take, *Mica Înțelegere*, București, Editura „Cartea Românească”, 1922.

Iliescu, Vladimir I., *Die Raumung Dakiens und die Anwesenheit der romanischen Bevölkerung nordlich der Donau im Lichte der Schriftquellen*, în ”Dacoromania”, Freiburg, Munchen, 1, 1973, pp. 5-28.

*Între Beijing și Moscova. România și conflictul sovieto-chinez*, vol I, 1957-1965, București, Institutul Național pentru Studiul Totalitarismului, 2004.

Jinga, Ion, *Uniunea Europeană, realități și perspective*, Ed. Lumina Lex, București, 1993.

Kirițescu, C. *Preludiile diplomatice ale războiului de întregire*, I-II, București, 1940.

Lefter, Cornelia, *Drept comunitar instituțional*, Editura Economică, București, 2001.

Leicu, Corina, *Drept comunitar*, Ed. Lumina Lex, București, 1998.

Leicu, Corina, Leicu, Ioan, *Institutiile comunitare*, Ed. Lumina Lex, București, 1996.

Luțaș, Mihaela, *Integrarea economică europeană*, Editura Economică, București, 1999.

Macartney, C.A., *Hungary and her Successors*, London, 1937

Maior, Liviu, *Memorandul. Filosofia politico-istorică a petiționalismului românesc*, Editura Fundației Culturale Române, 1992.

Manoilescu, Mihail, *Dictatul de la Viena. Memorii. Iulie-August 1940*, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 1991.

Marcu, Viorel, *Drept instituțional comunitar*, Ed. Nova, București, 1994.

Marin, Gheorghe, *De la Roma la Amsterdam via Maastricht*, Editura Independenta Economică, Brăila, 1999.

Marin, Liviu, *Integrarea Europei în România*, Editura Fundatia Eurisc, București, 2001.

Mazilu, Dumitru, *Integrarea europeană. Drept comunitar și institutii europene*, Ed. Lumina Lex, București, 2001.

Meleşcanu, Teodor, *Renasterea diplomatiei romanesti; 1994-1996*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 2002.

Mihăilă, Marian, Suci, Carmen, Stan, Dan, *Drept instituțional comunitar*, Editura Lumina Lex, București, 2002.

Milin, Miodrag, *Relațiile politice româno-sârbe în epoca modernă (secolul al XIX-lea)*, Editura Academiei Române, București 1992.

Mironescu, George G., *Cuvântări*. București, ed. tipografice reunite, 1937.

Moraru, Camelia, *După "războiul" de Jon Kipur (oct.1973)*, în *Dosarele Istoriei*, 2003, 8, nr. 10, p.34-38.

Moraru, Camelia, *1967. Stabilirea relațiilor diplomatice dintre România și Republica federală a Germaniei în lumina unor noi documente în Omagiu istoricului Ioan Scurtu*. Focșani, 2000, p.715-728.

Munteanu, Roxana, *Drept european: evoluție, institutii, ordine juridica*, Ed. Oscar Print, București, 1996.

Mureșan, Camil. *Locul și semnificația războaielor de la 1784 în context internațional*, în *Academia Română. Memoriile Secției de Științe Istorice*, Seria IV, t.V, 1980, București, 1982, p.73-78.

*Nicolae Titulescu, Politica externă a României (1937)*, ediție îngrijită de George G. Potra, Constantin I. Turcu, Ion M. Oprea, Editura Enciclopedică, București 1994.

Nistor, Ion I., *Restaurarea Daciei în sintezele diplomației europene*, în „Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile secției istorice”, S.III, t. XXI, 1939,

Olteanu, Constantin, *Din intimitățile Tratatului de la Varșovia. Atitudinea României față de problema exercitării conducerii, la pace și război, asupra forțelor armate unite ale Tratatului de la Varșovia în Studii și Articole de Istorie*, 2003, 68, p.221-230.

Olteanu, Constantin, *Singură împotriva tuturor: România și documentele de bază ale alianței militare comuniste în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2001, 6, nr. 8, p.16-26,

Oprea, I. M., *Nicolae Titulescu*, Editura Științifică, București, 1966.

- Opriș, Petre, *Retragerea trupelor "prietene" la sugestia lui Gh. Gheorghiu-Dej în Historia*, 2003, 2, nr. 22, p.5-8.
- Oșca Alexandru, , *În culisele Tratatului de la Varșovia. Divergențe româno-sovietice privind statutul Tratatului de la Varșovia în Magazin Istoric*, 2001, 35, nr. 2, p.16-21.
- Idem. *Poziția României față de sistemul de gestionare a crizelor din interiorul Tratatului de la Varșovia în Restituiri. Studii și comunicări*. București, 2003, p.15-24.
- Oșca, Alexandru, Vasile Popa, *În culisele preliminariilor Tratatului de la Varșovia în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2001, 6, nr. 8, p.3-8.
- Otu, Petre, *Aprilie '64: Relațiile româno-sovietice în dezbaterile Plenarei CC al P.M.R. în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2004, 9, nr. 4, p.38-41.
- Otu, Petre, *București-Washington. 1963 - Sfârșitul tatonărilor în Document*, 2002, 5, nr. 2, p.18-31.
- Otu, Petre, *O aniversare discretă la București. 10 ani de la înființarea Pactului de la Varșovia în Revista de Istorie Militară*, 2001, nr. 1, p.42-44.
- Otu, Petre, *Poziția României față de războiul israeliano-arab din 1973 în Revista de Istorie Militară*, 2002, nr. 4, p.14-18.
- Papacostea, Șerban, *Politica externă a Moldovei în vremea lui □tefan cel Mare; puncte de reper*, în "Revista de Istorie", tom XXVIII, 1975, nr 1.
- Papacostea, Șerban, *Relațiile internaționale ale Moldovei în vremea lui □tefan cel Mare*, în "Revista de istorie", tom XXXV, 1982, nr. 5-6.
- Papahagi Tache , *Basilica-Ecclesia*, in vol. "Omăgiu lui I. Bianu", București, 1927.
- Paravicini Bagliani, Agostino, *Lo sguardo dal centro. Il papato e il concetto d'Europa. L'alto Medio Evo*, în *Vita religiosa e identità politiche: universalità e particolarismi nell'Europa del tardo Medioevo*, a cura di Sergio Gensini, Pacini Editore, 1998, p. 14-19.
- Pascu, Ștefan, *Mișcări în Centrul și sud-estul Europei din secolul al XV-lea până în secolul al XX-lea*, în *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj*, 1965, p.7-72.
- Pascu Șt., Mavrodin V.V., Porșnev B.V., Antelava I.G., *Mouvement s pagans dans le centre et les sud-est de l'Europe du XV-e au XX-e siècles*, în vol. *Comité International desc Sciences Historique, Raports IV. Methodologie et Histoire Contemporaine*, Viena, 1965, p.211-235
- Pavel, Teodor, *Istoricul Leopold von Ranke în sprijinul emancipării popoarelor ortodoxe din Europa de Sud-Est în Națiune și europenitate. Studii istorice in honorem magistri Camilii Mureșanu*, Editura academiei Române, București, 2007.
- Pavel, Teodor, *Între Rusia Țarilor și Germania Wilhelmiană*, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 1996.
- Pascariu, Gabriela Carmen, *Uniunea Europeana, Politici si piete agricole*, Ed. Economica, Bucuresti, 1999.
- Paus, Viorica, *Probleme actuale ale integrării culturale*, Ed. Semne, 2000.
- Pârvan, Vasile, *Contribuții epigrafice la istoria creștinismul daco-roman*, 1911
- Păcățian, Teodor V. *Pronunciamentul de la Blaj*, în revista „*Transilvania*”, LIX (1918), nr. 1, p. 26–37.
- Pop, Ioan Aurel, *Mitropolitul Simion Ștefan și identitatea românească*, în *Mitropolitul Simion Ștefan. Teolog, Cărturar și Patriot*, Editura Reîntregirea , Alba Iulia, 2010, p. 388-399.
- Pop, Valer, *Bătălia pentru Ardeal*, Bucureși, Editura Enciclopedică, 1992
- Popescu, Andrei, Jinga, Ion, *Organizatii europene si euroatlantice*, Ed. Lumina Lex, Bucuresti, 2001.
- Popescu, Emilian, *Continuitatea daco-romana. Formarea poporului român și a limbii române. Rolul creștinismului*, în "Glasul Bisericii", nr. 6-9/1980, pp. 573-587.



- Popescu, Emilian, *Das Problem der Kontinuitat in Rumanien im Lichte der epigraphischen Entdeckungen*, in "Dacoromania", Jahrbuch, für ostliche Latinität, Freiburg-München, I, 1973, pp. 66-69.
- Popișteanu, Cristian, *România și Antanta balcanică*, Editura Politică, București, 1968.
- Popescu, Liviu Corneliu, *Autonomia locală și integrarea europeană*, Editura All Beck, București, 1999.
- Porțeanu, Alexandru, *Mișcarea memorandistă în preocupările diplomatice și consulare ale României în Austro-Ungaria*, în *Istoria României. Pagini transilvane*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1994, p. 309-326.
- Preda, Dumitru, *Stabilirea relațiilor diplomatice la nivel de ambasadă între România și Israel în Magazin Istoric*, 2000, 34, nr. 11, p.20-24.
- Predescu, Bianca, *Drept instituțional comunitar*, Ed. Cardinal, Craiova, 1995
- Pușcaș, Vasile, *Negocierea de aderare la Uniunea Europeană – modernizare și europenizare, în Națiune și europenitate. Studii istorice în onoare magistri Camilli Mureșanu*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2007, p. 455-462.
- Quinlan, Paul D., *The 1970s: the heyday of American-Romanian economic relations*. în *Buletinul Bibliotecii Române, Freiburg*, 1990-1991, 16, p.259-271.
- Rădulescu, S., Nicolae Titulescu, *Diplomați iluștri*, vol. I., Editura politică, București. 1969.
- Retegan, Mihai, *1968 – Din primăvară până în toamnă. Schiță de politică externă românească*, București, Editura Rao, 1998.
- Retegan, Simion, *Pronunțamentul de la Blaj*, în „*Anuarul Institutului de Istorie din Cluj*”, IX (1966), p. 127–142 .
- Rîjnoveanu, Carmen, *Poziția României față de criza cehoslovacă din 1968 în Revista de Istorie Militară*, 2003, nr. 6, p.12-18.
- România-Israel. 50 de ani de relații diplomatice. Vol. I (1948-1969)* , București, Ed. Sylvi, 2000, 460 p.
- Scurtu, Ioan, (ed), *România. Retragerea trupelor sovietice, 1958*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Scurtu, Ioan, *La retraite de l'armée soviétiques de Roumanie (1958)*. în *Nouvelle Etudes d'Histoire*, 10, Editura Academiei Române, 2000, p.187-194.
- Serediuc, Mircea, *August 1968. România și intervenția "frățească" în Cehoslovacia în Revista de Istorie Militară*, 2001, nr. 2, p.21-25.
- Serediuc, Mircea, *Poziția României față de intervenția militară în Cehoslovacia - august 1968 în Omagiu istoricului militar Jipa Rotaru*. Constanța, 2001, p.366-373.
- Stănescu Eugen, *La politique des grandes puissances et l'union des pays roumains sous Michel le Brave*, în "Revue Roumaine d'Histoire", tom. XIV, 1975, nr. 3.
- Stoica, Camelia, *Libera circulație a persoanelor în Uniunea Europeană*, Editura Oscar Print, București, 2001
- Stoica, Cristina, Webster, Janice, *Avocatul român în sistemul de drept european*, Editura All, București, 1997.
- tefănescu □tefan, *Mihai Viteazul. Între "Respublica christiana și monarhia absolută*, în *Istoria României. Pagini transilvane*, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 1994, p. 79-100.
- Șperlea, Florin, *Communist Propaganda on the Establishment of NATO în War, Military and Media from Gutenberg to Today*. Bucharest, 2003, p.86-93.
- Șuța Ion, *Cooperarea Comandamentului Militar român cu partenerii de alianță în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2001, 6, nr. 8, p.31-37.
- Toropu, Octavian, *Romanitatea târzie și stră-romanii în Dacia traiană sud-carpatică (sec. III-XI)*, Craiova, 1976.

Troncotă, Cristian, *Istoria instituției securității externe a regimului comunist din România, 1965-1989* în *Revista Istorică*, 2000, 11, nr. 3-4, p.195-219.;

Troncotă, Cristian, *Securitatea și serviciile secrete sovietice (1968-1989). O reconstituire istorică pe baza izvoarelor memorialistice și a unor documente secrete declassificate în Structuri politice în secolul XX*. București, 2000, p.536-556.

Tudor, Dumitru, *Oltenia romana*, ed. IV-a, București, 1978.

Turliuc, Cătălin, *Statutul juridic al naționalităților în România, 1866-1878 și idem Marile puteri și problema naționalităților în România, 1866-1918*, în Dumitru Vîtcu, Dumitru Ivănescu, Cătălin Turliuc, *Modernizare și construcție națională în România. Rolul factorului alogen, 1832-1918*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 2002, p. 175-194, 280-321.

Țărău., Virgiliu, *Caricatură și politică externă în România anilor 1950-1951*, în *România și relațiile internaționale în secolul XX*. Cluj-Napoca, 2000, p.215-226.

Țăranu, Liviu, *Proiectul declarației din aprilie 1964 și relațiile româno-sovietice în Omagiu istoricului Florin Constantiniu*, Focșani, 2003, p.771-789.

Țăranu, Liviu, *România în C.A.E.R. (1954-1964)*, în *Analele Științifice ale Universității din Iași istorie*, 1998-1999, 44-45, p.161-187.

Țăranu, Liviu, *Relații româno-sovietice în cadrul Tratatului de la Varșovia în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2001, 6, nr. 8, p.8-11.

Țăranu Liviu, Sălăvăstru, Irina, *CAER, cronica unui eșec în Magazin Istoric*, 2002, 36, nr. 2, p.21-25.

Truță, Florian, *La Statul Major al Forțelor Armate Unite ale Tratatului de la Varșovia în Dosarele Istoriei*, 2001, 6, nr. 8, p.37-40.

Turcu C.I., Voicu I., *Nicolae Titulescu în universul diplomației păcii*, Editura Politică, București, 1984.

Turcuș, Șerban, *Nuovi dati sulla prima testimonianza relativa all'etnonimo "Român", 1314*, în *Transilvania latina, dalla romanità alla romenità*, Treviso, 2002.

Turcuș, Șerban, *Un processo transilvano alla corte pontificia nel 1235* în "Medieval and Early Modern Studies for Central and Eastern Europe", I (2009), nr. 1-4, p. 5-21.

Turliuc, Cătălin, *România și problema germană până la mijlocul anilor '60. Ridicarea zidului Berlinului în presa românească în Punți în istorie. Studii româno-germane*. Iași, 2001, p.103-136.

Ungureanu, Mihai Răzvan, *Întotdeauna loial. Note diplomatice pentru o Românie modernă (2005-2007)*, Editura Polirom, 2008.

Ute Gabanyi, Anneli, *Die Aufnahme der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Rumänien (31 Januar 1967). Voraussetzungen und Folgen* în *Punți în istorie. Studii româno-germane*. Iași, 2001, p.176-179.

Vartic, Gheorghe, *Retragerea trupelor sovietice din România. O victorie a Bucureștilor sau o decizie a Moscovei?* în *Revista de Istorie Militară*, 2003, nr. 3, p.1-6.

Wolf, Iosif, *Răscoala din Boemia (1775) și răscoala lui Horea*, *Studiu comparat*, în vol. *Răscoala lui Horea (1784), Studii și interpretări istorice*, coordonatori Nicolae Edroiu, Pompiliu Teodor, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia 1984, p.169-199.

Young, Liu, *Factorii care au influențat relațiile sino-române în anii '60*, în *Anuarul Institutului Român de Istorie Recentă*, vol II, 2003.