

**“Babeş-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca
Faculty History and Philosophy
Institute of International Studies**

***ROMANIA AND ITS PUBLIC DIPLOMACY
IN THE PROCESS OF NATO INTEGRATION***

Summary of the Ph.D. Thesis

**Scientific coordinator:
Professor VASILE PUŞCAŞ, Ph.D.**

**Ph.D. Candidate:
Simona Liliana NEUMANN**

**Cluj-Napoca
2011**

CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Contents of the thesis..... | 3 |
| Key-words..... | 6 |
| Summary..... | 6 |
| Bibliography..... | 19 |

CONTENTS OF THE THESIS

| | |
|---|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| Actuality of the topic, motivation and the aims of the research | 5 |
| Methodological support of the research | 7 |
| Bibliography | 8 |
| Structure of thesis | 13 |
| | |
| Chapter 1. | |
| NATO – THE EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN HISTORICAL AND STRATEGICAL RELATIONSHIP AND ROMANIA’S INTEGRATION | 16 |
| | |
| 1.1. Western Europe and the United States of America – the basis of the transatlantic relationship | 17 |
| 1.2. The North-Atlantic Treaty Organization | 24 |
| 1.2.1. The set-up of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization in the aftermath of World War II | 24 |
| 1.2.2. The process of transformation of the Alliance. In search of the new strategic concept at the beginning of the ‘90s..... | 28 |
| 1.2.3. The process of NATO enlargement. Preliminary stages.. | 36 |
| 1.3. Cooperation between NATO and the new Eastern European democracies. The relations with Romania | 43 |
| 1.3.1. The general political-strategic context in Eastern Europe after 1989 | 43 |
| 1.3.2. Preparation of the accession through the pro-western Romanian policies after December 1989 | 46 |
| 1.4. NATO after 9/11. Continuation of Romania’s accession demarche | 57 |
| 1.4.1. The transatlantic relationship after September 11, 2001 | 57 |
| 1.4.2. The factors that determined Romania’s accession to NATO. Preliminary stages | 62 |
| 1.4.3. Accession and integration. Conceptual limitations | 72 |
| | |
| Chapter 2. | |
| PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AT THE END OF THE 20TH CENTURY AND BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY | 81 |
| | |
| 2.1. Public versus traditional diplomacy. Definitions, analogies and differences | 81 |
| 2.1.1. Traditional diplomacy and the emergence of public diplomacy..... | 81 |
| 2.1.2. Definition of public diplomacy from theoretical point of view | 92 |
| 2.1.3. Definition of public diplomacy from practitioners’ perspective and of the institutions that promote it..... | 97 |
| 2.1.4. Fields of action and instruments of public diplomacy: activities, programmes, policies | 112 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2.2. Public diplomacy, propaganda, international public relations, strategic communication | 126 |
| 2.2.1. Analogies and differences | 126 |
| 2.2.2. New elements promoted by public diplomacy | 135 |
| 2.3. Case study: NATO Public Diplomacy Division | 138 |
| | |
| Chapter 3. | |
| PUBLIC OPINION PERCEPTION AND THE POLITICAL-DIPLOMATIC DIMENSION OF ROMANIA'S NATO INTEGRATION | 150 |
| | |
| 3.1. The political dimension of Romania's NATO integration | 150 |
| 3.1.1. Romania's political and security interests..... | 150 |
| 3.1.2. Diplomatic steps in the view of accelerating the accession process after the Summit of Madrid | 157 |
| 3.2. Public opinion – indicator of public diplomacy in following up the achievement of its objectives | 164 |
| 3.2.1. The public opinion regarding Romania's foreign relations..... | 164 |
| 3.2.2. Domestic public opinion regarding Romania's NATO accession and integration process..... | 172 |
| | |
| Chapter 4. | |
| ROMANIA AND THE PRACTICE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN THE PROCESSES OF NATO ACCESSION AND INTEGRATION | 180 |
| | |
| 4.1. Is cultural diplomacy the predecessor of Romania's public diplomacy? Analogies, differences, overlapping of meanings | 180 |
| 4.2. Official channels of public diplomacy in Romania | 183 |
| 4.2.1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs | 183 |
| 4.2.2. NATO Centre of Information and Documentation in Kishinev | 193 |
| 4.2.3. Romanian Intelligence Service – The Centre for Information for the Culture of Security | 194 |
| 4.2.4. Ministry of National Defence and the civil society in promoting NATO integration | 197 |
| 4.3. Non-state actors of Romanian public diplomacy | 200 |
| 4.3.1. Non-governmental organisations | 201 |
| a. NATO House in Romania | 202 |
| b. Romanian Euro-Atlantic Council | 208 |
| c. Association of Atlantic Treaty (ATA) | 210 |
| d. Atlantic Association of the Young Political Leaders | 210 |
| e. EURISC Foundation – European Institute for Risk, Security and Communication Management | 211 |
| 4.3.2 Academic milieu | 212 |
| a. NATO Centre for Studies of the National School for Political and Administrative Sciences in Bucharest | 213 |
| b. Euro-Atlantic Centre | 216 |
| 4.4. Case studies | 217 |
| 4.4.1. The Vilnius Group Summit – <i>The Spring of the New Allies</i> in March 2002 | 218 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.4.2. Bucharest NATO Summit of April 2008 – a Romanian public diplomacy event in promoting NATO’s objectives of security and regional cooperation..... | 219 |
| Conclusions | 227 |
| Bibliography | 232 |
| Annexes | 249 |
| Annex 1 Background and justification of the Law for Romania’s accession to the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation, signed in Washington, on 4 April 1949 | 250 |
| Annex 2 Interview with dr. Oana-Cristina Popa, former ambassador of Romania in Croatia (2005-2009) | 253 |
| Annex 3 The Public Diplomacy Agenda. Events organised by the Romanian Missions and the Romanian Cultural Institutes abroad in January 2005 | 255 |
| Annex 4 The Public Diplomacy Agenda. Events organised by the Romanian Missions and the Romanian Cultural Institutes abroad in February 2007 | 284 |
| Annex 5 Press coverage for the Summit of the Vilnius Group, <i>The Spring of the New Allies</i> , Bucharest 25-26 March 2002 | 329 |
| Annex 6 Declaration of the NATO summit in Bucharest, April 2008 | 334 |
| Annex 7 Declaration of the Romanian Parliament on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of NATO and of 5th anniversary of Romania’s NATO membership..... | 349 |

Key words

Public diplomacy, diplomacy, international public relations, NATO, Romania, integration, accession, non-state actors, diplomat, Bucharest NATO Summit, The Spring of New Allies, NATO Public Diplomacy Division, cultural diplomacy, transatlantic relations, Cold War.

Summary

The end of the Cold War and the predictable structure of the international relations system until then demanded the re-thinking of the transatlantic relations and, implicitly, the redefinition of the concept of security of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation¹. In the meantime, the transformations determined by the disappearance of bipolarity, on the one hand, and the diversification of the means of communication and the emergence of new non-state actors on the international relations stage, on the other, determined the occurrence of the new forms of diplomacy as alternatives to the traditional one. In a bipolar world, based on ideologies, the forces that were confronted were the states. In the new, post-Cold War, circumstances states and governments interact. Equally, individuals and non-governmental organisations interact as well. All promote topic on the foreign politics agenda of their states. The most important and actual form of the new diplomacy is public diplomacy. It is used complementarily to traditional diplomacy, and the current research aims at analysing public diplomacy and its role in the context of Romania's NATO integration.

The reason for choosing this theme has been firstly its topicality, public diplomacy being a relatively new field of study and also of practice, to some extent, in Romania. The emergence of new actors on the international relations stage, the changes traditional diplomacy has been going through, together with the development of information technology, make this topic benefiting of great interest. Following the accession to the North-Atlantic Alliance, Romania has to be able to connect with the public diplomacy professed by the Alliance in order to be compatible with it and to communicate in a coordinated way its messages to the public at large. On the other hand, the accession process

¹The literature in the field of transatlantic relationship contains works related to the relationship between the USA and the European Community/ European Union – with highlights on either bilateral relations between the US and European countries or those existing within international organisations. The respective studies belong mainly to the realist current (Morgenthau, Kissinger, Carr), neorealist one (Kenneth Waltz) and the one of complex interdependence (Robert Keohane și Joseph Nye).

and the integration one into NATO in a moment of transformation of the organisation implied the call for traditional diplomatic channels as well as the involvement of non-state actors in order to promote adamantly these clear objectives of the Romanian foreign policy.

The idea of researching the topic of public diplomacy has been born and later developed following and during my experiences in some institutions and programmes directly connected with public diplomacy practice. It is about my activity within the organisation that manages the Fulbright programme – the most prestigious public diplomacy programme of the United States Department of State – namely the Council for International Exchange of Scholars in Washington, D.C. (USA), where I worked in the summer of 2001; my personal experience as Coordinator of the US Education Information Centre in Timișoara, set-up within the West University of Timisoara with the support of the US Department of State and of the Romanian-American Fulbright Commission; about the practical skills acquired in a UNDP-led programme which aimed to assist the public administration reform in Romania through a scholarships scheme for Romanian elite students that enabled them to study abroad and upon their return home to take office in the Romanian public administration. And last but not least it is about my experience in the European Commission, Directorate-General for Enlargement in the programme named *Information on the EU political and legal order in northern part of Cyprus*. All this has contributed to the development of my personal interest for this topic and for a better understanding of its practical applicability.

Why NATO integration? During the post-December 1989 period, the major political target constantly and consistently followed-up by all Romania's successive governments and which gathered, with very few exceptions, the consensus of all parties and benefited from the overwhelming support of the population, was the target of Romania's NATO integration in the North-Atlantic security structures. This challenge meant more than just a simple objective on the Romanian diplomacy agenda. It represented an adamant option of Romania to rejoin the European and Euro-Atlantic family of democratic values and to change its image in the world. It also meant security, even the option for economic prosperity, as it was perceived at the beginning, and in the moment of accession, it embodied the greatest political success of post-1989 Romania.

The major goals of this research consist in the analysis of the concept of public diplomacy, as well as the definition of its role in modern international relations in the particular context of Romania's integration in NATO. The questions to which I have been searching for answers are: When did this type of diplomacy appear? What does it consist of?

Who are the main actors and which are the ways this is being put into action?; How and who does influence public opinion?; To what extent does public diplomacy diverge from propaganda, on the one hand, and from public international relations, and strategic communication, on the other? I have aimed at analysing how transatlantic relations evolved in the aftermath of the Cold War and dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, especially those between the USA and Europe, as well as their impact on the North-Atlantic Alliance. Starting from such presentation I have focussed my interest on NATO's enlargement process and on the course traversed by Romania up to the accession and the start of integration process. In parallel with the traditional diplomatic demarche, I have analysed how the young public diplomacy set-up in Romania used the opportunities at hand in order to achieve its objectives. Last, but not least, since the value of public diplomacy is given by public perception, I analyzed a few public opinion polls realized during that time, concerning the issue of Romania's NATO accession and integration processes.

Within this research I have relied on theoretical methods such as *analysis*, *synthesis*, *generalisation*, *rationalisation* and the *comparative method*. I used the latter one particularly to define the concept of public diplomacy. The definitions given in the American system were compared with the ones belonging to the British, Norwegian, German and NATO ones. Also, the definition developed by theoreticians is compared with the ones given by practitioners of public diplomacy and institutions dedicated to public diplomacy.

Whenever state and non-state actors of public diplomacy were introduced into discussion, I aimed a *qualitative analysis* of them and of the public diplomacy programmes run by these actors rather than a mere quantitative enumeration of such bodies.

In order to perform a qualitative research I had, firstly, to analyze the content of documents such as discourses, declarations, reports drafted by various institutions and political figures, to decode messages in interviews published in the press of the time, and specialists' works. Secondly, I had to give *interpretation* of the opinion polls conducted by companies at national (Metro Media Transilvania, Institutul de Politici Publice) and international (Gallup, Transatlantic Trends) levels.

As far as the empirical methods are concerned, I have realized an *interview* with dr. Oana-Cristina Popa, former ambassador of Romania in Croatia (2005-2009) and presented some *case studies*. The aim of presenting them was to offer examples of actors or activities of public diplomacy in order to transpose into practice definitions from the first part of the thesis.

The sources I have used – i.e. the diplomatic ones – describe events *in actu* (which are happening in the present), however they are proving the authenticity of the languages. They gain a specific status and ensure “primary interdependence between language acts and actions”². The literature I relied on for drafting this work include *primary sources*, such as documents, treaties, laws, official reports on different organizations, interviews, press statements of the heads of states and governments on the occasions of various summits, or press statements of other top officials, as well as general press releases. I have consulted all this in the press of the time, the electronic public archives of NATO, the US State Department, United States Information Agency, and of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which can be found on the respective institution’s websites.

The *secondary sources* I consulted refer to specialized books, textbooks, dictionaries and studies published in various journals in university libraries in Timișoara, Cluj-Napoca, Bucharest, The Catholic University din Washington, D.C., Birmingham, as well as in the library of the Romanian Diplomatic Institute, the British Library in London, and on-line databases sources (CIAO and SAGE).

The research is structured in four chapters as follows:

The first chapter presents an analysis of the European-American relationship from historical-strategic point of view and the integration of Romania. The chapter is focused on the relationship between the USA and Western Europe that laid down the basis of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization in the aftermath of World War II. The transformation of the Alliance following the end of the Cold War is analyzed further and the preliminary stages of the enlargement process. The case of the relation with Romania is discussed within the paragraph concerning the cooperation with the new democracies in Eastern Europe. The viewpoints expressed by the politicians of the time are presented with the aim of illustrating the political and strategic context after December 1989 and the way of preparation of the accession through the Romanian pro-western oriented policies. A chronology of the steps completed towards integration contributes to an easier understanding of the topic. The integrative demarche of Romania is analysed in the context of NATO’s transformation and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. A separate place is granted to the conceptual delimitation between accession and integration into NATO as quite often the two notions are incorrectly overlapped or even confused.

² Reinhart Koselleck, *Conceptele și istoriile lor. Semantica și pragmatica limbajului social-politic*, translation from the German by Gabriel H. Decuble and Mari Oruz, Grupul Editorial Art, Bucharest, 2009, p. 18.

The literature reviewed concerning transatlantic relations and the definition of NATO's new security concept in the aftermath of the fall of the Iron Curtain and the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 is also abundant. The works referring to NATO enlargement tackle the topic through different angles and especially through the perspective of the reasons for which a country or another aspire to accede to NATO. Explanations that originate in the rationalist school of thinking reveal why states wish to become members of the Alliance, but do not discuss why NATO decided to enlarge³. Transatlantic relations went through many crises during time, but the present research analyses by choice the period of transformation generated by the disappearance of the Iron Curtain only and enlargement of the organisation towards Central and Eastern Europe. In the context of defining the strategic concept of the North-Atlantic Alliance, of the former Yugoslav wars and in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Therefore I have highlighted, among others, works of Erik Jones, Henry Kissinger, Catherine Durandine, Robert Kagan, Ron Asmus, Liviu Țîrău. In this context, referring to the transatlantic crisis, Erik Jones is wondering – by paraphrasing the definition of “crisis” given by the Websters Dictionary – if “the partnership should continue or it should be modified or terminated”, estimating that neither the continuation in the current form, nor its abandoning are realistic solutions⁴. It is sure that the transatlantic relationship has gone through many transformation stages during time. Henry Kissinger⁵ identified four such phases, namely: „disintegration of the Soviet Union; unification of Germany; the ever growing tendency to handle foreign policy as an instrument of domestic policy; and the germination of the European identity”. In fact, as Robert Kagan puts it, NATO was looking to define a new role after the Cold War, that is, to institute peace in South-Eastern part of Europe, eaten by interethnic conflicts⁶.

The second chapter covers public diplomacy at the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st one. The chapter starts with a sequence of definitions given by theoreticians and practitioners alike in the field of public diplomacy. This new form of diplomacy is compared with traditional diplomacy, with propaganda and with public relations in the context of strategic communication.

³ Frank Schimmelfenning, *The EU, NATO and the Integration of Europe: Rules and Rhetoric*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp.37-51.

⁴ Erik Jones, „Debating the Transatlantic Relationship: Rhetoric and Reality” în *International Affairs*, 80, 4, 2004, p.595.

⁵ Henry Kissinger, *Are nevoie America de o politică externă? Către diplomația secolului XXI*. [Does America Need A Foreign Policy? Towards the 20th Century Diplomacy] Incitatus Publishing, Bucharest, 2002, p.24.

⁶ Robert Kagan, *On Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2003.

The literature concerning the definition of public diplomacy is rich in studies and specialized books, especially the American and the British ones. From theoreticians to practitioners, all agree that public diplomacy differs from traditional one through the fact that the former assumes not only interaction among states, but firstly, that between non-state actors and public at large. It is worth to be mentioned here, among others, authors such as Edward Murrow, Christopher Ross, Sir Michael Butler, Mark Leonard, Catherine Stead and Conrad Smewing. Paradoxically, the end of the Cold War is the one that made public diplomacy become important through spreading over democracy, bringing about the explosion of mass-media, and the emergence of nongovernmental organizations.

The works of the American academic, Joseph Nye are references in the field as he introduces the concepts of *soft*, *hard* and *smart* powers into the international relations literature. According to his definition, *soft* power means the ability to achieve one's envisaged purposes based on voluntary participation of the allies rather than on coercion or inducement. *Soft* power rests in the cultures and political ideals within a state⁷. Professor Eytan Gilboa's⁸ works have also been relevant in defining public diplomacy. Following fundamental research in the field, he is advocating that the academic milieu and practitioners have used „confusing, incomplete or problematic” definitions during time whenever they referred to public diplomacy. This definition does not say, however, who controls communication even though it is understood that governments do it, as long as in the '80 only they used public diplomacy. Based on the means at hand of the public diplomacy and on its purposes, Gilboa refines definition, asserting that public diplomacy refers to „state and non-state actors that use media and other channels of communication in order to influence foreign public opinion”. Kristin M. Lord considers that more attention should be given for the provision of detailed information, which should take into consideration public perception abroad and also the culture and history of the respective country, so as the messages should easily be identified and successfully transmitted.”⁹.

⁷ Joseph Nye, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, New York, Basic Books, 1990.

⁸ Eytan Gilboa, „Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy” in *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, March 2008, pp.57-58. Eytan Gilboa is professor and director of the Center for International Communication of the Bar-Ilan University in Israel. He is visiting professor of Public Diplomacy at University of Southern California, USA. His research presents the temptation of theoretization and conceptualization of public diplomacy withing more subjects/ fields among them, international relations, strategic studies, public relations, and communication. It examines the academic methods used for the investigation of public diplomacy, including models, paradigms, studii cases and comparative analysis. His work identifies promising directions and weaknesses in knowing public diplomacy and in the methodologies used for understanding it and proposes a new agenda for research.

⁹ Cf. Kristin M. Lord, *What Academic (Should Have to) Say About Public Diplomacy*, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University; Cf.

The chapter reviews definitions given to public diplomacy by various practitioners – i.e. former diplomats and political figures, but also specialized institutions in the practice of public diplomacy, such as USIA, Department of State, Foreign Office and the Norwegian Foreign Ministry. The reviewed literature ranges from academic works of practitioners to official statements, reports, press statements to be found in the electronic archives of some institutions that promote public diplomacy (i.e. USIA, Department of State, foreign ministries). A leading British figure in this field is Shaun Riordan¹⁰, former diplomat, who after leaving the diplomatic service in 2000, has contributed to the field of public diplomacy through numerous lectures, discourses, courses, conferences, studies and books. In his works¹¹, Riordan champions a new type of diplomacy aimed to “reform” the traditional one through making it more efficient and adapted to the information society and the 21st century means of communication to promote values and ideas. The same sense is conferred by ambassador Simona-Mirela Miculescu, a Romanian practitioner of public diplomacy. As far as the role the new diplomacy is gaining within traditional diplomacy, the author circumscribes it to the transformations that are taking place in international relations and to those on the international political stage¹².

I have reviewed examples of programmes, activities and policies dedicated to public diplomacy. I have highlighted the case of the American public diplomacy since this form of diplomacy was born in the USA, however British, Norwegian and German cases have been also presented comparatively with the former. A case study concerning the NATO Public Diplomacy Division is concluding the second chapter and it is meant to analyse the relationship between the two major components of the thesis, namely the question of public diplomacy and that of Romania’s integration in NATO.

In the third chapter I have analyzed the perception of the public opinion and the political-diplomatic dimension of Romania’s integration into NATO. Based on some documents or studies written by former politicians and negotiators from that time the chapter reviews the international context and actors, Romania’s political and security interests and the diplomatic demarches of accession highlighting the elements of public

<http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&folder=7&paper=2469>.

¹⁰ Shaun Riordan, *Noua diplomație. Relații internaționale moderne* [The New Diplomacy. Modern International Relations], Antet Publishing, Bucharest, 2004.

¹¹ *Ibidem*; See also Idem, „Dialogue-Based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm?”, in *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, nr. 95, November 2004 (Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael).

¹² Simona Mirela Miculescu, „Relația dintre presă și diplomație – război sau pace?” [The relationship between press and diplomacy – peace or war?] cf. <http://www.praward.ro/resurse-pr/articole/relatia-dintre-presa-si-diplomatie-razboi-sau-pace.html>.

diplomacy, particularly after the Madrid Summit. A brief paragraph is aimed at commenting a few opinion polls concerning the NATO question and the Romanian foreign policy, in general.

I have reviewed the literature concerning Romania's integration in the Euro-Atlantic structures by highlighting a few works written by Romanian and international authors, like: Vasile Pușcaș, Teodor Meleșcanu, Ioan Mircea Pașcu, Ana Zilbermann and Stephen Webber, Constantin Vlad, Gen. Mihail E. Ionescu, George Cristian Maior, Mihai Răzvan Ungureanu, Ioan Talpeș etc., some of them being themselves also actors of transformation during the time and, consequently, their works are becoming testimonies of the historical process of integration.

The studies and books elaborated by these authors stress the political will of the Romanian governments that alternated during the post-1989 period, the populations' support in the integrative demarche, and the general international context where NATO was looking to define the new concept of security (Constantin Vlad, Vasile Pușcaș, Teodor Meleșcanu, Zoe Petre). Therefore, for example, Vasile Pușcaș, who was chief-negotiator of Romania for the European Union, considers that Romania's integration in the European Union and NATO represented the main goals of the new political generation after 1989, stressing the complimentary character of the two processes and the similarities of the accession criteria outlined by the two institutions¹³. Nevertheless, he considers that one cannot talk about a formal relationship between the two processes because of the institutional particularities of the two organisations¹⁴. Joseph Harrington and Scott Karns emphasize the diplomatic actions carried on by Romania in order to secure the support of the international community, and especially that of the Allies, in order to be able to achieve her major goal. The two scholars underline the importance, in this context, of concluding the treaties of understanding and good neighbourhood between Romania and Hungary, on the one hand, and Romania and Ukraine, on the other¹⁵. Also, they stress the importance of Romania's relationship with the USA, the re-gaining of the Most-Favoured-Nation status by Romania being a moment of high importance during the accession process¹⁶.

¹³ Vasile Pușcaș, „The Accession Negotiations to the European Union and the Euro-Atlantic Process” in Adrian Năstase (Editor), *Romania-NATO 2002*, Regia Autonomă Monitorul Oficial, Bucharest, 2002, pp. 163-166.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, pp.175-176.

¹⁵ Joseph Harrington and Scott Karns, „Romania's Ouestpolitik: Bucharest, Europe and the Euro-Atlantic Alliance, 1990-1998” in Kurt Treptow și Mihail E. Ionescu (Eds), *Romania and the Euro-Atlantic Integration*, The Center for Romanian Studies, Iași, Oxford, Portland, 1999, pp.36-37.

¹⁶ Vasile Pușcaș, *Sticks and Carrots. Reintegrating the Most-Favorite-Nation Status for Romania (US Congress, 1990-1996)/ Bastoane și morvovi. Reacordarea clauzei națiunii celei mai favorizate pentru*

Te fourth chapter is entitled “Romania and the practice of public diplomacy in the process of NATO accession” and it provides with an analysis of the origins of public diplomacy in Romania, by attempting to place it, initially, in the sphere of cultural diplomacy. Nevertheless the elements that distinguish the two types of diplomacy are highlighted through definitions and examples. Short descriptions of official channels of public diplomacy in Romania and non-state actors are indicated, among them, nongovernmental organisations and academic milieus. The selected examples are referring to those situations only when the respective entity promotes NATO integration by the means of a public diplomacy activity. The last part of this chapter includes two case studies, namely The Summit of the Vilnius Group, known also under the name of *The Spring of the New Allies* from the accession period, in March 2002, and the NATO Summit in Bucharest that took part after the accession, namely in April 2008. Both events had benefited from a large media exposure and had a very good dissemination of information regarding the topics discussed, the second event being the Romanian public diplomacy event of greatest range in the process of Romania’s NATO integration. The above-mentioned study cases include a thorough description of the NATO objectives and of the ideas of cooperation promoted, as well as adjacent activities – before or after the Summit – organized around NATO-related topics which had in view the cooptation of the Romanian population at large.

The information offered by the websites of different official or nongovernmental institutions (particularly those concerning the various programmes run by them, the descriptions of the respective institutions, documents, events, reports, press statements) were very useful in analysing the means by which public diplomacy is being practiced, but also of the more general themes concerning transatlantic relationships and Romania’s pro-western orientation and politics.

Starting from this, the originality of the research rests in the elaboration for the first time in Romania of a study where the role of the Romanian public diplomacy is being discussed in the process of NATO integration. By contrast of the approach of public diplomacy in Romania so far, that is, from the perspective of public relations and communication sciences, my thesis provides with an analyses from the angle of international relations and diplomacy. Thus, I hope I have contributed to the enrichment of the Romanian literature in the field.

A few conclusions. In the current context, characterized by multiple interdependencies and numerous axiological re-conceptualizations, public diplomacy is an immanent dimension of any step of internal and external relationship between organizations and states. The current research is aimed at clarifying the notion of public diplomacy in complementarity with the traditional one and by reviewing the definitions given by theoreticians and practitioners alike. It was exemplified through the most important of the objectives on the foreign relations agenda of post-communist Romania, that is the accession, respectively integration of the country into NATO. The transatlantic relationship was for long one of the most important partnerships in the international system. The USA cannot engage on a global scale without Europe's support. This relationship which lays at the basis of the North-Atlantic Alliance was meant to taking into account the transformations NATO went through after the collapse of the Iron Curtain and the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

Consequently, Romania's evolution after 1989 and the process of NATO accession were described in direct relationship with the process of re-definition of the Alliance on the international stage. I have tried to demonstrate that the actions undertaken in the sense of enhancing cooperation with NATO and aimed to the integration and accession of Romania represented a priority of the diplomatic effort and domestic policy alike. Romania was the first country to sign the Partnership for Peace with the North-Atlantic Alliance. In October 1996, president of Romania addressed a message to the heads of state and government of the allied NATO countries through which he reiterated the fact that Romania had the capacity to assume its obligations that she was supposed to assume as a future member. Though Romania was not invited to join the North-Atlantic Alliance at the NATO Summit of Madrid, she intensified the diplomatic demarches in order to promote its major objective.

Apart from the bilateral contacts with the members of the parliaments of the Allied states and the active participation to the works of the Council of Europe and of the security organizations such as OSCE and the Western European Union, Romania stand on the instruments specific to the new diplomacy, namely the public diplomacy. Therefore, with the aim of identifying mechanisms of public consultation harmonized to the Euro-Atlantic models, strong relationships were initiated with the specialized department within NATO, namely with its Division of Public Diplomacy.

The research has highlighted the fact that after accession, too, as the foreign minister of that time has put it, "the strategic objective of top priority having a direct relevance for the realization of the politics of security of Romania is the finalization of outlining the

definition and the directions for actions for Romania's consistent profile in NATO"¹⁷, and to this end the country "will continue its moves for the development of its influence at the Black Sea, as a part of an integrated vision on the consolidation of security in the region"¹⁸. This is exactly what happened if one would analyze the factor of stability role that Romania has played within the region and at the global scale by actively contributing to the operations in the hot regions of the world, and also supporting the accession of the new members to the Alliance. Representative in this sense is the "Declaration of the Romanian Parliament on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of NATO and of 5th anniversary of Romania's accession to the North-Atlantic Alliance" which, apart from the fact that it marks the successes of the Alliance, it underlines, once again, the legitimacy of the option for the accession to the Euro-Atlantic structure.

Having the pro-NATO option very clearly defined as a foreign policy objective, Romania initiated activities of public diplomacy, promoted through official channels and non-state actors. Within the first category I have reviewed the programmes and actions of public diplomacy conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Romanian Embassy in Chisinau as Contact Point for NATO, Romanian Representation to NATO in Brussels, the Romanian Intelligence Service through the Centre for Information for the Culture of Security, and the Ministry of National Defence. Among the non-state actors I mentioned a few non-governmental organizations and academic programmes directly connected to the NATO topic. The research work is focussed on the qualitative analysis, by highlighting, through a few examples and study cases, the features of public diplomacy with direct applicability to NATO, rather than merely inventorying the NGOs and academic programmes which tackled the Euro-Atlantic question during the pre-accession and integration periods.

The study values mainly the programmes that related themselves with NATO's Division of Public Diplomacy, emphasizing the impact they had among the public and whether they were sustainable in time. The questions to which I have tried to answer were: To what extent were Romania's foreign policy objectives after 1990 well defined and clear for the domestic and international publics? What is the explanation of the fact that Romania

¹⁷ Mihai Răzvan Ungureanu, „Prioritățile politicii externe: contribuția politicii externe la promovarea intereselor naționale și la politica de securitate a României” [Priorities of the foreign policy in promoting Romania's national interest and security policy] in *Întotdeauna loial. Note diplomatice pentru o Românie modernă (2005-2007)* [Loyal Forever. Diplomatic Notes for a Modern Romania (2005-2007)], Polirom Publishing, Iași, 2008, p. 268

Ibidem

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

knew how to follow-up its major objective of integration into the Euro-Atlantic security structures? Were there any programmes and initiatives of public diplomacy during the pre-accession period and if yes, which were the messages that were conveyed coherently and sustainable? How accurate were the messages and how efficiently were the proper platforms of information used in order to disseminate the information?

With reference to the professional profile of the Romanian diplomat, Simona-Mirela Miculescu thinks that “the new diplomat has to communicate with all levels of society, in an interactive way and under the constant pressure of time”¹⁹. Governments have to ensure that the public diplomacy that is being conducted in a certain country follows the proper manner for that country. Particularly, Romania had to conceive a differentiated strategy of public diplomacy according to the Allied or Partner NATO country where she promoted her interests and integration objective into the Alliance.

As I mentioned, the means by which public diplomacy promotes foreign policy objectives are : communication campaigns and the relations with the media multipliers; building long-term relationships through study scholarships offered to citizens of other states; academic, cultural, scientific and professional exchanges; using the NGOs, think-tanks, and academic multipliers’ networks for promoting the messages ; cooperation with other states in joint development programmes ; cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the academic milieu, think-tanks, NGOs, private sector ; and summits. As it results from the research, governments and diplomats are loosing gradually their monopoly over international relations. By significantly reducing costs and the speed of communication, the new information technologies have facilitated to other actors, too, to participate to debates about and implementation of international policies including here especially the nongovernmental organisations and academic milieu. These proved to be often more informed and specialized in particular fields of international relations and foreign policy than the officials of the respective governments.

Public diplomacy is already established in the world, while NATO’s public diplomacy has gained increasing importance by being allocated a post of Deputy Assistant Secretary-General in its scheme. As for Romania’s public diplomacy it has been shaped institutionally within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is why cooperation with the non-state actors from the whole country should be developed so as NATO’s objectives and

¹⁹ Idem, „Pentru o diplomație publică asertivă în promovarea imaginii României pe plan european” [For an assertive public diplomacy in promoting Romania’s image in Europe] paper presented at the *Olimpiadele comunicării* [Communication Olympics], Bucharest, 5 April 2005.

policies would be able to go deeper within the Romanian society. If Romanian public opinion was in favour of accession by large majority, this happened also due to emotional grounds and it was not only the merit of the mass media or of the public diplomacy activities of the respective institutions. During the integration period, a good knowledge of NATO's role in the world, of its missions in the operations theatres would have been useful in order to have a well informed public.

In Romania, both the academic milieu, as well as the nongovernmental organisations, promoted the North-Atlantic Alliance values, thus contributing to the increase of the awareness within the public at large. Nevertheless, the NGOs that benefited from the direct support of the government and of the Division of Public Diplomacy during the pre-accession period have significantly reduced their activities and visibility at national level in the aftermath of the accession, or were even closed down. Or, „the Euro-Atlantic conceptual offensive that Romania is aimed at promoting in the Black Sea region would need a large political backstopping and civil society support”²⁰.

I observed that the large majority of the practitioners of public diplomacy in Romania is composed by the representatives of nongovernmental agencies, of the NGOs, of the academic milieu, and of the business community. In parallel, the embassies and the diplomats have kept on playing an important role. According to the outcomes of this research, official/ traditional diplomacy will have to recognize and to resort on changes in its structure and its way of performing in order to align itself to the challenges of the 21st century. Romanian diplomats will have to be more cooperative and more interested when involving political elite, specialists in the academic milieu, representatives of the NGOs, key-journalists and political commentators. In order to succeed, it is desirable that they will be more open, more flexible and able to participate actively to genuine dialogues debates.

In the context of the civil society involvement, the main role will be that of ‘entrepreneurs of public diplomacy’, who identify opportunities for dialogue with the relevant nongovernmental agencies and, whenever the case may be, facilitating the very first steps necessary for cooperation. My conclusion is that orientation changes would be possible if carrier diplomats would come from different professional milieus in their country of origin. In such a case, the rapprochement to the academic milieu, active presence in the intellectual-civic life would add efficiency of the public relations.

²⁰ Mihai Răzvan Ungureanu, *op.cit.*, p.269.

There is no standard model of public diplomacy, but from the reviewed literature and the results of the current study it comes out that such an activity is the more as useful as its representatives have detailed knowledge about other countries, other languages and other cultures and about the history of other nations, being in the meantime able to convey successful messages from their own country. By building, through science and correct information, bridges between the population of a country, and also credible, harmonious social relationships and trans-national ideals, public diplomacy becomes an unmistakable benchmark. It generates the orientations of the 21st century, quite often based on research in humanities and social-political sciences.

My entire work has been possible due to the considerate and competent guidance of Professor Vasile Pușcaș, Ph.D. of the Institute of International Studies at the “Babes-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca. For all this and his constant patience and understanding cast during the research and drafting phases of this thesis I address him my distinctive acknowledgement and gratefulness. Also, I wish to express my thanks to the members of the academic and research staff of the Institute of International Studies within the Faculty of History and Philosophy at the “Babeș-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca since through their comments, reviews, recommendations and debates that we had during the intermediate paper readings they opened me new perspectives concerning my approach to the topic thus contributing to the enrichment of my thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

Documents, Treaties, Legislation, Official Reports

*** *North-Atlantic Treaty*, Washington D.C., 1949.

*** Framework document „Partnership for Peace”
www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940110b.htm

*** *Carta Albă a Guvernului. Armata României 2010: reformă și integrare euro-atlantică*, Editura Militară, București, 2000.

*** Foreign and Commonwealth Office, *Public Diplomacy Strategy*, www.fco.gov.uk

*** Smith-Mundt Act: Public Law 80-402 *Informational and Educational Exchange Act of 1948* ; <http://www.usaid.gov/policy/ads/plaws.html>.

*** The Law no. 104-171, passed on 3 August 1996 by the 10th Congress (Public Law 104-171) concerning grant of the status of the Most-Favoured-Nation to Romania.
<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-104publ171/pdf/PLAW-104publ171.pdf>.

*** *Programul de guvernare – politica externă. Prioritățile politicii externe a României* [Programme of government – foreign policy. Priorities of Romania’s foreign policy] (www.mae.ro).

*** Memorandum of understanding between Casa NATO Association - the Euro-Atlantic Council and the National University of Defense „Carol I” concluded on 4 November 2005.

*** Agenda 2000 of the European Union
<http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/overview/en/agenda.htm>

„The New Diplomacy: Utilizing Innovative Communication Concepts that Recognize Resource Constraints”, raport al Comisiei Consultative a SUA pe Probleme de Diplomatie Publică (US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy), iulie 2003; www.state.gov/documents/organization/22956.pdf.

Changing Minds Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab & Muslim World, Raport al Grupului SUA de Consiliere pe Diplomatie Publică în Lumea Arabă și Musulmană (US Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World), Washington, D.C., octombrie, 2003, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organisation/24882.pdf>

U.S. Public Diplomacy: State Department Expands Efforts but Faces Significant Challenges, Report of the United States General Accounting Office to the Committee of

International Relations, Chamber of Deputies, US Congress, Washington, D.C., September, 2003, www.gao.gov/new.items/d03951.pdf

The report *A Smarter, More Secure America*, Commission on Smart Power, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., 2007.

New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy. Navigating the Changing Balance of Power. The Royal Society – Common Report al Royal Society and AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science), The Royal Society, London, January 2010, <http://diplomacy.aaas.org/news/news.shtml>.

Report of Defence Scientific Board Task Force on Strategic Communication, septembrie 2004; <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/37.htm>

„Strategic Communication” - *Report of the Defence Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication*, Washington, 4 January 2008; apud. USC Center on Public Diplomacy at the Annenberg School, University of Southern California: <http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/resources/>

Department of Army USA și Department of Navy United States Marine Corps, *Doctrine for Joint Psychological Operations*, Joint Publication 3-53, 5 September 2003 <http://www.iwar.org.uk/psyops/resources/doctrine/psyop-jp-3-53.pdf>

ROMAN, Petre „Le principe democratique et le tissu de l’OTAN: les nouvelles démocraties européennes et l’enlargissement de l’OTAN”, Special report of the subcommission for NATO enlargement in the new democracies, Political Committee of the North Atlantic, Brussels, November 1996, <http://www.nato.int>

Interviews, Declarations, Press Statements

Public Diplomacy - the German View, speech by Dr. Albert Spiegel, Head of the General Directorate for Cultural Relations and Educational Policies within the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany at the Conference of the British Council staff, London, 18-19 March, 2002, http://publicdiplomacy.wikia.com/wiki/Public_diplomacy.

„Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance” – Declarația asupra unei Alianțe Nord-Atlantice a șefilor de state și guverne care au participat la întâlnirea Consiliului Nord-Atlantic („London Declaration”) 5-6 June 1990, cf. Arhiva NATO, official texts, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-D0DBCECB-70351935/natolive/official_texts_23693.htm?

„Declarația șefilor de state și de guvern participante la Reuniunea Consiliului Nord-Atlantic de la Praga”, 21 November 2002; <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-127e.htm>

„An Alliance for the 21st Century”, Comunicatul Summitului de la Washington al Șefilor de State și Guverne participante la întâlnirea Consiliului Nord Atlantic de la Washington, D.C, 24 aprilie 1999, Comunicatul de presă NATO nr. NAC-S(99) 064/ 24.04.1999. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27440.htm?mode=pressrelease

“Declarația șefilor de state și guverne participanți la ședința Consiliului Nord-Atlantic, București”, 3 April 2008, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/p08-09e.html>

ILIESCU, Ion și CONSTANTINESCU, Emil, „România – SUA, de la căderea comunismului la NATO”, interview in *Adevărul internațional*, newspaper 2 November 2008.

GAVEL, Doug, „Joseph Nye on Smart Power”, interview realized on 12 iunie 2008, sursa: <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/news-events/publications/insight/international/joseph-nye>

Allocution of the President of Romania, Mr. Ion Iliescu, at the National Consultative Council for Euro-Atlantic Integration, Bucharest, 28 December 1994. <http://www.presidency.ro>

Speech “On Public Diplomacy” by State Secretary Stat Thorhil Widvey in front of the Norwegian-American Chamber of Commerce, Ottawa, 7 November 2003; Cf. http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumentarkiv/Regjeringen-Bondevik-II/ud/Taler-og-artikler-arkivert-individuelt/2003/public_diplomacy.html?id=267536

Press statement of the Norwegian foreign minister, Jonas Gahr Støre, on the occasion of the launching of the Norwegian Forum of Public Diplomacy, 22 Mai 2007. Cf. <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/press/news/2007/Norwegian-Public-Diplomacy-Forum-lanche.html?id=467754>

BABST, Stefanie Dr., *Explaining NATO's Public Diplomacy*, videointerviu, 18 septembrie 2006. Cf. <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2006/s060918a.htm>

GEOANĂ, Mircea, *The Spring of New Allies: Challenges, Contributions and Responsibilities of Europe's New Democracies*, allocution of Mr Geoana in his capacity of Minister of Foreign Affairs delivered at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 4 April 2002.

POPA, Oana-Cristina (former Romanian ambassador to Croatia 2005-2009) - Interview realized by Simona Neumann on 31 January 2011.

TALPEȘ, Ioan – Interview realized by Horia Alexandrescu in *Revista Independent* no. 113, March 2008.

UNGUREANU, Mihai Răzvan, „Pentru o diplomatie publică asertivă în promovarea imaginii României pe plan european” alocuțiune rostită la *Olimpiadele comunicării*, București, 5 aprilie 2005, <http://www.olimpiadelecomunicarii.ro/arhiva-aparitii-in-presa/2005/pagina-4.html>

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Books, Textbooks, Dictionaries

ASMUS, Ronald D., *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself fo a New Era*, Prefață de Lord Robertson , Secretar-General al NATO, Columbia University Press, New-York, 2002.

- BABIUC, Victor, *O singură direcție: Apusul*, Prefață de Vladimir Pasti, The Center for Romanian Studies, Iași, 2000.
- BARSTON, R. P., *Modern Diplomacy*, Ediția a II-a, Longman, London, New York, 1997.
- BENNET, W. Lance și ENTMAN, Robert (Editori), *Mediated Politics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- BERRIDGE, G.R., *Theory and Practice*, Ediția a II-a, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, Hampshire, 2002.
- BRIDGE, G.R. și JAMES, Alan, *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*, Palgrave, Palgrave, Londra, 2001.
- BRONSTONE, Adam, *European Union – Unites States Security Relations. Transatlantic Tensions and the Theory of International Relations*, Macmillan Press Ltd., New York , Londra, 1997.
- CARR, E.H., *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939*, London, 1939.
- CROFT, Stuart; VERBECA, Vaceslav; BIRD, Tim; DUNGACIU, Sandra; MELEȘCANU, Teodor; MOGA, Dan; NAUMESCU, Valentin; NEUMANN, Simona; POEDE, George; RADLER, Dana, *Studii de securitate*, Ediția I, Editura Cavallioti, București, 2005.
- DIYARD, Wilson Jr., *Digital Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Information Age*, Prager, New York, 2001.
- DURANDIN, Catherine, *Statele Unite, mare putere europeană*, Traducere din franceză în română de Gabriela Șiclovan, Editura Cartier, Chișinău, 2007.
- EBAN, Abba, *The Modern Diplomacy: International Affairs in the Modern Age*, Random House, New York, 1983.
- EYAL, Jonathan, *Vicious Circle: Security in the Balkans*, Royal Services Institute for Defence Studies - RUSI, Londra, 1992.
- GEOANĂ, Mircea, *Politica externă a României la începutul secolului XXI. Drumul spre Europa și lumea transatlantică*, Univers Enciclopedic, București, 2005.
- GODSON, Joseph (Editor), *Challenges to the Western Alliance. An International Symposium on the Changing Political, Economic and Military Setting*, Times Books Limited, London, 1984.
- HAM, Peter van, KUGLER, Richard L. (Editori), *Western Unity and Transatlantic Security Change*, The Marshall Center Papers, George Marshall European Center for Security Studies, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 2002.
- HANSEN, Allen, *USIA Public Diplomacy in the Computer Age*, Ediția a II-a, Praeger, New York, 1989.

HUTCHINS, Robert L., *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War: An Insider's Account of U.S. Policy in Europe, 1989-1992*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1997.

KAGAN, Robert, *On Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2003.

KENNAN, George F., *American Diplomacy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.

KISSINGER, Henry, *Are nevoie America de o politică externă? Către diplomația secolului XXI*, Editura Incitatus, București, 2002.

KISSINGER, Henry, *Diplomația*, All, București, 2007.

KOLODZIEJ, Edward A., *Securitatea și relațiile internaționale*, Traducere de Ramona-Elena Lupu, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2007.

KOSELLECK Reinhart, *Conceptele și istoriile lor. Semantica și pragmatica limbajului social-politic*, traducerea din limba germană de Gabriel H. Decuble și Mari Oruz, Grupul Editorial Art, București, 2009.

LEGUEY-FEILLEUX, Jean-Robert, *The Dynamics of Diplomacy*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, Colorado, 2009.

LEONARD, Mark și ALAKESSON, *Going Public: Diplomacy in the Information Society*, Foreign Policy Centre, Londra, 2000.

LEONARD, Mark, STEAD, Catherine și SMEWING, Conrad, *Public Diplomacy*, The Foreign Policy Centre, Londra, 2002.

LIPPMANN, Walter, *The Public Philosophy*, Little Brown, Boston, 1955.

LORD, Kristin, *What Academic (Should Have to) Say About Public Diplomacy*, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University;
<http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&folder=7&paper=2469>.

LUIF, Paul (Editor), *Security in Central and Eastern Europe. Problems, Perceptions, Policies*, Austrian Institute for International Affairs, The Laxenburg Papers, Viena, 2001.

MAGHROORI, Ray, „Major Debates in International Relations” în Ray Maghroori and Bennett Ramberg (Editori), *Globalism and Realism*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1982.

MAIOR, George Cristian, *Incertitudine. Gândire strategică și relații internaționale în secolul XXI*, Editura Rao, București, 2009.

MALIȚA, Mircea, *Diplomația. Școli și instituții*, Ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1975.

MANHEIM, Jarol B., *Strategic Public Diplomacy and American Foreign Policy: The Evolution of Influence*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1994.

MELANDRI, Pierre, *Une incertaine Alliance. Les Etats-Unis et l'Europe 1973-1983*, Sorbonne, Paris, 1988.

MELEȘCANU, Teodor, *Renașterea diplomației românești 1994-1996*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 2002.

MICKELSON, Sig, *America's Other Voice: The Story of Radion Free Europe and Radio Free Liberty*, Praeger, New York, 1983.

MICULESCU, Simona Mirela, *Relații publice internaționale în contextul globalizării*, Editura Comunicare.ro, București, 2001.

MORGENTHAU, Hans J., *Politica între națiuni: lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Polirom, Iași, 2007.

MORGENTHAU, Hans, *Politics Among Nations*, Knopf, New York, 1978.

NĂSTASE, Adrian Năstase (Editor), *Romania-NATO 2002*, Regia Autonomă Monitorul Oficial, București, 2002.

NYE, Joseph, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, New York, Basic Books, 1990

NYE, Joseph, *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs - a member of the Perseus Books Group, New York, 2004.

PUȘCAȘ, Vasile (Editor), *International Studies at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, Editura „România de Măine”, București, 2002.

PUȘCAȘ, Vasile, *Sticks and Carrots. Reintegrating the Most-Favorite-Nation Status for Romania (US Congress, 1990-1996)/ Bastoane și morvovi. Reacordarea clauzei națiunii celei mai favorizate pentru România (Congresul SUA 1990-1996)*, Ediție bilingvă română-engleză, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2006.

PUȘCAȘ, Vasile, *România și iar România. Note pentru o istorie a prezentului*, Editura Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.

RANA, Kishan S., *Inside Diplomacy*, Ediția a II-a, revizuită, Manas Publications, New Delhi, 2002.

RANA, Kishan S., *Bilateral Diplomacy*, Diplo Handbooks, Geneva și Malta, 2002 (Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta).

RIORDAN, Shaun, *Noua diplomație. Relații internaționale moderne*, Editura Antet, București, 2004.

SCHIMMELFENNING, Frank, *The EU, NATO and the Integration of Europe: Rules and Rhetoric*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

SECHE, Mircea și Luiza, *Dicționar de sinonime*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2002.

TREPTOW, Kurt Treptow și IONESCU, Mihail E. (Editori), *Romania and the Euro-Atlantic Integration*, The Center for Romanian Studies, Iași, Oxford, Portland, 1999.

TREVERTON, Gregory F. (Editor), *Europe and America beyond 2000*, Council on Foreign Relations Press, New York, Londra, 2001.

ȚÎRĂU, Liviu, *Între Washington și Moscova: Politicile de securitate națională ale SUA și URSS și impactul lor asupra României (1945-1965)*, Editura Tribuna, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

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

VLACHOVA, Marie Vlachova (Ed.) *The Public Image of Defence and the Military in Central and Eastern Europe*, The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces and the Centre for Civil-Military Relations, Belgrade, 2003, http://www.dcaf.ch/milsoc/ev_prague_02_vlachova_webber.pdf.

WATSON, Adam, *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between State*, Methuen, London, 1984.

*** *Dictionary of International Relations Terms*, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C., 1987.

*** *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române*, Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan”, ediția a II-a, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1998.

*** *Noul dicționar explicativ al limbii române*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2002

*** *AAP6, Glosar NATO de termeni și definiții (engleză, franceză și română)*, Ministerul Apărării Naționale, București, 2007.

*** Department of Army USA și Department of Navy United States Marine Corps, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Joint Publication 1-02, 12 aprilie 2001, amendat până la 13 iunie 2007; <http://wstiac.alionscience.com/pdf/dodmilitarydictionary.pdf>

*** *NATO Logistics Handbook*, octombrie 1997, cap. 17 „Standardizare și interoperabilitate”, ediție online: <http://www.nato.int/docu/logi-en/1997/lo-1709.htm>

* * * *Manualul NATO-OTAN*, Biroul NATO de Informare și Presă, Bruxelles, 2001.

*** *Romania on Its Way to NATO*, Ministerul Informațiilor Publice, București, 2002.

*** *Parteneriatul pentru pace 1994-2004*, broșură realizată și editată de Casa NATO, București, 2004.

*** „Servicul Român de Informații – Centrul de Informare pentru Cultura de Securitate” – broșură de popularizare a Centrului creată cu ocazia înființării acestuia.

*** *Buletin Informativ – Ministerul Apărării Naționale pentru Buletinul de comunicare interministerială*, București, 1 iunie 2001,
http://www.gov.ro/buletin-informativ_11a5796.html.

*** *NATO Studies Center Newsletter* no.01/2003. Sursa: http://www.centru-studii-nato.ro/pdf/nws01_03.pdf

Studies in specialized journals

ASMUS, Ronald D., „Europe’s Eastern Promise: Rethintink NATO and EU Enlargement” in *Foreign Affairs*, January-February 2008.

ASMUS, Ronald D., „Transatlantic Blueprint: The Democratic Case for a Progressive Alliance” în *Progressive Politics*, vol. 3.2, iunie, 2004.

BRZEZINSKI, Zbigniev, GEOANĂ, Mircea..., *NATO: o nouă viziune*, Casa NATO, București, 2003.

BUGA, Vasile, CHIFU, Iulian, *România-Rusia: intrarea în normalitate*, Casa NATO, București, 2003.

BUZAN, Barry, „Security, the State, the New World Order, and Beyond”, www.ciaonet.org.proxycu.wrlc.org/book/lipshutz17.html.

CELAC, Sergiu, TABARAN, Dragoș, *Irakul post-conflict: recucerirea păcii și politica Golfului*, Casa NATO, București, 2004.

COWAN, Geoffrey și CULL, Nicholas J., „Public Diplomacy in a Changing World” în *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, nr. 616; 6, Pennsylvania, 2008.

CULL, Nicholas J., *Public Diplomacy before Guillon: The Evolution of a Phrase*, US Center of Public Diplomacy; <http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/pdfs/gullion.pdf>.

DAVENPORT, David, „The New Diplomacy” în *Policy Review*, nr. 116, December 2002, online edition: www.policyreview.org/dec02/davenport_print.html

FREEDMAN, L., „The Atlantic Crisis” în *International Affairs*, vol.58, nr.3, 1982.

GHEORGHE, Ioana, „Centrul de Informare pentru Cultura de Securitate” în *Profil*, publication of the Romanian Information Services, year 2, no.5, June 2004.

GILBOA, Eytan Gilboa „Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy” în *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, March 2008.

GILBOA, Eytan, „Media Diplomacy: Conceptual Divergence and Applications” în *Harvard International Journal of Press/ Politics*, nr.3 (3), Cambridge, 1998.

GORDON, Philip H., „NATO after 11 September” în *Survival*, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, vol. 43, nr. 4, 2001-2002.

GRAFFY, Colleen, „Public Diplomacy: A Practitioner’s Perspective” în *American Behavioral Scientist* nr. 52, Published by SAGE Publications, 2009.

GRANT, Charles, SHEA, Jamie, *Evoluția recentă a relațiilor NATO-Uniunea Europeană*, Casa NATO, București, 2004.

GREGORY, Bruce, „Public Diplomacy: Sunrise of an Academic Field” in *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, nr. 616, Pennsylvania, March 2008.

HOCKING, L., „Diplomacy: New Agendas and Changing Strategies” în *iMP Magazine*; apud: www.csip.org.

IRIMIEA, Locotenent-colonel Mihai, „Impactul acțiunii NATO în Iugoslavia asupra economiei românești” în *Securitate națională, politică de apărare și istorie militară în România la sfârșit de mileniu*, București, 2000.

IONESCU, Mihail E., *Romania’s Westernisation and NATO Membership – A Historical Approach*, Occasional Papers, Casa NATO, București, no. 3, 2002.

JONES, Erik, „Debating the Transatlantic Relationship: Rhetoric and Reality” în *International Affairs*, 80, 4, 2004.

LATTER, Richard, *NATO’s Future*, raport redactat în urma Conferinței Wilton Park cu tema „NATO’s Role in the Twenty-First Century” în *Wilton Park Reports*, nr. 491, 10-14 February 1997.

LEONARD, Mark; SMALL, Andrew; ROSE, Martin, *British Public Diplomacy in the Age of Schisms*, The Foreign Policy Centre, Londra, February 2005; <http://fpc.org.uk/fsblob/407.pdf>.

LORD, Kristin M., „What Academic (Should Have to) Say About Public Diplomacy”, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University; online version: <http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&folder=7&paper=2469>.

MALONE, Gifford, „Managing Public Diplomacy” în *Washington Quarterly* vol. 8 (3), Washington, D.C., 1985.

MARIN, Ionel, „Nu există realitate fără comunicare” în *Profil*, year 2, no.5, June 2004.

MELEȘCANU, Teodor, „Security in Central Europe: A Positive-Sum Game” în *NATO Review* / online edition no. 5 October 2003.

NELSON, Daniel N. și SZAYNA, Thomas, *The Politics of NATO Enlargement in Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovenia*, Conference proceedings „NATO Enlargement: The National Debates over Ratification”, 7 October 1997, <http://www.nato.int/acad/conf/elarg97/nelson.htm>.

NICOLSON, Harold, „Diplomacy Then and Now” în *Diplomacy*, ed. a 3-a, Oxford University Press, London, 1963.

NYE, Joseph S., „Noua diplomație publică” în *Dilema Veche* nr. 315, 25 February – 3 March 2010, translated into Romanian by Matei Pleșu.

PAPIC, Marco, „Nato’s Lack of Strategic Concept” în *STRATFOR* online edition: www.stratfor.com.

PAUL, James A. „NGOs and Global Policy Making”, communication on the occasion of the *Global Policy Forum*, New York, June 1996;
http://www.impactalliance.org/file_download.php?location=S_U&filename=10361022750
NGOs and Global Policy-Making - Global Policy Forum - NGOs.htm.

PETERSON, Peter G., „Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism” în *Foreign Affairs*, septembrie-octombrie, 2002; <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/58247/peter-g-peterson/public-diplomacy-and-the-war-on-terrorism>.

PRICOPIE, Remus, GUȚU, Dorina, MOROIU, Mihai (Eds), *Fulbright Ripple Effect on International Education: Looking Ahead from a Romanian and American Perspective*, Editura Comunicare.ro, Bucharest, 2010.

RIORDAN, Shaun, „Dialogue-Based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm?”, în *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, nr. 95, November 2004 (Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael).

ROBERTSON, Lord George, „Investing in Security” în *NATO Review*, Bruxelles, Fall 2002.

ROSS, Christopher, „Pillars of Public Diplomacy: Grappling with International Public Opinion (Perspectives)” în *Harvard International Review*, Cambridge, 22 June 2003; <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-105643330.html>

ROTH, Lois W., „Public Diplomacy: 1952-1977” in *The Fletcher Forum*, nr.8 (Summer), 1984.

SOROKA, Stuart N., „Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy” în *Harvard International Journal of Press/ Politics*, vol. 8 (1), Cambridge, 2003.

STAN, Valentin, “NATO și UE: dilemele extinderii” in *Politica externă*, nr. 3-4, Fall 1997.

WRIGHT, Quincy, „Problems of Stability and Progress” în *International Relations*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1954.

Press articles, Newspapers

MOWLE, Thomas S., recenzie a cărții lui Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO’s Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era*, în *Washington Post*, 14 March 2006, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/10160/washpost.html>

MANEA, Octavian, „NATO – un hotel de lux geopolitic cu servicii de 2 stele” in *Revista 22*, 1 June 2010, online edition: <http://www.revista22.ro/nato-un-hotel-de-lux-geopolitic-cu-servicii-de-2-stele-8317.html>

MICULESCU, Simona Mirela, „Relația dintre presă și diplomație – război sau pace?”, <http://www.praward.ro/resurse-pr/articole/relatia-dintre-presa-si-diplomatie-razboi-sau-pace.html>

Curierul Național, 1 August 1997.

„Ioan Talpeș va scrie o carte despre aderarea României la NATO”, Agerpres, 15 March 2008; <http://www.ziare.com/ioan-talpes/tg-mures/ioan-talpes-va-scrie-o-carte-despre-aderarea-romaniei-la-nato-414460>

Statistics

*** *Transatlantic Trends 2008*, www.transatlantictrends.org

*** Report elaborated by the Institute of Public Policies with the title: *Percepția opiniei publice din România asupra politicii externe și a relațiilor internaționale*, Bucharest, October 2005.

*** *Impact strategic*, no. 4-5, Centrul de Studii Strategice de Securitate, București, 2002,

II. ELECTRONIC SOURCES

Official websites

<http://www.nato.int>

<http://www.mae.ro>

<http://www.presidency.ro>

<http://www.state.gov>

www.sri.ro.

www.mapn.ro.

<http://www.unap.ro>

www.fco.gov.uk

<http://ec.europa.eu>

<http://www.archives.gov>

<http://www.casanato.org>

www.policyreview.org

www.foreignaffairs.com

<http://wwi.lib.byu.edu>

www.stratfor.com

<http://usepublicdiplomacy.org/pdfs/gullion.pdf>

<http://www.hks.harvard.edu/>

<http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/>

<http://www.diplomacy.edu>
www.iit.org
<http://www.atlantic-community.org/>
<http://diplomacy.aaas.org/>
<http://www.usaid.gov/>
<http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/>
<http://www.brook.edu/>
<http://www.countercurrents.org/>
<http://www.newallies.ro>
<http://www.bucharestconference.org/>
<http://www.summitbucharest.ro/>
<http://www.gmfus.org/blacksea>
www.BlackSeaNGO.org
<http://www.gcmarshall.ro>
<http://www.acus.org>
<http://www.ata-sec.org>
<http://www.aaypl.org>
www.eurisc.org
<http://www.centru-studii-nato.ro>
http://www.unibuc.ro/ro/cc_csea_ro
<http://www.isi-cluj.ro/prezentare.aspx>
<http://www.un.org/unfip>