

Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie, Anul XXVII, Nr. 1(41)/2022

ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA

ANALELE
UNIVERSITĂȚII
DIN CRAIOVA

ISTORIE / HISTORY

Bi-Annually Journal

Year XXVII, No. 1(41)/2022

April



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor in chief: Professor Sorin Liviu DAMEAN (University of Craiova, History Department)

Deputy editor in chief: Marilena RIZESCU (Universitaria Publishing House, Craiova)

REGULAR MEMBERS

Ioan BOLOVAN (Romanian Academy)

Cătălin TURLIUC („A. D. Xenopol” History Institute, Iași, Romania)

Sorin RADU („Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, Romania)

Constantin ARDELEANU („Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați, Romania)

Giordano ALTAROZZI („George Emil Palade” University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology of Târgu Mureș, Romania)

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Francesco Guida – University of Roma Tre (Italy)

Bruce A. Little – University of Wake Forest, North Carolina (USA)

Porfirio Sanz Camanes, University of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain)

Iakovos Michailidis – „Aristotle” University, Thessaloniki (Greece)

Luc de Vos – Royal Military Academy, Brussels (Belgium)

Apostolos Patelakis – Institute of Balkan Studies Thessaloniki (Greece)

Jan Bureš – Metropolitan University, Prague (Czech Republic)

Petr Just – Metropolitan University, Prague (Czech Republic)

Octavian Țicu – Institute of History, Chișinău (Republic of Moldavia)

CONTACT

Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie/Annals of the University of Craiova. History

University of Craiova, No. 13, A.I. Cuza Street, Craiova, 200585, Dolj, Romania

Phone / Fax: +40351403140

Email: history.annals@yahoo.com

analeleucv.istorie@gmail.com

Website: <http://www.istoriecraiova.ro>

© 2022 – All rights reserved to Universitaria Publishing House

The Journal is published bi-annually

There is no charge for publishing articles.

Nu se percepe taxa pentru publicare articolelor.

This issue is archived in the legal depository of the National Library of Romania and University of Craiova.

Prezentul număr este arhivat în depozitul legal al Bibliotecii Naționale a României și al Universității din Craiova.

ISSN – L: 1224 – 5704

ISSN Online: 2393 – 3682

Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie, Anul XXVII, Nr. 1(41)/2022

ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA

ANALELE
UNIVERSITĂȚII
DIN CRAIOVA

ISTORIE / HISTORY

Bi-Annually Journal

Year XXVII, No. 1(41)/2022

April

© 2022 – All rights reserved to Universitaria Publishing House.

The authors assume all responsibility for the ideas expressed in the materials published.

Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie (Annals of the University of Craiova. History) is indexed in:



<http://journals.indexcopernicus.com/karta.php?action=masterlist&cid=4285>



<http://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=21100285469&tip=sid&clean=0>



<https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/erihplus/search?enkeltSok=1224-5704&sok.discipline=-1&treffliste.tidsskriftTreffside=1&treffliste.vis=true>



<http://www.scopus.com/source/eval.url>



<https://www.ebscohost.com/titleLists/30h-coverage.htm>

CONTENTS

Verónica Fernández Espinosa, HISTORY OF EDUCATION REFORMS IN SPAIN	7
Oleh V. Razyhrayev, Svitlana V. Havryliuk, Galyna O. Maleonchuk, POLISH PRISONS IN 1918-1939: NUMBER, ORGANIZATION, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND SANITARY CONDITIONS (A CASE STUDY OF THE MATERIALS FROM UKRAINIAN, POLISH, LITHUANIAN, AND BELARUSIAN ARCHIVES)	25
Piotr Goldyn, A VISIT OF NICOLAE IORGA TO KRAKOW IN 1924	37
Stoica Lascu, THE ROMANIAN DIPLOMAT OF EUROPEAN STATURE NICOLAE TITULESCU IN THE VISION OF SOME CONTEMPORARIES	49
Alin Gabriel Ionescu, Mihaela Ionescu, Adina Dorina Glodeanu, Teodor Nicusor Sas, Cristin Constantin Vere, A SHORT HISTORY OF PANDEMICS	79
Daniel de la Rosa, Silvia Carrascal Domínguez, THE HISTORY AND CREATION OF THE AGENDA 2030: DESIGNING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS	95
Stoica Lascu, DAN BERINDEI (NOVEMBER 3, 1923-DECEMBER 23, 2021) – THE OLD DEAN OF TODAY’S ROMANIAN HISTORIANS, NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF SOCIETY AND THE COUNTRY, OF THE AUTHENTIC HISTORICAL VALUES THAT HE HAS SERVED ALL LIFE	113
Bogdan Emanuel Răduț, Sorin Liviu Damean (coordinator), Elites and mechanisms of power in the Romanian space (15th-20th centuries), Craiova, Universitaria Publishing/ Cluj-Napoca, University Press Publishing, 2021, 197 p.....	123
Stoica Lascu, Ioan Opriș, Pagini din istoria diplomației românești [Pages from the History of Romanian Diplomacy], Editura Altip, no place [Alba Iulia], 2020, 290 pp.; ill., facs., tab. ISBN 978-973-117-679-6	125
Stoica Lascu, Tasin Gemil, Tătarii. Relații cu otomani și români [The Tatars. Realations with the Ottomans and Romanians], Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2021, 430 pp.; facs., maps ISBN 978-606-37-1138-1	127
Stoica Lascu, Marian Zidaru, The History of International Relations from Antiquity to Modernity. A Level Course, Editura Etnologică, București, 2019, 308 pp., ISBN 978-606-8830-78-0	133
Stoica Lascu, xxx Dumitru Preda, la 70 de ani. De la istorie la diplomație în serviciul Neamului Românesc (Centrul European de Studii Covasna – Harghita. [Series] Profesioniștii noștri, 31. Coll. Centenarul Marii Uniri (1918-2021). Vols. I-II. Ediție coordonată și argument de Dr. Ioan Lăcătușu și îngrijită de Vasile Stancu și Ciprian Hugianu, Editura Eurocarpatica, Sfântu Gheorghe, 2021, 366+670 pp; ill. ISBN 978-606-8851-44-0; 978-606-8851-45-7	136
Stoica Lascu, Anatol Petrencu, A fi profesor de istorie în Republica Moldova. Cu prilejul conferirii înaltului titlu de DOCTOR HONORIS CAUSA de către Universitatea de Stat „Alec Russo” din Bălți [To be a History Teacher in the Republic of Moldova. On the Occasion of Conferred the High Title of DOCTOR HONORIS CAUSA by The State University “Alec Russo” from Bălți] (Academia Oamenilor de Știință din România. Universitatea de Stat din Moldova – Facultatea de Istorie și Filosofie. Centrul de Excelență Institutul de Istorie Socială „ProMemoria”), no publisher, Chișinău, 2021, 236 pp.; ill.; facs. ISBN 978-9975-66-714-2	142

Stoica Lascu, <i>Vlad Mischevca, Între pace și război. Domnii fanarioți în contextul raporturilor internaționale (1774-1812) (Ministerul Educației și Cercetării, Institutul de Istorie), Cartdidact, Chișinău, 2021, 429 pp.; diagr., facs., fig. ISBN 978-9975-3497-8-9</i>	145
Stoica Lascu, <i>Tasin Gemil, Simona Deleanu (eds.), Relațiile româno-turce în perioada modernă. Romanian-Turkish Connections in modern times (Institutul de Studii Avansate pentru Cultura și Civilizația Levantului. Institutul de Turcologie. The Institute for Advanced Studies in Levant Culture and Civilization. The Institut of Turkology), Presa Universitară Clujeană (Coll. Studii de istorie a Levantului), Cluj-Napoca, 2022, 432 pp. ISBN 978-606-37-1191-6</i>	148

HISTORY OF EDUCATION REFORMS IN SPAIN

Verónica Fernández Espinosa*

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.01

Abstract

This work provides a succinct historical overview of the history of the Spanish education system from 1812, date of the first Spanish Constitution, until 1970 at the end of the Francoist era in Spain, highlighting the legislative milestones and contextualising them within the larger political landscape in which they took place. The paper will go on to describe the basic legislation which has regulated the Spanish education system since 1970 describing some of their most significant aspects, from the General Education Law (LGE) of 1970 to the Organic Law Modifying the Organic Law for Education (LOMLOE) which came into force in 2020.

Key words: *Education, Spain, laws, history*

1. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE SPANISH EDUCATION SYSTEM

The invasion of Spain by Napoleon in 1812 sparked a series of popular revolts throughout the country. This would lead to the approval by the Cortes of Cádiz of the Constitution of 1812. This document proclaimed the sovereignty of the law over the king and a new organisation of society based on three principles: liberty, equality and property. The Constitution of 1812 is the only such document which dedicated an entire chapter to public education (Ministerio de Educación Cultura y Deporte, 2004), and included important innovative and reformist ideas for the public education system, most especially:

- The establishment of universal Primary Education throughout the entire country without exceptions.
- The uniformity of the education program throughout the country.
- Education would be the competence of Parliament, or *Cortes*, rather than the Government.

With the Constitution in place, the next task was to draft a General Regulation of Public Education that would establish and expand on these constitutional principles. In 1814, Manuel José Quintana, presented a report that would become the cornerstone of future public education in Spain. With certain changes, the *Quintana Report*, as it became known, was enacted in 1821 establishing a number of basic principles for public education, namely that it be equal, universal, uniform, public and free (Araque, 2013).

A few months later, General Francisco Javier led a coup d'état, repealed the 1812 Constitution and declared the decrees of the Cortes of Cadiz to be null and void. With the return of the *ancien régime* education, especially primary education, returned to the hands of the Church.

* PhD, Professor at Facultad de Educacion y Psicologia, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Madrid, Spain, Phone: +34 617 75 87 70, Email: veronica.fernandez@ufv.es

The years 1820 to 1823 were a pivotal time in the history of education in Spain, seeing the establishment of a new educational structure through the General Regulation of Public Education of 1821. For three crucial years the liberals held political ascendancy in Spain. Enacted by the *Ley Quintana*, the Regulation became law and established a new educational structure divided into primary, secondary and tertiary education. The new law also sanctioned the division of education into public and private spheres with public education being free. With the return of Fernando VII in 1823 absolutism was restored. For ten years, his royal supporters demanded a number of education reforms set out in the so-called *Plan de Caomarde*. These measures were a clear intent to make public education an instrument in furthering the absolutist cause (Araque, 2013).

In 1833, the regency of Maria Cristina began, bringing with it the so-called liberal decade. Now in power, the liberal progressives enacted the General Public Education Plan, better known as the Plan del Duque de Rivas, in 1836. The Plan remained largely implemented although it did set an important precedent for the famous *Ley Moyano* of 1857 which further organised and regulated the three levels of education: primary education, consisting of an elementary and superior level; secondary education, also divided into elementary and superior; and higher education corresponding to the faculties, special schools and centres for erudition. After the approval of the Constitution of 1837 there were attempts to ground constitutional principles into law but the uprising by Espartero forestalled their implementation.

The coming of age of Isabella II in 1843 opened a new chapter in Spanish history which lasted until 1854, known as the “*Década Moderada*” or the Moderate Decade. A key development during this temperate liberal period was the Constitution of 1845, which “was intended to serve the Spanish nation by palliating any hint of radicalism or idealism and steering the political life of the country. In the area of education, 1845 brought a new General Education Plan, the *Plan Pidal*, which renounced the ideal of universal and free education while laying the foundations of the contemporary education system *with the promulgation of the Ley Moyano in 1857*” (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, 2004, p. 2).

The Public Education Act of September 9, 1857, the *Ley Moyano*, was the product of a consensus between the progressives and moderates and represented the definitive consolidation of the liberal education system, marking the beginning a long period of stability in public education policy, legislation and administration which would endure for over a century.

The *Ley Moyano* was an important milestone in the history of education in Spain, remaining in force at least in its essence, for 113 years (1857-1970)¹. It also serves to emphasise the fact that since 1970 it has been followed by no less than 8 education laws and various reforms.

What follows is a brief summary of the most important aspects of the *Ley Moyano*, the most enduring of the Spanish education system.

¹ In 2017 the 160th anniversary of the proclamation was commemorated.

The law was divided into four sections:

- The first, *De los estudios*, regulated the different levels of the education system, these being: primary education, divided into elementary (obligatory and free for those unable to pay) and superior; secondary education, consisting of six years of general studies and studies applicable to trades and industrial professions; and higher education, that is, university faculties, advanced and professional education.
- The second, *De los establecimientos de enseñanza*, regulated public and private schools.
- The third, *Del profesorado público*, regulated initial training, access and the organisation of teachers in public education.
- Finally, the fourth, *Del gobierno y administración de la instrucción pública*, which established a hierarchy of education administration: central, provincial and local and regulated the participation of the public through consultation with the different administrations.

The fundamental characteristics of the law were as follows (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport [MECD], 2014):

- A pronounced centralism in the administration of education.
- A moderate and eclectic approaching in resolving the most problematic issues of education such as the role of the Church or the weight of scientific content in secondary education.
- The legal authorisation and consolidation of private education, basically Catholic, at the primary and secondary level.
- The definitive incorporation of technical and professional studies in post-secondary education.

The *Ley Moyano* was a product of its time, with an elitist conception of higher education and giving the Church a great deal of control over educational content. However, the law represented an important step forward in education, establishing for the first time obligatory education for all children, boys and girls, under the age of nine. Education would be free for those unable to pay.

Primary education was in the hands of local municipalities while secondary education was the responsibility of the provinces. University education became the exclusive competence of the state. The law also established that all children would study the same textbooks and while private schools were permitted for primary and secondary education these were a concession of the state and were required to be fully integrated into the general education system (Araque, 2013). For private education, the law recognised the possibility for individuals, societies or companies to establish their own schools, although private secondary schools required the authorisation of the *Real Consejo de Instrucción Pública* and to meet all the conditions established by the law (MECD, 2014).

Another aspect of the *Ley Moyano* was that it raised teachers' salaries, allowing them to live with greater dignity and better perform their work. This intention was not always successful, especially in primary education where local authorities were responsible for paying teacher salaries and often failed to meet their obligations. University education

under the *Ley Moyano* was conceived as being only for elites and the law established other alternatives to access the professions for the rest of the population.

On September 19, 1868, revolution broke out in Spain and political instability continued until 1873 when the First Republic was proclaimed. During this period there was an attempt to foster greater freedom in education with the Decree of October 21, 1868 which sought to redress the balance between public and private education; there was also a need to establish study programs of different lengths for those with different skills and, finally, greater academic freedom was pursued in universities. The Decree also established that the State lacked the authority to condemn or forbid the teaching of scientific theories, giving professors the freedom to teach and discuss their ideas freely. Furthermore, professors were given greater freedom in their teaching methodologies, choice of textbooks and to create their own educational programs. The Decree also granted absolute freedom to establish schools, alluding to the fact that the state had monopolised education (Decree on Education of October 21, 1868).

This was followed by the Manifesto of October 25, 1868, which announced the reforms to secondary education. "Changes were made to study programs, including promoting the use of Spanish rather than Latin in secondary education, introducing new subjects such as psychology, art and the History of Spain, the fundamentals of Law, the study of agricultural and commerce, etc." (Montagut, 2013, par. 7). This Manifesto gave education much more prominence than previous manifestos and was based on the liberal progressive and democratic principles in favour of universal suffrage and new freedoms: of religion, of publication (expression), of association and education; this was in opposition to the more moderate and conservative liberals who had dominated the political system under Isabel II (Manifesto del Gobierno provisional, 1868).

A new constitution was approved in 1876 which restored constitutional monarchy and established a number of fundamental principles including universal suffrage, the declaration of the rights of man and religious tolerance.

By the end of the 19th century education was again at the forefront of political debate. "The internal crisis of the country and the loss of the last colonies in Asia and America led to the coining of the famous phrase "Save Spain through school" (Delgado, 1994, p. 713). Spain would be regenerated by means of education reform. There followed a series of changes in the early 20th century in which the consensus between progressives and liberals again bore fruit. Reforms were made to normal schools, secondary education and university study programs. "These reforms also encompassed the regulation of exams, of religious instruction, teacher qualifications, the reorganisation of the baccalaureate and university autonomy" (Araque, 2013, p. 240).

One significant change was for teachers to be paid out of the state treasury. Until then teachers were paid by the local authorities which regularly failed to meet their obligations. Until 1923 the political situation in general, and education in particular, was erratic and unstable and during these years a coherent education policy was lacking.

On October 13, 1923, General Primo de Rivera headed a military coup d'état and the new anti-liberal regime put an end to academic freedoms and enacted reforms to the baccalaureate and universities.

Eight years later, on April 14, 1931, the Second Republic was proclaimed ushering in profound changes to the education system. Among other things, the Constitution of

the Spanish Republic (1931, Art. 48) established the unity of education, with free obligatory primary education, academic freedom and secular education and designated public school teachers and university professors as public employees. The many changes to the education system during these years included permission for primary schools to teach in regional languages other than Castilian, the elimination of obligatory religious education, reforms to initial teacher training and new regulations for the inspection of primary and secondary education.

In 1933, the second elections to the Cortes of the Republic were held, bringing a right wing government to power. The new government revoked many of these newly established regulations.

On July 18, 1936, a military uprising led by General Francisco Franco ignited the Spanish Civil War. The political, social and economic life of the country was convulsed by the three-year conflict and the education system remained in limbo until the end of the war.

Francoism brought the so-called Public Education Law and the Secondary Education Regulation Act, which designated education as a right of the Family, the Church and the State. These laws were entirely in line with the policy of National-Catholicism and the fascist thinking of the regime. Henceforth, education would be confessional, patriotic, social, intellectual, physical and professional, applying linguistic unity to the state and single-sex education.

Four important education laws were enacted in this period: the Secondary Education Reform Act (*Ley de Reforma de la Enseñanza Media*), of September 20, 1938, intended to regulate the education of the elites. The similar University Regulation Act (*Ley que regula la Ordenación de la Universidad*), enacted July 29, 1943. The third law, the Primary Education Act was proclaimed July 17, 1945 and the fourth, the Professional Industrial Education Law (*Ley de Formación Profesional Industrial*), of July 16, 1949 (MECD, 2004).

The 1950's saw a degree of relaxation in education policy, and while public education remained confessional, with a prominent role for the Church, there was "a diminishing of the preponderance of patriotism and political indoctrination over technical-pedagogical aspects" according to official guidelines (MECD, 2014, p.42).

By the 1970's it was evident that Spain was in dire need of change: social, political and educational. The changing circumstances of society during these times made it imperative to enact a new law that encompassed the entire education system. The aim was to provide the country with an education system that was more fair, more effective and more in tune with the contemporary needs of citizens and the country.

The foundation of the education reforms of 1970 was the 1968 'White Book' of the Ministry of Education and Science. This "was the key element, both conceptually and in terms of practical orientation, in the renovation of the education system" (Blat Gimeno 1992, p. 292). The report offered a detailed examination of demographic and economic factors that impacted education as well as figures on the education level of the Spanish population at that time, serving as the basis for public discussion during 1969-1970 of the design of the education reform of 1970.

The year of the White Book, 1968, was a pivotal year with large scale social movements taking place around the world, most famously in the United States, France

and Mexico. These movements were both cultural and political, bringing together diverse student movements which echoed around the world and “shook the foundations of academic life, particularly in universities, and had significant repercussions throughout the national education system” (Blat, 1992, p. 292). These events also influenced the drafting of the General Education Law (LGE) of 1970 (*Ley General de Educación y Financiamiento de la Reforma Educativa*).

The basic outlines of the Law were: the unity of all levels of education, the interrelation between them and the flexibility of the system (Law 14/1970, August 4).

The LGE was a milestone in the history of education in Spain and was largely the work of the Minister of Education J. L. Villar Palasí, who understood that the Spanish education system no longer fit the needs of Spanish society. The law was largely a response to the demands for the democratisation of education and the needs of a dynamic, urban and industrial society which had scant resemblance to the society of the *Ley Moyano* of 1857 (Law 14/1970, August 4).

During the period since the LGE of 1970 up to the year 2020, Spain has seen more than eight education laws and reforms. The following section will provide a general overview of these laws and reforms of the last fifty years.

2. THE GENERAL EDUCATION LAW OF 1970 AND SUBSEQUENT EDUCATION REFORMS

The LGE of 1970 was huge in scope, aiming to overcome the internal contradictions of the previous system created by successive, piecemeal reforms and which were now inadequate to respond to the accelerated social and economic change taking place in Spain at the time.

The principal features and characteristics of the Law were (MECD, 2004):

- It created a unified and flexible system, structured into four levels: Pre-primary, General Basic Education, Secondary Education and University Education.
- It generalised public education for all children aged 6 to 14, with complete integration into a unified, non-discriminatory system for all boys and girls.
- It specifically addressed the issue of the quality of education, beyond universalisation it attempted to establish a quality education for all.
- It explicitly revoked the principle of subsidiarity of the state with regards to its role in education existing up until 1970.
- It allowed for the greater presence of private education at the non-university level.
- It established a relatively unselective education system compared to other countries.
- There was a great deal of interest in vocational education and skills training, relating education with the job market.
- It configured a centralised education system.

But the law also had a number of shortcomings, such as a “deficient attention to pre-school education, which never materialised; the creation of a rigid, academicist baccalaureate with no flexibility; failure of vocational education despite the innovative ambitions of the law and the falsification of university autonomy. These failures were not entirely imputable to the law itself but rather to its implementation; an

unequivocal sign that in the area of education reform, policies for application are just as important as the theoretical design” (Puelles, 2008 p. 11).

In November 1975 Franco died, succeeded by King Juan Carlos I as head of state who named Adolfo Suárez president of the government in 1976. As part of the effort to dismantle Francoist institutions, the Political Reform Act was issued and approved by a majority of Spaniards by referendum, leading to the first democratic elections since 1936 and bringing the Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD) to power which would govern for the next six years. The new government designed a new Constitution, also approved in the referendum of 1978. Article 27 of the new Constitution set out the general principles of the current education system, introducing both far-reaching reforms and partial modifications. This article of the Constitution states (Spanish Constitution, 1978):

1. Everyone has the right to education. Freedom of teaching is recognised.
2. Education shall aim at the full development of the human personality with due respect for the democratic principles of coexistence and for basic rights and freedoms.
3. The public authorities guarantee the right of parents to ensure their children receive religious and moral instruction in accordance with their own convictions.
4. Elementary education is compulsory and free.
5. The public authorities guarantee the right of all to education through general education programming with the effective participation of all sectors concerned and the setting up of educational centres.
6. The right of individuals and legal entities to set up educational centres is recognised, provided they respect constitutional principles.
7. Teachers, parents and, when appropriate, pupils shall participate in the control and management of all centres supported by the Administration out of public funds, under the terms established by the law.
8. The public authorities shall inspect and standardise the educational system in order to ensure compliance with the laws.
9. The public authorities shall help the educational centres which meet the requirements established by the law.
10. The autonomy of Universities is recognised, under the terms established by the law.

The Constitution thus guarantees the freedom of education, the right to education and the autonomy of universities. This constitutional article provided the foundation for the Organic Law of 1980 by the UCD government (Unión de Centro Democrático) seeking to regulate the *Estatuto de Centros Escolares* (LOECE). With Organic Law 5/1980, of June 19, the UCD government aimed to develop Article 27 of the Constitution from a conservative perspective. The PSOE (Partido Socialista Obrero Español) contested the law before the Constitutional Court alleging it failed to respect the spirit and letter of the Constitution. The Court agreed and ordered the UCD government to conduct a thoroughgoing reform of the LOECE or to draft an entirely new law. For various reasons, this reform never took place, firstly due to the attempted coup d'état of February 1981 and then the elections of 1982 which brought the PSOE to power

making the implementation of the LOECE inoperative. In the years that followed the PSOE government enacted four basic organic laws on education which, along with the Constitution of 1978, regulate the Spanish education system. According to the MECD (2014), this legislative framework is completed by a large number of subsequent regulations, however, the basic foundations consist of the following:

- Organic Law 11/1983, of August 25, the University Reform Act (LRU).
- Organic Law 8/1985, of July 3, the Right to Education Act (LODE).
- Organic Law 1/1990, of October 3, the General Education System Regulation (LOGSE); and
- Organic Law 9/1995, of November 20, on School Participation, Evaluation and Governance (LOPEG).

a) THE UNIVERSITY REFORM ACT (LRU), 1983 AND THE RIGHT TO EDUCATION ACT (LODE), 1985

The LRU came into effect in 1983 and was the first education law of the socialist government of Felipe González. It remained in effect until 2002 and was the first law that established the principle of university autonomy, laying the foundation for the future reform of university education. Seeking to materialise the Constitution approved only five years earlier, the LRU sought to move from a highly centralised university system to “a decentralised system in which responsibilities for management and funding are shared by the Autonomous Communities and the State (...). The process of decentralisation initiated by the LRU led to, among other things, the expansion and diversification of the public university system and the participation of private initiatives” (Rodríguez, 2003, p. 147-148).

The LODE sought to further develop Article 27 of the Constitution, with the exception of section ten refereeing to university autonomy. The aim was to guarantee the right to education for all, with particular emphasis on providing basic, free and obligatory education without discrimination.

This ensuring the right of all to education led to the notion of education as a public service which was not monopolised by the state but also open to private initiatives. The law also attempted to reinforce the school system to correct grave educational inequalities in society through the undertaking of a range of programs such as compensatory education, adult education, special education and grants. With the LODE, the aim was clearly to guarantee the right of education to all.

The LODE also sought to guarantee and further the right to freedom in education. The rights of parents and students were explicitly recognised to ensure the achievement of certain educational outcomes in accordance with the Constitution. The law approved the existence of a dual network of schools, public and private, and establishing the figure of charter schools, privately owned schools financed with public funds. Another feature of the law was the admission of students in charter schools when the demand for public schools was greater than that set by the law.

This law did not alter the structure of the education system but rather sought to regulate this duality of schools, the participation of the entire education community and the right to education of all citizens regardless of their socio-economic circumstances. It also determined the composition of school boards and the manner in which these

were chosen. It regulated “the participation in general programming of education for all sectors involved, from the school to the highest levels of government, while recognising the freedom of association, federation and confederation of parents and the students themselves” (MECD, 2000, p.46).

In 1990, with the enactment of the LOGSE as the basic legal framework of education in Spain, the LGE of 1970 was almost entirely revoked, changing the education system as it had been until that time.

The architect of the LOGSE was Álvaro Marchesi. The model of the LOGSE was based on the development of constitutional principles by the LODE. It established a new legal framework for the education system, later complemented in 1995 by the Organic Law on School Participation, Evaluation and Governance (LOPEG) dealing with the management and participation in schools.

b) GENERAL EDUCATION SYSTEM REGULATION (LOGSE), 1990

The LOGSE was the third important reform enacted since the *Ley Moyano* of 1856 and the LGE of 1970 and, as mentioned, the LOGSE put an end to the LGE of 1970. It is important to note that while more than a century passed between the *Ley Moyano* and the *Ley Villar Palasí*, the reform of 1990 came just twenty years after the previous education law.

The new democratic institutions of the country and the establishment of the Autonomous Communities required a different education system. “Old problems and new needs called for education reform” (Puelles, 2008, p, 12).

The principal characteristics of the new education law were as follows:

- The extension of free and obligatory education up to the age of 16.
- The restructuring of the general education system into pre-primary education, primary education, secondary education - consisting of the obligatory secondary education, the baccalaureate and intermediate vocational education, advanced vocational education and university education.
- Provision of secondary education to all students.
- An in-depth reform of vocational education and an improvement in the quality of teaching not only to overcome past and present deficiencies but especially to establish an ambitious program to meet the demands of the present and future.
- Permit the Autonomous Communities to establish a significant portion of educational content and undertake, for the first time, to establish Obligatory Secondary Education (ESO).
- To combine quality education and social equity. The law was the first in history to introduce the quality of education as a principal objective of education reform, dedicating a specific section within the document to education quality. It should be noted that the financial resources assigned to this effort were insufficient (Puelles, 2008).
- Establish teacher training as a principal factor in the quality of education, with Article 56 setting out the foundations of teacher training.

- Reinforcement of linguistic diversity and cultural identity in each Autonomous Community through bilingualism and the inclusion of educational content proper to the culture of each region.
- The conception of education reform as a continuous process of innovation and change, incorporating a great deal of flexibility in order to serve as an effective framework for Spanish education over the long term.
- The attempt to combine the unity of the education system with decentralisation, respecting the division of governmental competences between the State and the Autonomous Communities.
- To introduce a system of special needs education.

The LOGSE also intended to modernise the Spanish education system, incorporating teacher training, fostering innovation or adding elements and mechanisms for the quality evaluation or inspection of the education system.

Among the shortcomings of the LOGSE were that it established a highly restrictive system of optional courses and standards for student evaluation and promotion. Without an adequate offer of optional courses it is impossible to address the diversity of interests, motivations and capacities of students. The LOGSE also underwent significant changes to its regulations, including poorly designed norms regarding the evaluation and promotion of students as well as aspects of school curricula and organisation. A further problem was “transversality, which was a true innovation, but remained inoperative possibly because it did not prepare teachers nor took into account so-called school culture” (Puelles, 2008, p.13).

As for university education, the LOGSE did not address issues directly but by focussing on the theme of education quality it connected “with the dynamic of change that was taking place within universities [since the LRU]. All of which led to the adoption in 1995 of the National Plan for University Quality Evaluation” Rodríguez (2003, p. 148).

c) ORGANIC LAW ON SCHOOL PARTICIPATION, EVALUATION AND GOVERNANCE (LOPEG), 1995

Enacted on November 20, 1995, this law is more generally known as the *Ley Pertierra* and addressed questions of school management and governance. The law was created to further develop aspects of the LODE with regard to the right to education and participation, regulating the organisation and functions of the organs of governance of publicly funded schools to bring these into line with the LOGSE of 1990.

The LOPEG “is the law that links ahead of it time, quality of education and quality of life, understanding this quality through a greater focus and regulation of aspects of participation, evaluation and governance” (Fernández, 2016, p. 39). Seeking to enhance the notion of participation in schools, the law created School Boards which incorporated teachers, students, families, administrative and services personnel, municipal representatives and the owners of private schools, thus bringing constitutionally recognised rights to practical application in the work of schools.

Among the tasks assigned to the School Boards was the election of school directors and the exercise of greater autonomy in the organisation and management of the school, including producing directives for the educational project of the school, from the specific aims of the courses imparted to the offer of courses available to students.

The *Ley Pertierra* also focussed on the professional development of teachers, regulating the system to improve their professional perspectives, both in terms of classroom teaching and promotion to responsibilities of coordination and management. The law also explicitly established that the improvement of the quality of education required the expansion of the limits of evaluation in order to be applied effectively to schools, teaching and teachers throughout the education system.

d) ORGANIC LAW ON QUALITY OF EDUCATION (LOCE) 2003

In 1996, the Partido Popular (PP) won the general election but failed to win an absolute majority. The new government was formed through a pact with nationalist parties of Cataluña, the País Vasco and the Canary Islands. Thus, José María Aznar became the new president of Spain. In the following general elections of 2000, Aznar and the PP won again, now with an absolute majority and so began a second legislature at the head of the country. During this second mandate, the Aznar government passed the LOCE, coming into force on June 27, 2003, but its application was paralysed by Royal Decree (R.D. 1318/2004) after the 2004 elections when José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero of the PSOE became president.

The LOCE sought to modify both the LODE of 1985, the LOGSE of 1990, and the LOPEG of 1995, including a series of measures designed to improve the quality education for all, as indicated by its name. Furthermore, the LOCE “recognised the need to address new themes such as school abandonment and the improvement of content at various levels” (Fernández, 2016, p. 41).

The law also intended to establish a general framework for the various aspects of the system which directly impacted the quality of education. The general purposes of the law were as follows (Delgado 2006):

- To normalise and legalise anachronous, hierarchical and selective situations in many public schools, by way of fact and departing in many cases from applicable regulations.
- To significantly reduce democratic participation in public schools while increasing the opacity of private schools.
- To promote the privatisation of education at all levels and to consolidate the preponderance of catholic ideology throughout the education system.

At the university level, in 2001 the Organic Law on Universities (4/2007 [LOU]) was enacted, substituting the existing LRU of 1983 and focusing on the organs of university governance and the accreditation body ANECA (*Agencia de Evaluación y Acreditación*). The approval of this law encountered a great deal of public resistance (El mundo.es 2002).

There was also significant opposition within the PSOE itself and the law was immediately reformed by the Zapatero government with the Organic Law of April 12, 2007 (LOMLOU), admitting that Spanish universities should adapt to the European Higher Education Area in line with the Bologna Process (Organic Law 4/2007).

As mentioned, the LOCE, never took effect and was replaced by the Organic Law on Education (LOE), of May 3, 2006, analysed in the following section.

e) ORGANIC LAW ON EDUCATION (LOE), 2006

On April 6, 2006, the Spanish Parliament approved the LOE, coming into effect on May 3 of the same year. This new law substituted the LOGSE (1990), LOPEG (1995) and the LOCE (2002) and revoked the LGE of 1970 and the norms for the provision of employment positions for teachers (1994), but merely reformed the LODE of 1985.

This law sought to further the proposals of the LOGSE and to revoke and replace the LOCE. It also aimed to restructure the entire educational system, the sixth such education reform since the approval of the Spanish Constitution and the restoration of democracy.

The most significant changes introduced by the law are (Organic Law 2/2006): the reduction of itineraries in the baccalaureate, the substitution of marks by letter (from insufficient to outstanding) with numerical qualifications from 1 to 10 in secondary education, the introduction of an obligatory and evaluated Civics course (*Educación para la Ciudadanía*) with content on democracy, human rights (including sexual education content), and the Spanish Constitution, in detriment to Language and Literature which were reduced by 25 hours.

The imposition of this new course sparked public protest across Spain and the opposition of a number of groups, including the PP (which voted against the law), deeming it an attempt at the moral indoctrination of students and a flagrant invasion by the State into educational matters properly the concern of families. Protest movements encouraged parents of students to conscientiously object and not attend to the course. In 2009, the Supreme Court ruled that the contents of the course were constitutional and did not constitute indoctrination, thus disallowing conscientious objection.

Another criticism of the law was aimed at the reduction of standards, allowing students to pass the year while having failed a number of courses.

The fundamental principles of the LOE (Organic Law 2/2006) are as follows:

- First, to “provide a quality education to all citizens of both sexes at all levels of the education system” (par. 15). The aim was for all citizens to fully develop their individual, social, intellectual, cultural and emotional capacities for which they require a quality education adapted to their needs. There was a great deal of interest in supporting students with learning difficulties although the method to achieve this remained unclear.
- Second: the need for all members of the education community to collaborate in meet these ambitious goals. Achieving the combination of quality and equity expressed above necessarily requires a shared effort and commitment.
- The third principle: a decisive commitment to the educational goals of the European Union.

f) ORGANIC LAW ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION QUALITY (LOMCE), 2013

A general election was held on November 20th, 2011, bringing the PP into power with Mariano Rajoy as president of the government. Two years into the new mandate a new law was enacted, the LOMCE, popularly known as the “*Ley Wert*”. This was the first Education Law by the PP since the LOCE of 2002 was never applied.

From the presentation of the initial draft to the final approval the law was fiercely contested by opposition parties and certain sectors of the population. The law received no political support from any parliamentary group other than the PP. The law passed with 182 votes in favour and 143 against and 2 abstentions by the UPN (Trillo, 2013).

This new Law, which partially reformed the LOE, incorporated among other things a new definition of the subjects, the establishment of external tests at the end of obligatory secondary education and the baccalaureate and the creation of a new basic vocational education system to substitute the Initial Professional Qualification Program (*Programa de Cualificación Profesional Inicial* or PCPI).

The most significant aspects of the new law (Organic Law 8/2013) were:

- A new course distribution, classifying courses as core, specific and free configuration by the Autonomous Communities (Art. 6, 2).
- Revalidations. Two external evaluations were established after ESO and the baccalaureate, obligatory for graduation. Other tests were also established for Primary education.
- Itineraries were moved forward.
- Vocational education was reinforced.
- Three types of baccalaureates were introduced.
- Religion or Ethics. Religion would become obligatory in Primary and Secondary education with the 'mirror' course Social and Civil Values in Primary and Ethics in Secondary. Thus removing the controversial Civics course (*Educación para la ciudadanía*).
- Designating Spanish as the 'vehicular' language.
- Recognition of teachers as public authorities.
- Support for single-sex education.

As has occurred with practically all education laws enacted during the democracy, the LOMCE has generated opposition from certain sectors of the population while receiving support from others.

The arguments in favour and against have been widely aired in public debates and the aspects of this law receiving the most criticism and demands for reform are those regarding revalidation necessary to graduate from ESO and the baccalaureate; the diminished weight of humanities with philosophy now an optional course in 2nd year of the baccalaureate; the replacement of the Initial Professional Qualification Program (PCPI) aimed at students with difficulties in completing secondary education, introduced by the LOMCE. "There are demands to change the proposed education itineraries since students must choose between FP (vocational education) or the baccalaureate at the age of 13, from the 3rd year of ESO. This is one of the changes questioned even by the OCDE which has requested Spain to delay the choice of itinerary by one year" (El País, 2017); finally, there were also demands to rescind the guarantee of single-sex education.

There are other aspects which have raised controversy among teachers, parents, students and psychologists related to the subject of religion and languages. Religion is once again an evaluated course, with the same weight on the final mark as core subjects, and many demand it not be an evaluated course. As for languages, "some bilingual Autonomous Communities such as Cataluña have pointed to the fact that community languages have become "specialities" and not evaluated in the state tests, a situation which will "undo 30 years of social cohesion" (El Confidencial, 2013).

g) ORGANIC LAW MODIFYING THE ORGANIC LAW FOR EDUCATION (LOMLOE), 2020

This latest education law, passed on February 15, 2020, is also known as the *Ley Celaá* after the then Minister of Education. Enacted by the current Socialist government of Pedro Sánchez, it is the first reform drafted and passed by a coalition government (PSOE and Unidas Podemos). It aims to replace the previous law and essentially restore the LOE of 2006 passed by the Zapatero government. This law is as controversial as its predecessors.

The law introduces the following reforms (BOE-A-2020-17264):

- Spanish is no longer the “vehicular” language.
- It removes provisions for the opening of new charter schools or the expansion of existing charter schools.
- Schools receiving public funding cannot separate students by sex and reconfigures the admission of students in schools.
- Religion becomes a voluntary course and does not count for the final grade. Students are not obliged to choose a replacement course.
- Within obligatory education students may repeat a maximum of twice and in the baccalaureate may pass the year with a failed course.
- Prioritises that students with and without special needs are integrated into the same schools.

These regulations will be applied during the 2022-2023 academic year, one year after the law was enacted.

Conclusion

Since the UCD government passed the LOECE in 1980 there have now been eight, including the LOMLOE, new laws and reforms of the Spanish education system, an average of one every five years. This reflects the failure of governments and political parties to reach a consensus and to agree to a pact for education that provides stability to the Spanish education system. It has been demonstrated that the best educational outcomes are found in countries with stable, consolidated education systems, as is the case of Finland, often held up as a model of educational success². It also demonstrates that every political party that achieves power puts the interest of their party ahead of those of society as a whole rather than building a consensus on questions which are essential to the progress of the nation such as education.

It is probable that the political alternation from one party to another will continue and the road to constitutional reform will remain a long one. Education laws require time to be implemented and produce results and cannot be the subject of electoral campaigns where parties use the issue of public education to differentiate themselves from other parties. The importance political parties give to this issue is demonstrated by the difficulty in reaching a consensus in the Constitution of 1978, the result being Article 27 which allowed each party to postpone the problem and implement their own

² For more about Finland, see the case study by J.M. García-Patos at: <https://www.madrid-secreto.es/2014/03/14/finlandia-un-caso-de-estudio/>

policies when they achieved power. This situation has a grave impact on the quality of education and has a disconcerting effect on the performance of schools and teachers. A minimum consensus on education is essential on the diagnostic of the education system - leaving aside interested opinions that merely seek to weaponize the issue against political adversaries; on the important problems revealed by this diagnostic - many of which are now part of the current education imaginary; on the policies necessary to resolve these problems and that these remain in place despite changes in government - the experience of past years has shown that, in order to be effective, these policies must be sustainable over the short and medium term; for these agreements new laws are not necessary (Statement by the *Colectivo Lorenzo Luzuriaga* on the education debate during an election year, 2015, p. 4).

References

1. Aportaciones del Colectivo Lorenzo Luzuriaga al debate educativo en un año electoral (marzo de 2015). Recuperado de <http://www.colectivolorenzoluzuriaga.com/PDF/-Aportaciones%20en%20un%20ano%20electoral.%20Marzo%202015.pdf>
2. Araque Hontangas, N. (2013). *Manuel José Quintana y la instrucción pública*. Madrid: Univ. Carlos III de Madrid.
3. Blat Gimeno, J. (1992). La Ley General de Educación veinte años después. *Revista de Educación*, 289-296. Recuperado de <http://www.mecd.gob.es/>
4. Carceller, I. (2012). Sobre la Ley Orgánica de Educación. *Revista sociocultural valenciana losojosde hipatia*. Recuperado de <http://losojosdehipatia.com.es/-educacion/sobre-la-ley-organica-de-educacion/>
5. Constitución de la República Española (9 de diciembre de 1931). Recuperado de: <http://www.filosofia.org/cod/c1931es.htm>
6. Constitución Española. (1978). Recuperado de http://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/documents/constitucion_es1.pdf
7. Decreto sobre enseñanza de 21 de octubre de 1868. *Gaceta de Madrid del 22 de octubre de 1968*. Recuperado de <http://www.filosofia.org/hem/dep/-boe/8681022.htm>
8. Delgado Ruiz, F. (abril, 2006). Reflexiones sobre la LOE. Recuperado el 23 de marzo de 2017, de https://www.upct.es/seeu/_as/divulgacion_cyt_09
9. Delgado, B. (1994). *La Educación en la España Contemporánea (1789-1975)*. Madrid, España: Ediciones SM.
10. Digón, P. (mayo, 2003). La Ley Orgánica de Calidad de la Educación: análisis crítico de la nueva reforma educativa española. *Revista electrónica de investigación educativa*, 5(1). Recuperado de http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?pid=S1607-40412003-00100003&script=sci_arttext El 65 % de trabajadores secundan la huelga educativa, según los sindicatos (9 de marzo de 2017).
11. El Pais.com. [Periódico en línea]. Recuperado de http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2017/03/09/actualidad/-1489047869_847994.html

12. Fernández, C. (2016). *La calidad y el servicio público educativo*. Valencia, España: Tirant lo Blanch.
13. Las aulas se levantan (2002). *El Mundo.es*. [Periodico en línea]. Recuperado de http://www.elmundo.es/especiales/2001/10_sociedad/-educacion/calendario.html
14. Ley de Instrucción Pública 9 de septiembre de 1857. *Alma Mater hispalense*. Recuperado de: http://personal.us.es/alporu/historia/ley_moyano_texto.htm
15. Ley 14/1970, de 4 de agosto, General de Educación y Financiamiento de la Reforma Educativa. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 6 de agosto de 1970. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
16. Ley Orgánica 9/1995, de 20 de noviembre, de la Participación, la Evaluación y el Gobierno de los centros docentes. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 21 de noviembre de 1995. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
17. Ley Orgánica 5/1980, de 19 de junio, por la que se regula el Estatuto de Centros Escolares. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 27 de junio de 1980. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
18. Ley Orgánica 8/1985, de 3 de julio, reguladora del Derecho a la Educación. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 4 de julio de 1985. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
19. Ley Orgánica 1/1990, de 3 de octubre, de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 4 de octubre de 1990. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
20. Ley Orgánica 10/2002, de 23 de diciembre, de Calidad de la Educación. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 24 de diciembre de 2002. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
21. Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 4 de mayo de 2006. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
22. Ley Orgánica 4/2007, de 12 de abril, por la que se modifica la Ley Orgánica 6/2001, de 21 de diciembre, de Universidades. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 13 de abril de 2007. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
23. Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa. Boletín Oficial del Estado, 10 de diciembre de 2013. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
24. Manifiesto del Gobierno provisional. (25 de octubre de 1868). Recuperado de: http://www.historiacontemporanea.com/pages/bloque5/el-sexenio-revolucionario-18681874/documentos_historicos/manifiesto-del-gobierno-provisional-25-de-octubre-de-1868
25. Ministerio de Educación Cultura y Deporte. (2000). *El Sistema Educativo español 2000*. Madrid: CIDE. Recuperado de: http://webcasus.usal.es/orgyprof/_private/Lecturas/Mariano/cide.pdf
26. Ministerio de Educación Cultura y Deporte. (2004). *El Sistema Educativo español. Madrid: MECD/CIDE*. Recuperado de: <http://uom.uib.cat>
27. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. (2014). *La participación de las familias en la educación escolar*. Subdirección General de Documentación y Publicaciones. Recuperado de:

- <http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/cee/publicaciones/estudioparticipacion/estudioparticipacion.pdf?documentId=0901e72b81b45e35>
28. Montagut, E. (2013). La educación en la Revolución de 1868. *Revista sociocultural valenciana losojosdehipatia*. Recuperado de: <http://losojosdehipatia.com.es/educacion/la-educacion-en-la-revolucion-de-1868/>
29. Perales, M. (29 de enero de 2009). Ciudadanía será obligatoria y no cabe ninguna objeción de Conciencia contra ella. *El Mundo.es*. [Periodico en línea]. Recuperado de: <http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2009/01/28/espana/-1233149624.html>
30. ¿Por qué la LOMCE es tan polémica? Los profesores contestan al Gobierno (9 de junio de 2013). *El Confidencial*. [Periódico en línea]. Recuperado de: http://www.elconfidencial.com/alma-corazon-vida/2013-06-09/por-que-la-lomce-es-tan-polemica-los-educadores-contestan-al-ministro-wert_582976/
31. Puelles, M. (7 de marzo de 2008). Las grandes leyes educativas de los últimos doscientos años. *CEE Participación Educativa*, 7-15.
32. Real Decreto 1318/2004, de 28 de mayo, por el que se modifica el Real Decreto 827/2003, de 27 de junio, por el que se establece el calendario de aplicación de la nueva ordenación del sistema educativo, establecida por la Ley Orgánica 10/2002, de 23 de diciembre, de Calidad de la Educación. Boletín Oficial el Estado, 29 de mayo de 2004. Recuperado de <https://www.boe.es/>
33. Rodríguez R. (2003). La evaluación institucional de las universidades españolas. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 32(125), 145-156. Recuperado de http://www.ses.unam.mx/integrantes/uploadfile/-rrodriguez/Rodriguez2003_Evaluacion%20InstitucionalUnivEspa%C3%B1olas.pdf
34. Trillo, M. (29 de noviembre de 2013). El Congreso aprueba la LOMCE con los únicos votos del PP. *Diario ABC*. [Periodico en línea]. Recuperado el 4 de abril de 2017 de <http://www.abc.es/sociedad/20131128/abci-congreso-aprueba-lomce-201311281144.html>

**POLISH PRISONS IN 1918-1939: NUMBER, ORGANIZATION,
INFRASTRUCTURE, AND SANITARY CONDITIONS
(A CASE STUDY OF THE MATERIALS FROM UKRAINIAN, POLISH,
LITHUANIAN, AND BELARUSIAN ARCHIVES)**

Oleh V. Razybrayev, Svitlana V. Havryliuk,** Galyna O. Maleonchuk****

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.02

Abstract

The article highlights the issues of the number, organization, infrastructure, and sanitary condition of Polish prisons in 1918-1939, as reflected in the materials of the Ukrainian, Polish, Lithuanian, and Belarussian archives. The main research methods are problem-chronological and comparative-historical.

In 1922, there were about 400 prisons in the Second Polish Republic (II Rzeczpospolita), but their number tended to decrease. Architecturally, the Polish prisons in the interwar period were closed complexes with various interconnected buildings. Most of the prisons were located in former monasteries and ancient castles, so their reconstruction and renovation/repair were pertinent throughout the whole interwar period. The infrastructure of the prison depended on its function features and size. The prison complex included, besides the prison administration building, premises where prisoners were housed and trained, barracks for penitentiary guards, hospitals or medical centers, various handicraft workshops, places of worship, and specially designated courtyards for prisoners' walks in.

Various controlling bodies inspected regularly the state of things in prisons regarding their observance of the law and the proper sanitary condition. They were special audits by the Ministry of Justice, inspections by prosecutors and the judicial authorities, or even inspections conducted by governmental commissions. The normative-legal documents determined that the Polish prisons ought to be quiet, clean, and orderly. In fact, the situation was often the opposite.

Key words: *Poland, prison, organization, number, structure*

Introduction. The consequence of the First World War was the collapse of the great empires (Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Germany), which stipulated the creation of newly independent countries on their territories. In November 1918, after 123 years of subjection, the interwar Polish state, the Second Polish Republic, revives. The emergence of a new state body encouraged the formation of its authorities and administration, numerous state institutions, and so on. In this period, the Polish state's

* PhD in History, Associate Professor, Faculty of History, Political Science and National Security, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 43025, Lutsk, Ukraine, Phone: +380508330669, Email: razigrayev.oleg@vnu.edu.ua

** Full Doctor in History, Professor, Faculty of History, Political Science and National Security, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 43025, Lutsk, Ukraine, Phone: +380504387304, Email: gavryliuk@vnu.edu.ua

*** PhD in History, Associate Professor, Faculty of History, Political Science and National Security, Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 43025, Lutsk, Ukraine, Phone: +380993512225, Email: maleonchuk.galyna@vnu.edu.ua

law enforcement agencies were formed, including the penitentiary system comprising prisons and their administration.

The history of Polish prisons in the interwar period remains an understudied issue of historical science. In modern Polish historiography, we have identified only a few scholars who studied this issue, in particular, the works of such authors as K. Pawlak, K. Urbański, and M. Rodak. However, in their works, these researchers consider the issue under study using only documents and materials from archival and library institutions of Poland. Concurrently, due to historical circumstances, sources on the prisons' functioning in the Second Polish Republic are stored not only in the archives of Poland but also scattered in the archival institutions of neighboring countries - Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belarus. The fact is that in the interwar period, some regions of modern Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belarus were part of the Second Polish Republic.

The purpose of the article is to elucidate the study findings regarding the number, organization, infrastructure, and sanitary condition of the Polish prison in 1918-1939, according to the archive documents of Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, and Belarus. The main research methods are problem-chronological and comparative-historical.

The prisons number. One of the integral elements of any penitentiary system is the institution where the person serves his/her sentence or is detained for the duration of the investigation. Interwar Poland was no exception, with about 400 prisons as of 1922 (Czerwicz, 1958: 211). In the inter-war period, establishing new penitentiary institutions became acute. But, as the study has revealed, in 1918-1926, no new penitentiary facility was built in Poland. The main obstacle was a difficult post-war economic situation that precluded the development of penitentiary infrastructure. Thus, on March 11, 1920, in his letter to the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance of Poland W. Grabski called on the latter to save money on construction work, because after the last strike of builders, the prices for their services had to be increased: «When planning new works..., you should keep to the maximum economy, simplicity of buildings and their appearance, remember that the time will come when Poland will be able to afford luxury and convenience, but today is not the time. Now is the time of struggle for the very existence of the Polish state, the time when it is essential not to do today what can be done tomorrow. Various unnecessary decorations and grandiosity should be avoided both while construction, repairing, and furnishing. The ordinary tables, not stylish furniture, suit today's situation. We must export decorated furniture to import grain, flour, fats, locomotives, and tractors. We ourselves ought to show an example of simplicity and modesty as the authorities» (SAZ. Fund 99. Matter 1. Page 28). In general, the Second Polish Republic tended to reduce the number of prisons. Thus, in 1928–1938, their number was from 366 to 344 prisons in the country (Urbański, 1997: 44). Actually, no new institution was founded except a prison in Tarnów in the late 1920s and the introduction of specialized prisons in the 1930s, such as agricultural colonies, craft facilities, and prisons-mobile labor centers (Rodak, 2017: 95).

In the autumn of 1938, the Polish penitentiary system was replenished with penal institutions of the occupied by its troops Cieszyn Silesia. On October 7, 1938, the Ministry of Justice sent a letter to the head of the Wiśnicz prison (probably also to other Polish prisons' chiefs - (Authors comment)) stating that in view of the need to staff

Cieszyn Silesia penitentiaries with prison guards, Poland had to submit two candidates for employment. The requirement was that these should be persons with good professional qualifications (completed a training course at the Central Prison Guard School) and appropriate moral qualities. To save public funds, it was welcomed that such persons should move at their own expense or get compensation only for transport tickets. As early as October 10, the head of the Wiśnicz prison informed the Ministry of Justice that three officers had reported their consent for relocation (NAK. Fund 480. Matter 1. Pages 481-483). Thus, with the inclusion of Cieszyn Silesia prisons into Poland's penitentiary system, the number of prisons on the eve of World War II was about 340 (Pawlak, 1995: 23).

Prisons organization. Architecturally, the interwar Polish prisons were closed complexes with interconnected administrative buildings. The prison complex included, besides the prison administration building, premises where prisoners were housed and trained, barracks for penitentiary guards, hospitals or medical centers, various handicraft workshops, places for praying, and specially designed courtyards for prisoners' walks in. Larger prisons had their own bakeries and vegetable gardens, and the like.

The prison was headed by a chief appointed by the Minister of Justice. The staff of the penitentiary institution was directly subordinated to him: assistants, inspectors, security guards, office servants, and the persons who were in prison by court decision or for investigative actions period. The available support staff, doctors, teachers, and clergy, were also partially dependent on the head of the prison. During 1918–1939, the Kalisz prison (Łódź Voivodeship) was headed by four persons in turn (SAK. Fund 195. Matter 16. Page 1). In the Grodno prison of the Białystok Voivodeship, five directors succeeded each other during only a few post-war years (1919–1923) (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 26. Pages. 1-2, 12; Matter 34. Page 4).

The internal structure of the prison included mainly administrative, economic, labor, and accounting departments. The administration department was in charge of maintaining order and proper sanitation in the prison, supervising the prison staff, and providing for the training of prisoners. The economic department was in charge of food provision, other prison supplies, and the maintenance of the prison premises. The labor department was engaged in the employment of prisoners during their execution of sentences and the sale of their products. It is worth mentioning that the members of the labor department in Polish prisons were not only the prison guards but also civilians (SAW. Fund 1742. Matter 8. Page 2).

From the first days of the restoration of independence, the reconstruction of prisons that functioned until November 1918 and were destroyed during the Great War or did not meet the needs of the time had become an urgent issue for interwar Poland. "... Most of the prisons, mainly in central and southern Poland, were housed in former castles, forts, and monasteries adapted to the purpose. Polish historian K. Urbański characterizing the Polish penitentiary system in the first half of the 1920s points out: «...Most facilities did not have sewerage, central heating, and electrification. An additional problem that prisons had faced for several years, mainly in winter, was the unsystematic delivery of heating materials» (Urbański, 1997: 46).

Within the walls of the former Franciscan monastery, there was a notorious penal prison in Rawicz, located in the west of the Second Polish Republic and founded by the

Prussian authorities in the first quarter of the 19th century. In 1918, the Holy Cross, one of the most severe prisons located in Kielce, came under the jurisdiction of the Polish Ministry of Justice. Since the 19th century, it has been housed in the premises of the famous Polish shrine - the Benedictine monastery that was closed by the Russian Empire authorities. Its name comes from the sacred building of the same name, which housed the fragments of the cross on which Jesus Christ completed his earthly journey. It is important to note that until 1864, these premises served as a prison for clergy of various confessions sentenced by civil courts for various crimes. After 1864, the Russian government stopped sending Orthodox clergy there, and around 1865 the monastery became Kielce prison (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 15. Page 4).

After Poland declared its independence, the Holy Cross Prison had not functioned for almost a year because of its poor physical condition. During the Great War, the prison premises were not used for their intended purpose. Taking advantage of the situation, the local population dismantled the doors and windows and even the ceiling of the top floor of the main prison building. During 1918-1919, the Polish government fulfilled the most necessary repairs, and on October 1, 1919, the Holy Cross Prison officially began operating within the Polish penitentiary system. In November 1920, it was headed by M. Butwilowicz, who remained the head of this institution until September 1939 (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 15. Pages 1, 4).

Most of the premises of the Grodno prison complex were also housed in sacred buildings owned by the Roman Catholic Church. The state paid rent for their use to the Chamber, which in 1925 amounted to 324 zlotys. Only the courtyard and part of one of the prison buildings belonged to the Polish state. The prison's administrative building housed security guards and a teacher's dwelling (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 59. Page 1).

The Kalisz prison, which belonged to the Łódź County Prison Directorate until 1921, was housed in a building of neo-Romanesque style designed by G. Marconi (1792–1863), a prominent Polish architect of Italian descent. The prison building in Częstochowa (Kielce Voivodeship), was located in the city center next to the Town Hall and belonged to the magistrate, which caused some difficulties in this institution functioning. In 1919, the issue of prison repairs became acute. However, the decision to start the repairing work was delayed due to disputes over the ownership of the premises. The magistrate considered the prison to be the property of the city, while the prison administration insisted that the Ministry of Justice owned it. (SAC. Fund 1. Matter 6187. Unnumbered). In the end, the prison remained in the previous building and was recognized the property of the city. The prison was obliged to pay the magistrate for the use of the communal property. In legal terms, the prison was subordinated to the government. However, such situation had only contributed to numerous conflicts between the penitentiary institution and the magistrate regarding repairs, management, cleaning of the area of common use, the amount of rent, the use of water resources, etc. (SAC. Fund 1. Matter 6310. Unnumbered).

At that time, there were many other Polish prisons in a state of disrepair and actually needed capital renovations. The Lukiszki prison in Wilno was one of them. As of October 1919, the reconstruction of this prison was proceeding at a slow pace (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 15. Pages 10-11; Matter 16. Page 14). In the early 1920s,

some of the prison Lukiszki rooms were not heated, and the window frames in them were not glazed. (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 61. Page 178). In 1922, many of the Polish prisons were partially renovated. Ministry of Justice, in a letter dated January 18, 1923, asked the heads of the prisons of the district appellate court jurisdiction in Warsaw, Lublin, and Wilno to submit reports on the repair works progress in their prisons in 1922. Evidently, the problem of the Polish prisons' reconstruction in the first half of the 1920s was solved only partially. A report of a specially created parliamentary commission that studied the situation in prisons in 1924-1925, dated January 23, 1926, stated that most prisons were housed in old rooms not intended for such exploitation and were overcrowded (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 923. Page 1).

Repair works in penitentiary institutions continued in this period. For example, in the early 1930s, a big criminal prison in Wiśnicz was reconstructed. Prison administrations willingly involved prisoners with appropriate work skills in repairs. On April 14, 1936, in his letter to Brześć, the head of the Kobryń prison of the Poleskie Voivodeship, B. Dolatowski, informed about the renovation of some of his prison premises and asked if there were any prisoners in Brześć prison who were skillful in masonry and painting. In his response to this letter, dated April 25 of the same year, the head of the Brześć prison, J. Horoch, wrote that there were no "extra" workers at his disposal, as his prison was also undergoing renovations at the time. In the Krasnystaw prison of Lublin Voivodeship, prisoners were also involved in various construction works within the penitentiary complex (SAZ. Fund 99. Matter 35. Page 5).

Prisons infrastructure. A prison infrastructure depended primarily on the functional status and size of the penitentiary institution. For example, in the late 1920s, the complex of the Holy Cross prison in Kielce was really in an appropriate condition and included the main prison building, a newly built hospital made of brick, a farm building (cook room, bakery, mill, and warehouses), a guard post, a weapons depot, a wooden administrative building, a stable, a wood warehouse, two brick administrative buildings, one of which needed repair, and a room for security guards, which was connected with the main prison complex. The main prison building housed 35 cells and the administrative premises consisting of 51 rooms for penitentiary staff. There was the sewage that was flushed with water from a well. In addition, the prison consumed the brought-in water from a forest well. The prisoners slept on mattresses filled with straw, which covered the floor of the cells (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 16. Page 17).

Electrification was essential for the Holy Cross prison functioning. However, in the 1920s, it was quite a difficult task to electrify the whole complex. There were no sources of electricity at close quarters to the prison. And unfortunately, the prison resources were insufficient to build its own power station. Construction of power plant began in the early 1930s, and in 1933, thanks to the efforts of chief M. Butwilowic, the prison was electrified, which significantly improved the security level of the penitentiary institution. Due to the thick walls of the monastery and accordingly rather costly electrification works, laying communications was a very complicated task and the prison authorities decided to use holes in the ceiling for this purpose. Thus, every prison cell was illuminated with 5 light bulbs (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 15. Page 3).

The large punitive prison in Wiśnicz consisted of three large buildings. The first two-story building housed long-term prisoners. The second, a one-story building, was

intended for short-term prisoners. Another building served as a hospital for tuberculosis patients and was initially designed for 100 beds. However, as of September 1938, there were 60 beds here (NAK. Fund 480. Matter 45. Unnumbered). The study of the archive materials has revealed that not all prisons could locate hospitals in separate buildings. It was available only for large prisons, such as the Grodno prison, where the hospital occupied a separate building with 8 cells (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 85. Page 230).

The Lukiszki prison complex consisted of four buildings: three of them housed prisoners, while in the fourth, there lived prison staff. The cells were of two types - single and shared. The prison had a bakery, built by the Germans during the Great War, and a hospital with about 120 beds. In the autumn of 1919, due to the difficult financial situation, the prison complex operated at only a third of its capacity. Simultaneously, the Lukiszki prison, headed at that time by chief K. Przewlocki, could house a maximum of 1,500 prisoners. The prison's electrical system needed repairing after the Great War, but by the mid-1920s, it had already been in good functioning condition (LCSA. Fund 142. List 1. Matter 1. Page 1-2).

The Stefańskie prison was a branch of Lukiszki. It was also located in Wilno, 3 km away from the main prison. This penitentiary institution was intended for the detention of women and got its name from the name of the street where the prison was located. As of October 1922, some of the prison buildings housed military. However, as early as January 1925, all the premises were used only for the needs of the prison (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 61. Page 108).

In the second half of the 1920s, the Kalisz prison had 109 individual cells and 7 shared ones. The prison had central water heating, electric lighting, and ventilation ducts. The alternative ventilation was provided by opening windows and doors (SAK. Fund 195. Matter 19. Page 83).

Drohiczyn prison in Poleskie Voivodeship was one of the smallest penitentiary institutions in Poland that functioned under the jurisdiction of the local elders' court and consisted of three buildings. The first building housed 9 cells, the prison chief's office, a cook room, a laundry, etc. The second one was used as a carpentry workshop, a warehouse for household materials and personal belongings of the prisoners. There was also a disinfectant room and other necessary premises. In the next, third building, there was a toilet (SABR. Fund 2266. List 1. Matter 11. Page 3).

Horses were the main kind of vehicle on the balance of Polish prisons. For example, in October 1919, there were only three horses at the disposal of the Wilno Lukiszki prison, which were used to deliver food or heating materials, waste removal, and the like (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 15. Page 12-13). Owning an automobile was quite a rare case in an interwar Polish prison. Only large prisons could afford to have such a 'luxurious' thing. For example, the Warsaw Remand Prison, located in Daniłowiczowska Street, bought a second-hand German NAG truck in 1922. In November 1927, a traffic control officer stopped the car and sent it for inspection, which found out that the automobile was in poor technical condition and needed immediate repair. The commission confiscated the car's registration number and the right to drive on the streets of Warsaw. In response to this act, the head of the prison appealed to the Ministry of Justice to get a permit to sell the car, as the repair work was unprofitable and did not correlate with the prison budget (SAW. Fund 1741. Matter 5. Page 93-98).

Prisons Sanitary Condition. Several control bodies regularly inspected the activities of prisons regarding the observance of the law and the sanitary condition of penitentiary institutions. They were special audits by the Ministry of Justice, inspections held by the prosecutor's office and the court authorities of the country, and even inspections conducted by governmental commissions. The normal-legal documents determined that the Polish prisons ought to be quiet, clean, and orderly. In fact, the situation was often the opposite (SABR. Fund 2043. List 1. Matter 393. Page 1; Fund 2044. List 2. Matter 1. Page 1; Fund 2266. List 1. Matter 1. Page 1).

In October 1919, the Wilno Lukiszki prison was audited. The inspection found that many cells were foul-smelling due to faulty sewers, and lice and bedbugs were common in the shared cells. The linen and bedclothes were in poor condition, and due to the lack of shoes, the prisoners mostly walked barefoot and often lacked clothes, especially in winter. Prisoners complained en masse about "hunger, cold, dirt, prolonged imprisonment without investigation or notification of the reasons for imprisonment". In addition, the prisoners' diet was low in nutrients, consisting mainly of soup with cereals and potatoes, bread, and coffee surrogates. At that time Lukiszki housed 1,074 prisoners, 303 of whom were military personnel and one priest of Lithuanian nationality. The commission had revealed that some of the detained in this prison had to be sent to internment camps. Thirty-five persons of the total number of prisoners were in the hospital, including those with sexually transmitted and dermatological diseases. In addition, Lukiszki prison detained children over the age of 13, which the auditors said was unacceptable. The prison inspection reported that «a significant percentage of prisoners... were held in prison without any legal grounds. This state of affairs cannot exist for a single minute in the Polish state, which ought to serve as a model of law and justice, even in the transition period» (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 15. Page 10-13).

The conclusion of the audition act regarding the above-mentioned prison, dated October 14, 1919, was the following: "Lukiszki main prison is not a correctional institution of the kind it should be but is rather reminiscent of the Bolshevik torture chamber, leaving far behind even what was done during the reign of the tsar. People here are hungry, cold, and ragged (literally, without clothes), do not have either straw to cover the floor or hot water to wash, and cannot even dream of such a luxury as soap and a towel. They are also deprived of any spiritual and moral consolation. It is urgent to appoint a chaplain...». At the end of October of 1919, the situation had not changed. Dirty floors and toilets, dust, cobwebs were a daily occurrence in this penitentiary institution (LCSA. Fund 128. List 1. Matter 15. Page 13, 76).

In June 1921, the Ministry of Justice informed the chief of the Grodno prison in Białystok Voivodeship that a recent inspection of the Polish prisons had revealed a number of sanitary norms violations. Therefore, the main recommendations for keeping prisons were to keep the cells clean, ventilate the mattresses ("haylofts") at least once a week, appoint a prisoner in charge of the order in a cell, try to provide prisoners with bath services at least once every two weeks, and disinfect their clothes (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 4. Page 1).

In the first half of the 1920s, the Grodno prison, like other Polish penitentiaries, experienced financial difficulties. There was a lack of resources for both the

maintenance of prisons and the provision of personnel and prisoners with everything they needed. In particular, the wiring system was in an «inadmissible» state and required immediate repair. (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 910. Page 2). At the end of 1924, there was a shortage of blankets for prisoners. The head of the prison then asked his colleague from the Suwalki penitentiary institution to borrow 30 blankets and received a positive response. On January 8, 1925, the Grodno prison's economic department received the blankets, and the head of the penitentiary institution pledged to return them immediately after receiving material support from the Ministry of Justice (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 52. Page 8). In 1928, the head of the Grodno prison informed the county architect that the sanitary commission revealed that there were no garbage cans near the administrative building and the poor condition of drains and other sewage facilities in his institution, and asked the architect to estimate the costs of these works (SAGR. Fund 55. List 1. Matter 971. Page 64).

In early 1926, an inter-ministerial commission inspected the Holy Cross prison in Kielce. Its creation was preceded by information from parliamentarians, clergy, and the press that the penitentiary complex was not fit for purpose and caused loss of health and high mortality among prisoners. The Polish Seimas even discussed the necessity of this prison liquidation. In fact, it was caused by the initiative of the Roman Catholic Church to get the premises of the penitentiary into its property. Therefore, the purpose of the above-mentioned inspection was to ascertain/find out whether the prison corresponded to the purpose in view of its premises state and the existent sanitary norms and facilities (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 14. Pages 1-3).

The commission informed that the prison was located on a mountain 650 meters above sea level. It was surrounded by a high wall and a forest. The prison complex consisted of a two-story prison building, which previously housed the monastery, outbuildings, a church destroyed during the First World War, and individual buildings of the former monastery. The inspection found that cells were dry, ventilated by opening windows, and the corridors were spacious, bright, and warm with wooden floors. The doors to the prison cells were gradually replaced by bars, which contributed to better heating and ventilation. At the time of the inspection, the chambers were not overcrowded, the humidity was moderate, and the temperature was about 12 degrees Celsius at the outside temperature of 18 degrees below zero. In the cells, for safety reasons, there were only the most necessary things/the essentials – plates, spoons, hangers for towels, soap, brushes, and bedclothes in good condition. The toilets were in every corridor with good sewerage. A separate courtyard was set aside for 20-minute walks for prisoners serving life sentences or long-term imprisonment. The prison had various workshops, a bath with a disinfection device, its own bakery, the clean enough cook room, and foodstuff was stored in a dry place. The prisoners did not complain or expressed discontent. The food was satisfactory. Fifteen prisoners stayed in a prison hospital, 12 of whom had open form of tuberculosis. The hospital was located in a separate wooden building, which was too big for such needs. In each corner of the prison complex, there were posts with guards, and one additional post located on the roof of the monastery. The prison was lit with oil lamps and heated with wood (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 14. Pages 1-3).

As the result of auditing, the commission had inferred that the Holy Cross prison was housed in a suitable building, the humidity level in cells was within the norm, the number of TB prisoners, the topographic location, working conditions, and nutrition were not of concern. The commission report suggested that in case of the closure of the prison, a similar isolated complex had to be built. Unfortunately, the economic potential of the Polish state was insufficient for this. As a result, the Holy Cross prison continued to function. Subsequently, several buildings of this complex were returned to the clergy, much to the displeasure of its then-chief, M. Butwilowicz (CSHAUL. Fund 611. List 1. Matter 14. Pages 1-3).

In early June 1934, T. Krychowski, Director of the Criminal Department of the Ministry of Justice, concluded that many prisons in Poland were "neglected in terms of cleanliness and order" and that dirt, lice, and bedbugs were a daily occurrence. T. Krychowski was very much dissatisfied with such a state of things because, back in April, he instructed the heads of penitentiary institutions to improve the situation with the sanitary facilities (SABR. Fund 1999. List 1. Matter 1. Page 240).

Evidently, the heads of prisons took into account the criticism of the Polish Penitentiary Administration. For example, an inspection of the Wiśnicz penitentiary institution in late May 1935 found a "model order" there: prisoners had water procedures every two weeks, bed linen was changed weekly, and the administration respected the prisoner's right to daily one-hour walk, sick prisoners spend outdoors three times more. Moreover, the prison administration respected the right of prisoners to educational, medical, and religious services, and the labor department functioned orderly. At the same time, the inspection commission recommended the prison administration to whitewash the cells, paint the doors of individual cells, repair stairs and some sections of the floor on the ground floor, re-equip the old cook room into a school classroom, repair the sewer system (the residents of the city complained about its malfunction), and increase the number of security guards by at least 5 persons. It is worth noting that problems with sewage and sewers were also relevant for the Wiśnicz prison up the second half of the 1930s (NAK. Fund 480. Matter 27. Unnumbered).

Sources also reflect the audit materials of several other prisons in Poleskie Voivodeship in the late 1930s. Thus, the inspection of the Prużany prison, organized on December 15, 1937, discovered that, despite the cleanliness and exemplary order in the buildings, the walls on the first floor were moist. But the improvements were obvious and the prison then got a radio set as an award from the local county eldership and positioned it in the main building of the prison (SABR. Fund 2042. List 4. Matter 55. Page 12). An audit of the Pińsk prison in March 1, 1938 revealed poor ventilation of some cells. An inspection of Stolin Prison on November 27, 1938, assumed a satisfactory sanitation. Among the faults mentioned in a special book was the lack of ventilation in the corridor, the lack of the lattice on one of the corridor's upper windows, and the lack of fencing between the prison and the courtyard. There was also a lack of bed linen for prisoners. An audit of the Drohiczyn prison on 10 March 1939 recorded the appropriate state of sanitary conditions, proper discipline and quality nutrition in the penitentiary institution. At the same time, the prisoners' clothing and bedding needed renovating, and there was a lack of bars on the windows of prison basements (SABR. Fund 2043. List 1. Matter 295. Pages 16, 26, 32).

Conclusion. A thorough study of the achieve materials allows drawing the conclusion that prisons occupied an important place in the law enforcement system of the interwar Polish state and were intended both for serving sentences and detaining persons during investigative actions. Revived in November 1918, the Second Polish Republic took over the penitentiary institutions located on the territories of the Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian empires during the period of statelessness. Owing to the devastating effects of the First World War, these institutions were in poor condition and often needed significant repairs. In the interwar period, the necessity of building new penitentiaries was critical, as many prisons were overcrowded and half-ruined. The difficult post-war economic situation precluded the rapid development of penitentiary infrastructure and the construction of new prison facilities.

Architecturally, the interwar Polish prisons were closed complexes with interconnected prison offices. Most prisons were housed in former monasteries and ancient castles, which were often unsuitable for such purposes. The infrastructure of a penitentiary institution depended on its function and size. In addition to the prison administration building, the prison complex included cells for prisoners and barracks, posts for penitentiary guards, hospitals or medical centers, various handicraft workshops, places of worship, and specially designed courtyards for prisoners' walk. Larger prisons had even their own bakeries, vegetable gardens, and so on.

The sanitary condition of penitentiary institutions was inspected by various regulatory bodies. Most often, these were special audits by the Ministry of Justice, inspections by prosecutors and the judicial authorities, and also inspections by governmental commissions. According to normative and legal documents, Polish prisons had to be quiet, clean, and orderly. But as the study has revealed, the situation was often the opposite. Sanitary conditions in Polish prisons were particularly troublesome in the first years after the revival of independence due to the post-war devastation and economic crisis. In the second half of the 1920s, the situation had partially stabilized. However, during the global economic crisis, the sanitary condition of prisons deteriorated significantly again, caused by overcrowding (due to rising crime and an increasing number of political prisoners) and financial instability in the country.

References

1. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (CSHAUL). Fund 611. List 1. Matter 14. Pages 1-3.
2. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (CSHAUL). Fund 611. List 1. Matter 15. Pages 1, 3-4.
3. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (CSHAUL). Fund 611. List 1. Matter 16. Page 17.
4. Czerwiec, M. (1958). Więzienieoznawstwo. Warszawa: Centralny Zarząd Więziennictwa Ministerstwa Sprawiedliwości.
5. Lithuanian Central State Archives (LCSA). Fund 128. List 1. Matter 15. Pages 10-15, 76.
6. Lithuanian Central State Archives (LCSA). Fund 128. List 1. Matter 16. Page 14.
7. Lithuanian Central State Archives (LCSA). Fund 128. List 1. Matter 61. Page 178.
8. Lithuanian Central State Archives (LCSA). Fund 142. List 1. Matter 1. Pages 1-2.
9. National Archives in Kraków, Poland (NAK). Fund 480. Matter 1. Pages 481-483.
10. National Archives in Kraków, Poland (NAK). Fund 480. Matter 27. Unnumbered.
11. National Archives in Kraków, Poland (NAK). Fund 480. Matter 45. Unnumbered.
12. Pawlak, K. (1995). Więziennictwo polskie w latach 1918–1939. Kalisz: Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej
13. Rodak, M. (2017). Pospolitalcy, cuwaksi, powrotowcy. Osadzeni w więzieniu karnym Warszawa-Mokotów (1918-1939). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Nertion.
14. State Archives in Kalisz, Poland (SAK). Fund 195. Matter 16. Page 1.
15. State Archives in Kalisz, Poland (SAK). Fund 195. Matter 19. Page 83.
16. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 1999. List 1. Matter 1. Page 240.
17. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2042. List 4. Matter 55. Page 12.
18. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2043. List 1. Matter 295. Pages 16, 26, 32.
19. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2043. List 1. Matter 393. Page 1.
20. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2044. List 2. Matter 1. Page 1.
21. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2266. List 1. Matter 1. Page 1.
22. State Archives of Brest Region, Belarus (SABR). Fund 2266. List 1. Matter 11. Page 3.
23. State Archives of Częstochowa, Poland (SAC). Fund 1. Matter 6187. Unnumbered
24. State Archives of Częstochowa, Poland (SAC). Fund 1. Matter 6310. Unnumbered.

25. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 4. Page 1.
26. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 26. Pages. 1-2, 12.
27. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 34. Page 4.
28. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 52. Page 8.
29. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 59. Page 1.
30. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 85. Page 230.
31. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 910. Page 2.
32. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 923. Page 1.
33. State Archives of Grodno Region, Belarus (SAGR). Fund 55. List 1. Matter 971. Page 64.
34. State Archives of Warsaw, Poland (SAW). Fund 1741. Matter 5. Pages 93-98.
35. State Archives of Warsaw, Poland (SAW). Fund 1742. Matter 8. Page 2.
36. State Archives of Zamość, Poland (SAZ). Fund 99. Matter 1. Page 28.
37. State Archives of Zamość, Poland (SAZ). Fund 99. Matter 35. Page 5.
38. Urbański, K. (1997). System penitencjarny II Rzeczypospolitej a więźniowie polityczni (na przykładzie województwa kieleckiego). Kielce: Kieleckie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

A VISIT OF NICOLAE IORGA TO KRAKOW IN 1924

*Piotr Goldyn**

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.03

Abstract

In June 1924, a scholar and Romanian politician, Professor Nicolae Iorga, visited several Polish cities. Some fragmentary materials relating to the organisation of this visit to Krakow were preserved in the archives of the Jagiellonian University. This task was assigned to the university authorities by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In order to provide a reasonably detailed description of this visit to Krakow, the preserved source material as well as press reports from popular newspapers published in this city at the time were analysed. Above all, the analysis was of a qualitative nature. This led to elaboration of a study which illustrates the circumstances of Nicolae Iorga's visit to Krakow and the course of his stay. It also serves as a starting point for similar considerations with regard to other Polish cities - Warsaw, Vilnius, Poznan and Lviv - which were also visited by Nicolae Iorga at the time.

Key words: *Nicolae Iorga, Krakow, Jagiellonian University, Poland*

This text was inspired by an article written by V. Telvak, B. Yanyshyn and V. Telvak published in 2020 (Telvek, Yanyshyn, Telvak, 2020). The following paper is an attempt to provide more details about the account of Nicolae Iorga's stay in Krakow. In fact, documents relating to the preparations for his visit were preserved in the Jagiellonian University Archives. They were produced both by the university authorities and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Additionally, articles from Krakow press, especially "Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny" (Illustrated Daily Courier), "Czas" (Time) or "Goniec Krakowski" (Krakow Messenger), which informed the public about this important - from the Polish point of view - visit, were employed.

Welcoming Nicolae Iorga to Krakow University was not initiated by the university authorities themselves but suggested by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry informed the Rector on 17 June 1924 that, in consultation with the Polish legation in Romania, they had decided to invite Iorga to Poland. At the same time, the letter briefly presented the visitor's profile. It was stated that Nicolae Iorga was a member of the Romanian Parliament, a professor of history, and also the owner of a Romanian newspaper called: "Neamul Românescu". It was also noted that he was one of the most widely read political and historical writers of his time, and his output included historical studies and political pamphlets. He conducted research on Poland and intended to issue a book on Polish-Romanian relations in his native language (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

*Dr hab. Associate Professor, Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, Faculty of Pedagogy and Arts in Kalisz, 62-800 Kalisz, ul. Nowy Świat 28/30, Poland, Phone: 0048618296420, E-mail: piotr.goldyn@amu.edu.pl

In this letter, one can read that “the University - on its part - should write an official letter to Prof. Iorga inviting him to give a lecture (or two lectures) and send such an invitation to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs so it could forward it - through the Polish Legation in Bucharest - to Prof. Iorga” (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). It was also suggested that the university authorities headed by the rector should establish a special university committee to welcome the Romanian professor. The precise programme of the visit, which was planned in considerable detail, was also provided. Iorga was supposed to arrive in Warsaw on 10 June 1924 and stay there for three days until 12 June, when he was to leave for Vilnius in the evening. His visit there was to last two days. Then, he was to return to Warsaw for one day, in order to move on to Poznan in the evening of 15 June. The visit to Poznan was planned for two days until 17 June. The following days - 18 to 20 June - were planned precisely for Iorga’s stay in Krakow. Lviv, from which he was to return to Bucharest, was to be the last stop of his journey (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

It is known that the rector of the Jagiellonian University took appropriate steps to organise the visit. He contacted professors to seek their opinions on this matter. One of the professors - Stanisław Wędkiewicz - considered that N. Iorga is first and foremost a historian and that it is historians who should express their opinion on the invitation of this Romanian scholar in the first place. (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

Unfortunately, no source materials have been preserved according to which it would be possible to deduce what the opinions of Krakow historians were not only about Iorga himself but also about the issue of inviting him to Krakow.

In line with the suggestions of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a committee, whose task was to host Nicolae Iorga in Krakow, was appointed as well. Dr Kazimierz Morawski, President of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences (based in Krakow) was one of its members. The committee also included the following professors: Władysław Konopczyński, Władysław Semkowicz, Waclaw Sobieski, Stanisław Kot, Ludwik Piotrowicz, Roman Grodecki and Stanisław Wędkiewicz. Other members were Prof. Stanisław Gołąb, Edmund Krzymuski, Michał Cezary Rostworowski, Stanisław Kutrzeba, Kazimierz Władysław Kumaniecki. The first meeting was held on 15 May 1924 (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

On 4 June 1924, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the rector of the Jagiellonian University that the arrival of Nicolae Iorga would take place as planned and no complications were anticipated. It was further stated: “Mr and Mrs Iorga and their daughter will be accompanied on the trip by Mr and Mrs Cusin as tourists” (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). The Ministry also requested the Rector of the University to send the programme of the visit and the calculation of the costs which the university intended to incur with regard to the organisation of Nicolae Iorga’s stay in Krakow (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

The topics of Iorga’s speeches he was to give at the Jagiellonian University were communicated to the university authorities by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Two lectures were planned. The first one was entitled: *Romania and Italian economic and artistic influences in the East*, while the other: *Eminescu: the main representative of Romanian poetry of the 19th century* (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

In view of the above, the rector of the Jagiellonian University sent the following letter to lecturers and students: “Mr Nicolae Iorga - Professor of the University of Bucharest will arrive on Wednesday, the 18th day of the current month [June], to Krakow. This prominent Romanian scholar, who will be a guest of the Jagiellonian University, will deliver 2 lectures in French in the Lecture Hall no. 2. On Wednesday, the 18th day of the current month, at 5 p.m., he will speak on the following subject: «Romania and Italian economic and artistic influences in the East», and on the next day, on Thursday, the 19th day of the current month at 7 p.m. on: «Eminescu: the main representative of Romanian poetry of the 19th century». Furthermore, on Friday, the 20th day of the current month [June], at 5 p.m., he will deliver a popular lecture supplemented by lantern slides. Having informed you of this, I hereby invite you all to participate in the said lectures” (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

The whole Nicolae Iorga's stay was to take place according to a fairly detailed programme. And so, the guest was to be greeted (and was actually greeted as discussed below) at the railway station on 18 June 1924. Afterwards, a meal and a rest were planned in the French Hotel before noon. At 12 p.m., Iorga was to participate in a meeting of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences and eat lunch two hours later at the Grand Hotel restaurant. A lecture was scheduled for 4 p.m., followed by a sightseeing tour of the city. At 7:30 p.m., the visitor was to attend a show at the Juliusz Słowacki Theatre and then eat dinner planned for ten persons at the Old Theatre restaurant. On Thursday, 19 June, a tour of the city was planned in the morning, followed by lunch, and at 1:50 p.m. - a train trip to Wieliczka with a visit to the salt mine located there. An afternoon tea was also to be served there. Nicolae Iorga was to return to Krakow at 6:20 p.m., and at 7:30 p.m. a banquet was to be held in the Small Hall of the Old Theatre, with fifty people expected to attend. The third day of his stay in Krakow - 21 June 1924 - was also filled with many activities, similarly as the previous ones. It was planned to leave for Zakopane by cars at 6:00 a.m. Breakfast was scheduled at the ‘Santo’ guesthouse at 10:00 a.m., and at 11:00 a.m., the trip was to be continued by cars to the Eye of the Sea (the most famous lake in the Tatra Mountains). After visiting the area, the second breakfast was to be served there. The dinner was planned for 4:00 p.m., also in the ‘Santo’ guesthouse. Nicolae Iorga was to return to Krakow by a fast train, which departed from Zakopane at 6:15 p.m. and was due to arrive in the former Polish capital at 11:30 p.m. The train to Lviv was to leave the Krakow station at 1:55 a.m. (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

The programme presented was to a large extent merely a proposal. As one can see, the two other lectures, which the Romanian professor was to deliver in Krakow, were not included in the schedule. Press reports did not mention Nicolae Iorga's trip to Wieliczka and Zakopane. Instead, there was some information about his lectures which were planned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

On 18 June 1924, a formal welcoming ceremony in honour of the Romanian guest was held in the small hall of the Old Theatre. Interestingly, the cost of this banquet was to be funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; however, at the time of its organisation, it was the University that had to actually cover the costs of the event. Hence, the attendees were asked to make advance payments which were to be refunded after settling the accounts with the ministry. The amount of this advance

was based on the number of people participating in the banquet. In case of 20 participants, fees in the amount of 25 zlotys were planned, and in case of 30-40 participants - 20 zlotys. The rector mentioned that the participation of university professors in the banquet was highly desirable (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). It is known that from the Faculty of Agriculture, the following professors confirmed their participation in the banquet: Feliks Rogoziński, Tadeusz Sikorski, (?) Sokołowski, Jan Włodek and Edmund Załęski. Professor Leopold Adametz paid the fee but he could not take part in the event, similarly as Prof. Brzeziński. The latter fell ill and could not come. Professors: Kazimierz Rouppert, Władysław Vorbrodt refused to attend the banquet for unknown reasons (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). A list prepared by the bursar indicating the professors who were to be reimbursed for the fees they had paid for the organisation of the banquet for Prof. Iorga was preserved. The following professors were listed there: Kazimierz Nitsch, Władysław Natanson, Władysław Semkowicz, Tadeusz Estraicher, Stanisław Wędkiewicz, Father Antoni Bystrzonowski, Ludwik Piotrowicz, Waclaw Sobieski, Fryderyk Pappe, Jerzy Mycielski, Leon (?) Sternabachowski, Jan Łoś, Ignacy Chrzanowski, Zdzisław Jachimecki, Stanisław Gołąb, Jan Piltz, Michał Cezary Roztworowski, Adam Wawrzyniec Łobaczewski, (?) Sokołowski and Edmund Załęski. This may therefore suggest that they actually attended the banquet (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

A report showing the exact course of Nicolae Iorga's visit to Krakow was preserved in the source materials. According to this account, Prof. Iorga was welcomed at the railway station in Krakow, where he arrived from Poznan at 6 a.m. On the part of the University, Professors Sobieski, Semkowicz and Piotrowicz took part in the welcome. They were accompanied by dr Pappe - the director of the library, Feliks Stańkowski - the starost of Krakow and (?) Regula - the vice-secretary of the University. After the welcome, the guests went to the French Hotel to have some rest, and then visited the Jagiellonian Library. At 12 p.m. (noon), the annual meeting of the Academy of Arts and Sciences was held, also attended by Nicolae Iorga. Dr Kazimierz Morawski, the President of the Academy, greeted Professor Iorga as an active foreign member of the Academy, stressing the scholars' desire to establish the strongest possible cultural and academic links with Romania. In response, Professor Iorga, in a longer speech, emphasised the merits of the Academy and the magnitude of its efforts taking into account the conditions under which its work had to be carried out. Next, he raised the importance of Polish culture and history as the oldest of the Slavic nations. He concluded by expressing his wish for the closest possible cooperation between Romanian and Polish scholars" (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). An analysis of the press note published in the Krakow "Czas" newspaper allows us to assume that it was more an account prepared for the local press than a report. It is worth adding that a year earlier, Polish state authorities had approved N. Iorga as an active member of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences ("Czas" 1924, no. 138). It should also be mentioned that the Romanian professor supported the Academy's library with his publications. (Rocznik [Yearbook], p. 29). He was also elected a member of the historical and philosophical faculty of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences ("Kurier Wieczorny" [The Evening Courier] 1924, no. 137, p. 3).

After the meeting, the Romanian guest, accompanied by President Morawski, drank coffee and then gave the first of two scheduled lectures at 5 p.m. The first one pertained to Romania and Italian influences - both economic and artistic - being the case in the East. In the evening, at the Juliusz Słowacki Theatre, N. Iorga watched a play - *Kordian* - whose author, after all, was the patron of the theatre. During the performance, the director Teofil Trzciński was the interpreter, or more precisely the commentator of the play. It is worth mentioning that N. Iorga watched only the first act, and after it was over he went to a banquet given in his honour by Colonel dr Józef Aleksander Kryszakowski and his wife (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

19 June 1924 fell on a Thursday. On that very day, the Catholic Church was celebrating one of its festivals called the 'Feast of Corpus Christi'. From the analysis of the programme it appeared that Iorga was to participate in a procession which took place around the Krakow's Market Square (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination).

An interesting fact was - as already mentioned - that the university authorities also planned to organise an excursion for Nicolae Iorga and his companions to Zakopane, a Polish town located at the foot of the Tatra mountains. The letter sent to the rector by the Polish Tatra Society shows that a trip to the Eye of the Sea [lake] was planned during the visit, and that a lecture was to be prepared by a member of the above-mentioned Society and delivered in the presence of Prof. Iorga. Several people were expected to participate in the trip to the Eye of the Sea. A banquet in Zakopane was to be organised by Henryk Dobrowolski and Teofil Janikowski, who was a lessee of a mountain shelter located near the Eye of the Sea (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). This, however, did not happen.

On the following day, 20 June, Nicolae Iorga visited the monuments of Krakow and in the evening at 7 p.m., he gave his second lecture in the University lecture hall. This time he spoke about a famous Romanian Romantic poet - Mihai Eminescu. On the next day, a visit to the Wawel Royal Castle took place and at 5 p.m. Iorga delivered a popular lecture in the Industrial Museum. In the evening, a banquet in honour of the Romanian guest was organised in the hall of the Old Theatre. On the night of Friday to Saturday, Iorga headed to Lviv to continue his journey.

The above-mentioned lecture at the Industrial Museum was announced by the press as follows: "Today, i.e. on Friday, the 20th day of the current month [June] at 5 p.m., Prof. Nicolae Iorga will deliver a popular lecture devoted to knowledge of his country in the hall of the Technical and Industrial Museum (Smoleńska street). The lecture will be supplemented by colourful slides depicting landscapes from Romania and beautiful costumes of the Romanian people. Admission is free". (IKC 1924, no. 167).

It should be noted that the above-mentioned "Czas" newspaper familiarised the inhabitants of Krakow with the figure of Nicolae Iorga as well. It was stated that he was born on 5 June 1871 in Botoșani. He completed his studies in Paris, Leipzig and Berlin. He started his academic career as a historian at the University of Bucharest. The people of Krakow could further learn that he became a member of the Romanian Parliament in 1905 and established the Democratic Nationalist Party in 1908. He published his texts not only in his mother tongue, but also in five other languages, which made him very famous. He was the founder of the 'Institute of South-East European Studies' and

the 'Romanian Institute'. As a corresponding member, he belonged to academic societies in France and Poland (Lviv). It was also stressed that "his works revolve not only around academic and political matters; he is also a poet, a playwright, a translator, and above all an outstanding Romanian prose writer. As a great friend of Poland, he wrote a number of works about this country and encouraged his students to study Polish history, language and literature. Jagiellonian University lecturers - Grigore Nandris and Piotr Nanaitescu - were also his students". ("Czas" 1924, no. 138).

Nicolae Iorga received a lot of attention from "Goniec Krakowski", which appreciated the importance of not only the visit but also of the Romanian guest himself. One could read at the time: "The arrival of this eminent Romanian scholar invited by the Jagiellonian University should arouse great interest in the wider circles of intelligentsia of the city under Wawel Hill. The man who visits us is an academic, a social activist and a politician from a friendly nation who, for various reasons, should be of special interest to us. He is one of the great builders of today's Romania, a true friend of Poland, a man highly popular and influential in his homeland distinguished by his integrity and impeccable character" ("Goniec Krakowski" 1924, no. 138). It was further emphasised that this popularity translated, among other things, into the fact that his academic, literary and political activities were obviously of interest to many people in Romania and have resulted in various publications about him. The author of the article highlighted Iorga's great commitment and relentless energy, which enabled him to quickly complete his higher education. It was also mentioned that he had began lecturing at the University of Bucharest as early as 1894. Moreover, it was written that: "he gained deep understanding of a historian's work. Seeing that there was almost everything to be done in this field in the country, mainly due to extremely insufficient number of source publications, he began to work vigorously in this direction. He made research trips to a number of foreign archives, not excluding, of course, Poland, making copies from manuscript documents concerning the history of his homeland". As reported by "Goniec Krakowski", this research had resulted in dozens of volumes of source material on the history of Romania from different periods. It was also underlined that he focused particular attention on the origins of the Romanian nation by promoting a thesis that the Romanians are descendants of Roman settlers. "However, Iorga's activities also go in another direction. Iorga is perhaps the most prominent promoter of the idea of Romanian unity. Having worked tirelessly in this direction already in pre-war times, in 1910, he established the »democratic nationalist« party, with the main objective of making political life in Romania more moral. The ruthless morality of party leaders is Iorga's motto; the goal - the good of the nation. For Iorga is a nationalist, he sees the nation as an organic whole that lives and develops according to the vitality of its component parts. According to Iorga, every citizen should renounce egoism and sacrifice everything for the good of the nation. Iorga is an anti-Semite at the same time; in understanding the destructive role of the Jewish element in Romanian life, he is also the author of several dissertations concerning the Jewish question". An interesting picture of Nicolae Iorga emerges from the above description. It is important, however, that both nationalism and anti-Semitism mentioned by the journalist of "Goniec Krakowski" should be assessed not from the contemporary perspective, but through the prism of its understanding at the time. In fact, many states in the nineteenth century

experienced a lack of independence and a lack of statehood; hence, the nation was a special value for them. Anyway, it was further stated that Iorga was “a strong supporter of the coalition orientation” and thus called for the unification of the lands inhabited by Romanians. It was also stressed that Nicolae Iorga also supported Polish national aspirations - the aspirations to regain independence. “In these difficult moments, Iorga showed his favour and sympathy for the Polish cause. In 1916, he strongly supported our national aspirations, coming into contact with Polish political leaders with a coalition orientation. This enthusiast of Polish culture and history, appreciating the influence of Poland on the history of Romania, which owes much to us for surviving as an island of Latin culture among foreign cultures, hastened with pleasure to Poland to resume old relations with us”. And it was further written: “Iorga’s visit should remind us of the brotherhood of the two nations culturally linked by ties of the past and now allied in the defence of Western culture - so beloved by this great historian - against the barbaric deluge from the East”. The author of this article also paid tribute and honour to Iorga as a great Friend of Poland. (“Goniec Krakowski” 1924, no. 138, p. 4).

However, Krakow press was not particularly interested in Nicolae Iorga’s presence in the city and at the university. If one considers the two most widely read Krakow dailies, i.e. “Czas” and “Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny” this presence was just mentioned and the stay in the royal city was not covered in detail.

After N. Iorga’s visit in Krakow, financial settlements still had to be made. Hence, the materials from the Jagiellonian University Archives also included accounts. For example, the “Old Theatre” Restaurant operating in the French Hotel in Krakow received an amount of almost 230 zlotys (exactly 229.46 zlotys) (JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination). On the other hand, a stay at the aforementioned French Hotel was valued at almost 240 zlotys (237.20). The total cost of Nicolae Iorga’s stay in Krakow amounted to almost 800 zlotys or at least that is what the Ministry of Foreign Affairs communicated to the Jagiellonian University authorities.

It is worth mentioning that before Iorga arrived in Krakow, his article was published in “Przegląd Współczesny” [Contemporary Review] edited by Professor Wędkiewicz, an academic lecturer at the Jagiellonian University. It was entitled *Polska a Rumunia. Wspomnienia z przeszłości i wskazania na przyszłość*. [Poland and Romania. Memories of the past and recommendations for the future]. The article was written in May 1924, so one can safely assume that it was a kind of announcement and presentation of Iorga’s views on Polish-Romanian issues. Iorga began his considerations from the end of the 17th century by referring to John III Sobieski as “the leader of the modern crusades”, whose political plans were supported neither by the Polish people nor, perhaps above all, by the magnates. He also mentioned Poland’s fight against the Turkish invasion, which the Romanians had to face as well. In the further part of his reflections, he went through the entire 18th century. He stressed that the Romanians instinctively understood the link between their interests and those of Poland. He pointed out that after the partitions “there was never a case in which a Pole, fleeing after the failed uprising against the invaders, did not find in Romania not only a refuge and a temporary shelter, but even a second homeland that welcomed him with kindness and even invited him to civic cooperation with the locals”. (Iorga, 1924, p. 382).

Interestingly, he also noted that after Poland has regained its independence, these signs of ‘cordial sympathy’ were no longer necessary - it was the relationship between the two nations that should be “close, deep and long-lasting”. He argued that the two countries should respect each other and “love each other at least a little”, but for this to happen they also need to get to know each other, and “meanwhile, Poles and Romanians either do not know each other at all or have not entirely accurate perceptions of each other”. He wrote: “Three years ago [1921], I tried to get closer to the Poles by offering them a small book written in French and allowing to get more information about the Romanians. However, the book did not sell at all, and no one thought about translating it into Polish. On the other hand, the history of Poland is not well known in our country: in general, we still almost exclusively bring up the question of past conflicts between the nobles of Poland and Moldavia” (Iorga 1924, p. 383).

He noted that so far not a single Romanian scholar has had the opportunity to deliver lectures in Poland and vice versa. The only Polish-Romanian relations he noticed were the bilateral visits of Marshal Józef Piłsudski to Romania and the royal couple to Poland (Iorga 1924, p. 383). It is important to note that these relations were developing over the following years. Some examples include the visit of the Romanian Minister of Education to Poland (Goldyn 2017) and the signing of the Polish-Romanian cultural and educational convention in 1937 (Goldyn 2019).

In the same volume of “Przegląd Współczesny”, there is an extensive article by Stanisław Wędkiewicz presenting the figure as well as work and activities of Nicolae Iorga. It was written just a few days before the Bucharest professor arrived not only in Krakow, but also in Poland. It was entitled “Życie umysłowe za granicą – Mikołaj Iorga” [Intellectual life abroad - Nicolae Iorga]. In the introduction, the author noted that the development of intellectual life in the areas inhabited by Romanians developed until the middle of the 19th century under difficult conditions and pointed out the main reasons for these difficulties, such as the split between the four state systems - Moldavia, Bukovina, Bessarabia and Transylvania with Banat. He recognised Prof. Nicolae Iorga as one of the leaders of cultural development in Romania, writing, among other things: “Without him, it is impossible to imagine how academic, literary, moral and political life of Romanians would look like, not only in the former Kingdom, but also in the areas subjected to the rule of foreign rulers until 1918. In the face of the unprecedentedly rich results of this scholar’s painstaking, relentless and intensive work, everyone may feel overwhelmed and astonished. The great number of works written by him, the variety of their content, and the incredible amount of erudition make it really difficult to form an opinion about this extraordinary man” (Wędkiewicz 1924).

In the further part of this text Prof. Wędkiewicz familiarised the people of Krakow (and others) with the biography of Nicolae Iorga. He detailed his date and place of birth, the schools and universities he graduated from along with various degrees he earned. He highlighted his political commitment and his efforts to reunify Romania. He also emphasised the fact that Iorga was able to reconcile his political activities with his continuous academic work in an incredible way. He wrote as follows: “pure and selfless, a true idealist, hostile to dirty political shenanigans, helpful to all who need his help, a paragon of diligence and civic dedication - Prof. Iorga has earned the respect and gratitude of the entire nation”. However, he also pointed out that Iorga had a lot of

enemies, who tried to strongly diminish and downgrade his academic research, completely rejecting his views as a scholar. Wędkiewicz also believed that there were those who deliberately sought out Iorga's mistakes and errors and "in this way – with the help of meticulous observations – wanted to dim his fame by making a great noise and obscure the unquestionable uniqueness of his character" (Wędkiewicz 1924: 431).

Naturally, Wędkiewicz believed that the positive reception of Iorga was prevailing. This was evidenced, among other things, by the fact that even representatives of the opposition parties valued Iorga's opinion, and the royal family entrusted him with the education of their son. Further on, Wędkiewicz described Iorga's works, stressing the extremely abundant list of them. According to him, Iorga's publications on historiography were at the forefront. In analysing them, he highlighted the methodology used in the preparation of these works in which Iorga discarded the 'romantic' direction favoured by Tocilescu and adopted a more Western approach to research in the field of history. He also highlighted Iorga's commitment to searching archives almost all over Europe for traces, records or references related to Romania. Furthermore, Wędkiewicz noticed that Iorga's activities in this area had set a new direction in research, which was developing slowly in Romania. He also listed and briefly characterised all these works, summarising them as follows: "All this 'Benedictine' work was done by himself, almost without anyone's help, incurring great personal financial expenses and receiving no due support from state authorities". He also added that they indeed included some errors, mainly due to haste (Wędkiewicz 1924: 434-435).

In the next part of the article, Wędkiewicz focused on discussing methodological issues appearing in Iorga's output. He listed his publications in which this topic was present. Among them, there were such works as: *Współczesne pojęcie historii i jego geneza* [The modern concept of history and its origins] (1894), *O pożytku płynącym ze studiów historycznych* [On the usefulness of historical studies] (1895) or *Dwa pojęcia historii* [Two historical concepts]¹ (1911) (Wędkiewicz 1924: 436).

When analysing Nicolae Iorga's output, the Krakow professor drew attention to another important motif that Iorga employed in his research. Iorga did not consider the history of his nation solely through the prism of politically motivated events concerning, for example, territorial changes or didactic complications. "Iorga [...] thus incorporates all aspects of social life, both manifestations of material and moral culture, i.e. religion, writing, education, commerce and industry, farming, the fine arts, into the scope of his investigations". Then, Wędkiewicz proceeded to list the works that were created using precisely this approach to historical research (Wędkiewicz 1924: 440).

He described another motif of Iorga's academic activities more or less in the following way: "It has already been mentioned that Iorga passionately loves the idea of cultural and political unification of all the Romanians of the inhabited provinces. This gave rise to his consistently maintained mindset, according to which he considers every issue simultaneously in all Romanian areas and he always goes beyond the borders of the former Kingdom" (Wędkiewicz 1924: 443). Thus, when writing about, for example, the literature of the Romanians, Iorga did not limit himself to just one region, such as

¹ In Romanian, this book was entitled: *Doua concepții istorice*.

Bukovina, but characterised and analysed it in a broader geographical context, including other areas where Romanians lived and worked.

In his discussions, Wędkiewicz did not forget to refer to Iorga's nationalism. He characterised it in the following way: "Iorga's nationalist doctrine derives its content from premises that are also widely known in the Western Europe. Political positivism demands that we carefully examine the economic and territorial conditions of a society, learn and understand its history, consolidate the duties and rights deriving from tradition, avoid rationalistic platitudes, perceive the nation as an organic whole, which can develop or wither, live or die, but which cannot change its organic structure on *a priori* order, bear fruit that it is not capable of, or shine with colours it has not been granted by nature. Iorga's nationalism excludes - from collaboration in a party - people who »devote themselves to politics solely for the sake of personal ambition or profit, even if such profit is permitted by law, public opinion, and even social morality«, and instead requires »in the extremely difficult times we are facing today, the most complete renunciation of egoism, the dedication of a political activist entirely to the good of the nation«" (Wędkiewicz 1924: 452).

Without delving into further details of this article, in which some attention was also paid to the relationship with Poland, it has to be noted that it served as an interesting and quite comprehensive introduction to Iorga's visit to Krakow. In this extensive text, Professor Wędkiewicz tried not only to outline the Romanian scholar's academic profile, indicating his areas of interest, but attempted to portray him as a politician as well.

The stay in Krakow was short but quite fruitful. It was certainly an intellectual feast for those who attended the lectures delivered by Nicolae Iorga. It should also be emphasised that the university authorities in Krakow were up to the task and successfully organised the Romanian guest's stay in the former Polish capital. Naturally, they planned an extensive schedule for this stay, but it was not implemented in full as it did not coincide with the programme determined by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, the fact that the local press took a little interest in this visit and wrote about it in a very laconic manner may be somewhat dissatisfying. Accounts of lectures both given at the Jagiellonian University and in the Industrial Museum were completely overlooked.

Krakow, along with Warsaw, Vilnius, Poznan and Lviv, was one of the cities that Nicolae Iorga visited in June 1924. This gives rise to further research and attempts to analyse his stay in the above cities in greater depth and detail. However, this is a topic to be discussed in other articles.

References

1. "Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny" 1924, no. 167, p. 3 (IKC)
2. *Doroczne posiedzenie Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności*, "Czas" 1924, no. 138, p. 1
3. Goldyn P. (2017), *W kręgu polsko-rumuńskiej współpracy oświatowej w pierwszej połowie XX wieku. Wybrane aspekty Aspecte ale colaborării polono-române în domeniul educației în prima jumătate a secolului al XX-lea*, Kalisz-Poznań
4. Goldyn P. (2019), *Polsko-rumuńska konwencja o współpracy kulturalno-oświatowej z 1937 roku*, [in:] *O relacjach polsko-rumuńskich na przestrzeni wieków w Stulecie Odzyskania Niepodległości Polski i Wielkiego Zjednoczenia Rumunii/Despre relațiile polono-române de-a lungul timpului în anul Centenarului Independenței Poloniei i Marii Uniri a României*, Suceava
5. Iorga N., *Polska a Rumunia. Wspomnienie z przeszłości i wskazania na przyszłość*, "Przegląd Współczesny" 1924, vol. 9, pp. 378-383.
6. Jagiellonian University Archives (JUA), JUA, Matter S II 942, no pagination
7. *Mikołaj Iorga*, "Goniec Krakowski" 1924, no. 138, p. 4.
8. *Prof. Mikołaj Iorga w Krakowie*, "Czas" 1924, no. 138, p. 2.
9. *Rocznik Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności. Rok 1924/25*, Kraków 1925.
10. *Rocznik Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności. Rok 1925/26*, Kraków 1926.
11. Telvak V., Yanyshyn B., Telvak V. (2020), *A Visit of Nicolae Iorga to Poland in June 1924: an attempt of reconstruction*, *Analele Universității din Craiova. Istoria*, no. 2 (38)
12. *Uroczyste posiedzenie Akademii Umiejętności*, "Kurier Wieczorny" 1924, no. 137, pp. 2-3.
13. Wędkiewicz S. (1924), *Życie umysłowe zagranicą. Mikołaj Iorga*, "Przegląd Współczesny", no. 26

THE ROMANIAN DIPLOMAT OF EUROPEAN STATURE NICOLAE TITULESCU IN THE VISION OF SOME CONTEMPORARIES

Stoica Lascu*

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.04

Abstract

The Romanian diplomat of European stature, born on March 4, 1882 (died abroad, on March 17, 1941 in Cannes, France) on the coast of France, in a family of Oltenian owners; left without a father (former Deputy and Prefect) at just one year old, Nicolae Titulescu will study law in Paris, and when he returns to the country he will enter political life, in Take Ionescu's party (the Conservative-Democratic Party). He will be a Deputy, Minister of Finance (1917-1918), Minister of Foreign Affairs (1927-1928, 1932-1936), Romania's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to London (1921-1927, 1928-1932), Romania's representative in the League of Nations and its President (twice: 1931 and in 1932). He was member of the Romanian Academy (elected in 1935). This paper presents some opinions (with more recent detailed bibliographic references) excerpted from the book – in 3 volumes, published (under the auspices of the European Titulescu Foundation) in 2012, *Pro și Contra Titulescu*, edited by George G. Potra – of some people politicians, diplomats, and journalists, Romanians and foreigners – contemporaries of him –, relative to the personality of the greatest diplomat of Romania, and one of the most famous of interwar Europe, whose birth marks, in 2022, 140 years.

Key words: Nicolae Titulescu, Diplomacy, League of Nations, Interwar International Relations, George G. Potra

Introduction

The Romanian diplomat Nicolae Titulescu – whose 140th birthday is in this spring (March 4, 1882-17 March 1941) was recognized during his lifetime as one of the greatest and most clairvoyant European statesmen of his time, in the context of diplomacy and international relations in the Interwar Period (Moisuc, 2007: 147-253; Zidaru, 2019: 228-241). Romania's representative in London, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1932-1936), twice consecutive President of the League of Nations in Geneva (1930 and 1931) (Șandru, Bușe, Lupu, 1982: 159-219; Dubicki, 2005: 35-45), he campaigned for European peace through a system of regional alliances guaranteed by the Great Powers and was a fervently promoter of “a policy for maintaining Romania's territorial integrity (Campus, 1966: 225-250).

Dozens of contemporaries (over 250), foreign and Romanian authors (xxx, 2007. *Pro și Contra Titulescu*, 3 Vols.) revealed the dimensioning of the personality of the one who was also one of the greatest speakers of his time: the benefits of democracy, the topicality of some of its foreign political directions, in the international context of the period interwar, the place of our country in the European political-diplomatic architecture, the relations between the “small” countries and the Great Powers, the need to stop the aggressions of the Third Reich, the primordiality of the good neighborly relations with the USSR.

* Professor, PhD, Associate member, Academy of Romanian Scientists, Phone: 0040771161200
Email: lascust@gmail.com

After his resignation on August 29, 1936 – “considered by Romanian historiography as a real failure of global peace” (Potra, Buzatu, Dobrinescu, Dascălu, 1982: 275-329) –, as Foreign Minister, he settled in France, where he died five years later.

As a tribute to this great personality, we now bring back some of the appreciations of contemporaries to him, taken from an extensive work (3 Vols.), composed by the late archivist, historian, and publicist George V. Potra (February 9, 1940-17 December 2015) – “Titulescu’s Faithful and Adopted Son” (Mareș ((2022) –, author on Titulescu (Potra, 2001, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2016), and editor of several Titulescu’s works (Titulescu, 1994, 1996, 2003, 2004, 2007), as well as numerous articles and studies (Potra, 1966: 124-133; 1982: 379-384; 2010: 219-247; 2014: 450-459; 2015: 25-39) on the „a great Romanian, a great European, a great Contemporary” (xxx Titulescu, 2002: *passim*; Năstase, 2021: 7-14), and, no less, “A forerunner of a united Europe” (Coposu, 1991: 12; xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 385; Năstase, 2007: 70).

Appreciations from Some Romanian Diplomats, Politicians, and Journalists

Corneliu Coposu (1916-1995 – Romanian politician): “Titulescu’s dismissal caused consternation in Romania (Potra, 2010: 219-247). Romanian foreign policy, in the case of every Romanian citizen, was related to the presence of Titulescu. With his disappearance at the head of our foreign policy, the Romanian world began to ask where we were going. The same confusion was caused throughout Europe, which commented on the moment with great diligence, considering it a crucial moment to change our political orientation. This change came a little later, but Titulescu’s dismissal was one of the premises that made this change possible. The attempt to orient our country towards Germany, which was later shown, in 1938-39, by the economic pacts and later, in 1940, by our accession to the Rome-Berlin Axis, showed that this initial attempt to get closer Hitler’s Germany was started by the dismissal of Titulescu. No doubt there could be other subjective reasons, but in my opinion, what weighed the most on the scales was the pressure exerted by the Hitlerite Reich” (July 1991) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 386).

Eugen Cristescu (1895-1950 – Head of the Romanian Special Intelligence Service /1940-1944/): “They were to be assassinated (after King Alexander of Serbia and Prime Minister of Romania Ion G. Duca – our note), Nicolae Titulescu and the King of Belgium (he died in February 1934, in suspicious circumstances, in a ski accident – our note), but Nicolae Titulescu, I knew this in time, was very well guarded both in the country and abroad at that time. Titulescu suffered politically and was also politically sacrificed because of Germany” (May 1946) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 433).

Dimitrie Drăghicescu (1875-1945 – scientist, diplomat): “We met with our colleagues (during his student days, in Paris, in the period 1902-1904 – our note) Serbs and Bulgarians at Café Voltaire. We held regular meetings. At these meetings we discussed, informative conferences were held, with a political, economic, social topic. The brightest of the speakers was, of course, Titulescu. Duca, after completing his doctorate, left us, leaving for Bucharest. From these meetings resulted the formation of a student association: *Union des pays danubiens*, with the aim of our solidarity liberation. The status of the association was drafted by Titulescu. And how, among us, he was also

the most generous, although he was not rich either, we printed that status with his money” (March 1945) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 519).

Radu R. Florescu (1925-2014 – American historian of Romanian origin): “Titulescu’s negotiations for the recognition of Bessarabia will remain the most important title of his foreign policy action (Titulescu, 1992: *passim*; Calafeteanu, 2013: 380-382; Enciu, 2017, Mareș, (2022¹). It is an action closely linked to that of rapprochement with Russia, knowing that both countries have a long common border, once the issue of Bessarabia is settled, there is no dispute between the two countries destined to live in good neighborliness. The rapprochement with Russia, Titulescu argued, was to establish conditions of peace in the European East, as Russia no longer feared a possible alignment of Romania with the powers of Central Europe, which under Hitler and Mussolini, by the way of their aggressive policy (Moisuc, 2007: 237-253; Zidaru, 2019: 237-241), were set to change the balance of power in Europe (Titulescu, 2021: 23-235). Romania’s traditional policy was not to seek any gain by exploiting a German-Russian rivalry. He had less to expect from a German-Russian collaboration. I heard Titulescu say that as long as Germany and Russia were opposed to each other, we Romanians had nothing to fear, but in the case of a German-Russian agreement, our situation became much more difficult (Titulescu, 2021: 171-240). In Titulescu’s opinion, Romania, having the task of consolidating its internal economy, had to rely on defensive and non-aggression treaties with its neighbors, under the guarantee of the Great Powers, of which Russia was the most important, being our neighbor” (July 1959) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 573).

Dante Gherman (1891-1973 – lawyer from Arad, delegate to the Great National Assembly in Alba Iulia): “The triumph of light, unsurpassed talent and the work of your Excellency, above the abject politics and petty detractors of our unfortunate country” (September 1931) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 67).

Onisifor Ghibu (1883-1972 – Transylvanian Romanian militant for the Great Union, Professor, Corresponding Member of the Romanian Academy): “I approached Nicolae Titulescu for the first time, from a distance, in the spring of 1915. Although he was part of the Conservative Party, focused on the line of respecting the alliance with the Central Powers, he was on the opposite line, the «Antantist» line, for which we, the Transylvanian refugees, were also fighting. He had given an extraordinary speech at the meeting in Ploiești (Buzatu, 1984: 91-100), on May 3, 1915, bringing to Transylvania praises as no one else had done before, according to Bălcescu: «Romania cannot be whole without Transylvania»” (/1992/) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 68).

Petru Groza (1884-1958 – lawyer and politician: Minister /in the 1920s /, Prime Minister /1945-1952 /, head of Romanian State /1952-1958 /): “I was a colleague of Titulescu in the Averescu government, constituted in January 1920. Two years of close collaboration are enough to get to know the man and the politician. The naive, expansive, almost childish combined with the brilliant intelligence of the debater, always ready to attack, with an amazing promptness in response. In the same government we had a colleague, Take Ionescu, the Boss [*Patronul*] – he was called – and Titulescu’s teacher. But the student flew high above the master” (April 1945) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 143).

Dimitrie Gusti (1880-1955 – scientist, Minister, president of the Romanian Academy /1944-1946/): “for a long time, thanks to your, in Geneva, Romania is considered a great power!” (September 8, 1931: at the Titulescu’s re-election, for the second time in a row, as President of the League of Nations) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 148).

Iuliu Maniu (1873-1953 – Romanian statesman, Prime Minister /1928-1930, 1932-1933/): “He was expelled from the government, obviously, for the reason that the government, in his soul, contrary to his statements, is against politics Mr. Titulescu’s foreign affairs, which was and is the very policy of our nation” (December 1937) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 382).

Ion Mihalache (1882-1963 – Romanian statesman): “We do not know, Minister, why he was fired and how we do not know, I do not know the allies, who were worried (Potra, 2010: 219-247). And it is natural that he does not know, because both your explanation and your procedure are incomprehensible. This policy, which the Foreign Minister set out, with the exception of matters in Poland – on which I will return separately – is nothing but the policy that followed before with Titulescu, with Titulescu’s talent and which was known rightly or wrongly. of «Titulescu politics». I claim that it was and is the politics of the country, but Mr. Titulescu appropriated it classically and made it known, both through the evidence of the justice of our cause and through his exceptional talent. He will say, you are doing «Titulescu politics, without Titulescu» today” (December 15, 1936) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 415).

G. Millian-Maximin (1885-1952 – Romanian journalist): “Romania was not lucky with the three statesmen, marble pillars of our foreign policy, which would have been so necessary in the difficult years – but which seemed, on the surface, so happy – who followed the War of National Integration: Take Ionescu, Ionel Brătianu, Nicolae Titulescu. The foreign policy of the great Romanian and diplomat has always been – and from the beginning – clear: to ensure the borders of Greater Romania (Campus, 1966: 225-250) built with so many Romanian sacrifices and with the broad and Entente support of the Allies and first of all of France (Titulescu, 1994: *passim*; Titulescu, 2021: 171-240).

Two vulnerable borders: Bulgarians, Hungarians. For the Hungarians, Take Ionescu had made, with Edvard Beneš, the Little Entente (Moisuc, 2009: 10-16). Titulescu strengthened it, consolidated it. For Bulgarians, Titulescu concludes the Balkan Agreement with Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey (Oșca, 2021: 99-122).

And as for Russia, our great neighbor, against which it was necessary to have a policy only of realities, and not one of dreams and desires, Titulescu wanted – and worked, struggled, suffered – a policy of friendship, of sincerity.

This was broadly Nicolae Titulescu’s policy. He made it shine, with a personal prestige, from which he shared his homeland in abundance, because we must honestly admit that it was not the country that lent Titulescu its prestige, but Titulescu poured on the Romanian state his personal brilliance and sympathy. the confidence he enjoyed in all the great capitals” (September 15, 1944) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 416-417, 418, 419).

Nicolae I. Ottescu (1885-1950 – lawyer, writer /and memoirist/, politician): “And this tendency to spend a lot has become an irresistible habit. He had 50-60 pairs

of boots, 50-60 suits, about ten coats, about five coats, countless hats, countless flannels, flannels, woolen vests, scarves, pajamas, thick robes (because he was cold in nature, and he had become accustomed to walking thickly dressed). Then his tendency to spend went beyond the field of clothing – without leaving it – to other things. When he moved to Kiseleff Road, he had a passion for carpets for a while, later for leather suitcases of all kinds and sizes, and then for foreign wine boxes, although he was not a wine lover, then for price watches (he had a few watches). Awarded at competitions in Switzerland) which he bought in order to have or to give away. He had a notebook in which he kept all the expenses, a habit that he kept until the end of his life - the notebook, but he never stopped their exaggerated expenses. In his profession, however, Nicolae Titulescu was serious and thoughtful – only in this way could he satisfy these costly whims. He studied the processes down to the smallest detail, wrote his arguments carefully, prevented any objection from the opponent, and knew how to charge fees. I saw him collecting 2-3 thousand lei for a plea, and a lawsuit for all the courts did not cost him less than ten thousand lei. Take Ionescu did not receive higher fees than him either. He had a natural gift for claiming them, which left no room for retort, and the one who hired him – because most of the time he had heard him plead – did not object. But he pleaded so well that the fee, no matter how high the demands, never paid for his unsurpassed work, skill, and talent. It's true, he used to postpone the trials, but he postponed them in order to study them even more thoroughly. He was a Master of Civil Law like no other, which he had fresh in his memory – in his memory, which he had never known deficiencies – and, above all, he had a spirit of analysis of facts and a synthetic spirit of exposition, which gave him the opportunity to rise in his pleadings, without losing a single moment of contact with the realities of the process” (Grecescu, Popa, 1997) (/May 1997/(xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 512).

Cincinat Pavelescu (1872-1934 – Romanian magistrate and epigram writer): “One day, in the box of an antique shop, I find an almanac of the Sorbonne and the Faculties of Law and Letters. I bought it to document the flowery letters I sent to my parents about my classes. Browsing the almanac of the highest institution of French culture, I was struck by the name *Titulescu*, which is repeated many times, with the mention: For the 5th time grand *palmares d'or*. I knew that of all the Romanians who had studied in Paris, they had been distinguished with this exceptional honorary classification: *Ioan N. Lahovary*, a former Conservative Minister, the father of Princess *Martha Bibescu* (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 140-142), one of the greatest writers of modern French literature. Under the name of Titulescu, another note said: «Retained the license thesis for publication and awarded with a prize of 5 thousand francs»!

I came to the Latin Quarter very excited to find out about our valuable compatriot. But his reputation was already legendary. A doctoral student told me an impressive scene. In a room of the Faculty of Law, a Romanian was defending his doctoral thesis. The professor was wrapped in a thick shawl on the chair, just as our old and great Professor of Roman Law *Danielopol* came to class. The teacher was coughing, being very flu-like. It was the famous civilian *Marvel Planiol* who had recently printed his great *Elementary Civil Law Treaty* at the publisher Pichon, 24 rue Soufflot. While the future Doctor of Law was defending his thesis, N. Titulescu also entered the room, driven by a simple curiosity. Professor Planiol sees him and gestures familiarly to take a seat next

to him. Quite embarrassed, Titulescu obeys. At the end, when the teacher had to speak and summarize in a brief and scholarly critique the thesis with its shortcomings and qualities, he leans over to his former student and asks him, because of his absent voice, to make a summary in his place of the thesis and the critique of the paper. Titulescu stands up, thanks the professor for the flattering honor he does him, and, apologizing for the inadequacy of his preparation because he was in the room only by chance, develops, in the uncontrollable admiration of all, a true lecture on the work, full of merit. , of his colleague and shows a high level of vision, an erudition, a critical spirit and an eloquence that are not found even in the greatest and most versed university professors.

As a simple corollary of this scene, I later heard that, when N. Titulescu left Paris, the teachers offered him an agape and took him *in corpore* to the train station. Why should we be surprised today that, when the great diplomat passes through the border stations, he is greeted by all the ministers, the presidents of the councils and the high authorities of each country? (1934 /June 1969/) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 41-42).

N.N. Petrașcu (1901-1974 – lawyer, journalist): “Apart from the alliance relations with France, Romania’s foreign policy, led by Mr. Titulescu, had relations of perfect harmony and friendship with England. The United Kingdom is today – and will continue to be – one of the leading states in the world. Will you allow me to read Mr. Titulescu’s characteristic of Great Britain, which I ask you to listen to carefully, being one of the most perfect syntheses of all that I know?

«The Great Britain evokes for me a complex of human qualities so chosen that, to the extent that it encompasses them, they are a source of high esteem, and to the extent that they surpass you, you can achieve them only by worshipping a feeling. of admiration. The strength of character has never been more harmoniously united with gentleness, the conscience of justice, generosity, the power of action with discipline and patience, as in British individuality. The whole of Britain’s action, domestic and international, is only a reflection of this soul-making of the race. Within its borders, Britain, protected from three centuries of rebellion or war on its own territory, has succeeded in depicting a way of life that cannot be surpassed and that is based on a single foundation: dignity. Outside its borders, Britain, through the perfect balance of its judgment, its pacifying spirit, its Entente of this fundamental truth that it cannot be prosperity for some based on the ruin of others, has managed to work the miracle of turning its national selfishness into an international function. Romania can be proud to be one of its friends in the United Kingdom and to have an offspring of the British dynasty» (Titulescu, 2007: 161-162, 172-173).

Apart from these friendships, on the one hand, the Franco-English friendship, outside the alliances: the Little Entente and the Balkan Entente, Mr. Titulescu, in his policy, was concerned with asserting a perfect policy with one of the largest states we have as neighbors, with Russia. In this regard, he has often been questioned by certain personalities, especially by Mr. Gheorghe Brătianu (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 179-182).

The first interpellation in this regard was the interpellation of November 28, 1932, when Mr. Titulescu opposed the conclusion of a non-aggression pact – he was then a minister in London – a pact that would have reduced the situation in which we found ourselves and would have worsen it because, at the time, we had the Briand-Kellog Pact

in force with Russia, far superior to the proposed pact. After successful negotiations, Mr. Titulescu was able, when he personally led the Romanian-Russian negotiations, to establish with Russia a regime that, after signing the non-aggression pact and defining the aggressor (Bacon, 1999: 93-102), came to establish a friendship between these states, indispensable friendship because posed a problem and, perhaps, the most important for us, because Russia is our greatest neighbor, a friendship commanded by geographical imperatives, first of all, and by that historical, secondly, because the war between Romania and Russia does not I never had. This was necessary in order to consolidate our country and the peace of Romania, achieved without sacrificing any national ideal. (Applause) Mr. Titulescu, on occasion of another interpellation, answering the interpellant, said: «We must be friends with Russia. There can be no Little Entente (Campus, 1980: *passim*) in the face of friendship. Let's melt everything that could hinder Romanian interests. That is the whole point of my policy towards the USSR.» (Applause) I forgot to mention that, by signing the aggressor's pact, the situation in Bessarabia was indirectly recognized, expressly stipulating: «that the territory of a nation is equal to the territory over which a state currently exercises authority», so all of Romania's borders were fully secured by the foreign policy pursued by Mr. Titulescu. (Applause.) (Constantin, 2018: 24-46). In addition, we had an alliance with Poland, which is in the current form of mutual guarantee of all frontiers since 1931, and which is again necessary for the smooth running of our foreign policy. Apart from these alliances and friendships, we had good relations with all the states, because Mr. Titulescu's policy starts from a great principle, it was a policy of peace (Titulescu, 1996: *passim*; Titulescu, 2017; Năstase, Potra, 2008: 66-75, 263-268, 407-412; Potra, 2015: 25-39), because Romania only sought to maintain its territorial status quo and thus be able to become a thriving state for the realization of its most precious good, to raise the homeland to the height to which it is entitled (Applause)” (February 11, 1937) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 54-55).

Stelian Popescu (1874-1954 – journalist, politician): “But, if I was not always in Titulescu's opinion, this could not and cannot prevent me from recognizing and affirming, in front of the country, the considerable value of his activity in foreign policy. The work done by Titulescu in the service of the country (Năstase, Potra, 2008: 229-238), his superior qualities, the extraordinary appreciation, as well as the esteem and authority he enjoys abroad, and from which he sought to make the most of his country, made me regret deeply that the current government found it appropriate to deprive it of its support, at a time when the country needed, more than ever, its brilliant intelligence (Năstase, 1995: *passim*). Of course, Titulescu, like any human being, has some flaws, but these can at most harm him personally. However, his intellectual and spiritual qualities are so extraordinary and overwhelming that his authority has prevailed everywhere, and wherever his word and intelligence have been appreciated, he has aroused the unanimous admiration of even his opponents. Through the almost 15-year permanent contact he has had with the most authoritative exponents of the world's foreign policy, Titulescu came not only to know and appreciate the people and the peoples at their fair value, but to anticipate in advance the difficulties they had to avoid or overcome. Titulescu thus served his country abundantly, skillfully, usefully, gaining strong ties of friendship, and often his superior intelligence was called upon to give

general European solutions to problems that seemed unbeatable. One of the most solid results of its activity and provision in the interest of the country was the Pact for the Organisation of the Little Entente concluded in February 1933 (Moisuc, 2007: 154-173). Realizing that, through the geographical situation of the member states, by the moral authority of the idea of international justice represented by their own political settlement, by the historical basis of their existence as nation-states out of the will of the nations that compose them, and by the considerable strength of their solidary armies, the Little Entente (Campus, 1980: *passim*) can play a role Titulescu conceived, persevered and succeeded in giving the Little Entente the organization of 1933, which definitively linked the three states. Unifying their foreign policy and without undermining any of the national sovereignty of each, the 1933 pact framed the foreign policy of the Little Entente and its attitude to all European issues within the limits of absolute solidarity, which does not allow any of the three states to do something without the prior consent and support of others. Great work, work in line with the particular interest of each of the three states and their common interest, a work useful to the security of each state and to European peace in general (Preda, 2021: 390-399). Through this organization, the Little Entente was raised to the potential of the Great Powers, it was put on an equal footing, as it should be, with the great powers, and thus its word was given the full authority it should have. Let everyone look to the past and see what prestige, what authority the Little Entente enjoyed as long as this strong covenant between the states that make it up has been sacredly respected" (April 1937) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 104-105).

Savel Rădulescu (1895-1970 – Romanian diplomat; Under Secretary of State at Romania's Minister of Foreign Affairs /1932-1936/): "One of those rare people who brought together the qualities of a great thinker and at the same time a director, Titulescu marked a moment of greatness in the history of contemporary foreign policy of the country (Rădulescu, 1969: 373-435).

His work from now on will take on its true dimensions and will talk to the future.

Pilgrim of peace (Titulescu, 1996: *passim*), firmly believing in a better organization of the world, his message of peace will always resound.

If I were to put a «motto» to Titulescu's policy, I would say that he tried to replace «the law of force» with «the force of law»; campaigned for the moral idea of international politics; she believed in a peace that could only be maintained by fighting for it; and above all, Titulescu was a great Romanian and a great patriot who put his whole being in the service of defending the country, its sovereignty and independence.

Titulescu was an exceptional wealth of gifts, a great intellectual brilliance, a generous waste of qualities, which, only at great intervals in the history of a country, meet on a man.

Many knew Titulescu the minister, Titulescu the speaker, Titulescu the diplomat, Titulescu the lawyer. Fewer have known the diversity and multiple attributes of man. As one of whom I have had the great privilege of enjoying his trust and affection, of having been his closest collaborator to the end of his political life, as one of whom I have known his activity and qualities, it may be my duty – when I am asked – to reveal, especially to those who did not know him, the multiple, complex and rich gifts and to present the coordinates that define man.

With a completely exceptional intelligence, far exceeding the usual one, Titulescu had a great power to assimilate the specifics and relations of ideas, in order to reach generalizations and ingenious solutions, with astonishing speed.

His speech was light, clear, logical, sometimes charming, sometimes stern, or incisive, and the mastery of his eloquence made him regarded as one of the greatest orators of his time on the international stage.

His eloquence, full of eloquence, acquired over time a sobriety as imposing as it was charming. Those who have heard Titulescu will not forget the spell of his eloquence.

Titulescu prepared the great speeches through a thorough study and research of the issue and his only concern was the convincing effect of the arguments, their succession and dosage. The form came to him speaking and he rarely prepared the end of a speech.

His notes were few and laconic. I remember the opening speech of the League of Nations in 1931, when for the second time in a row – an unprecedented situation – its president was elected; a few notes on an envelope. I was accompanying him to the Assembly.

He was sitting in the car quiet and thoughtful. The speech was brilliant. The English newspaper «Times» emphasized the importance of the content of that speech in the feature article the next day – a little used; the form, when it came to Titulescu, was understood to be exceptional” /1966/ (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 186-187).

A.P. Samson (1907-? – journalist, author of a volume of memoirs published in 1979): “In June 1933, at a restaurant wagon table where Cezar Petrescu [Romanian writer] was also present, I heard Victor Iamandi [Romanian politician] say that if Ionel Brătianu [1864-1927; former in several times Prime Minister; the last time: June-November 1927] was still alive six months, Romania would have become a republic. The Liberal leader, Iamandi explained, had no confidence in Prince Nicholas and the Patriarch and considered Buzdugan (all three, members of the Regency, established after the death of King Ferdinand I /July 20, 1927/) – our note] an honest jurist, but not a surface figure capable of resisting pressure to return Carol to the throne. Titulescu’s solution – president of the Republic seemed much better. First, once the form of the state was changed, it would have been much harder to return to the Monarchy. Secondly, Titulescu enjoyed such prestige inside and outside that its removal seemed impossible. A National-Peasant government overseen by Titulescu it was becoming bearable and the most important opposition party would have agreed to the establishment of the Republic. As for the left, no matter the nuances, it could not refuse its support for a Republican movement” /1979/ (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 235).

Constantin Vișoianu (1897-1994 – Minister of Foreign Affairs /November 1944-February 1945/; refugee in the USA in 1946): “Let us remember Titulescu’s great struggle for the stability of the treaties, by respecting the word given and the commitments accepted (Grecescu, Popa, 1997: *passim*; Năstase, Potra 2008: 476-482). He saw here a fundamental principle of international life, the very basis of peace and the most important protection of smaller countries. A small state can rest its security on

the strength of a neighboring and strong state, making a good deal with it. He must never become an accomplice or instrument of foreign aggression against this neighbor. He must strictly pursue a policy of enforcing treaties and respecting morality in international life. Unleashing force is almost never conducive to him. Titulescu knew that Romania had the vocation and interest of peace (Turcu, Voicu, 1984: *passim*; Năstase, 1995: 27-37, 61-64; Titulescu, 1996: *passim*) and that its development and consolidation could only be done in a regime of peace and stability” (December 1944) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 441).

Constantin Xeni (1878-1963 – lawyer, politician, publicist): “Taking stock of this eccentric and hectic life, in which so much intelligence, so much talent, so much noisy publicity, so much spending on speeches, banquets and money has been wasted, you wonder what he used and what he did remained, as a constructive work, from this bizarre politician? The leading creed of his political life was the close adherence of our Anglo-French alliance policy, a policy based on the Little Entente and the Balkan Entente (Vanku, 1986: *passim*; Moisuc, 2007: 154-173; Preda, 2021: 390-399). It was not a purely sentimental policy, springing from the indestructible bond of gratitude for the creation of Greater Romania (Titulescu, 2015: 25-39), but it was the only policy that the very logic of things commanded. Therefore, no one contradicted this policy, except for small and sporadic manifestations of several politicians without any echo in the country. Take Ionescu ((xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 260-262) had died in 1922, Ionel Brătianu (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 182-184) in 1927. However, there is no doubt that until the outbreak of the war on September 1, 1939, they would have persisted in the same policy. Romania, having sacred and inalienable rights over Transylvania, Banat, Bukovina, was and is destined to live in eternal hostility with Hungary. We could only achieve Greater Romania once (Constantin, 2018: 24-45), when, by the luck of coincidences, we found ourselves in the Franco-Anglo-American camp, so in the camp always hostile to the Germans and the Hungarians. How could we have kept the new borders except by persevering in those friendships, as the Hungarians have persevered for centuries in alliance with Germany? An elementary logic therefore required us to persevere in our 1916 policy. Also, to secure our borders, Take Ionescu’s idea of close solidarity of war-torn countries to win a possible revenge on Germany and Hungary was dictated by common sense itself. A sincere coalition of the new states would have stopped Germany’s courage to attack in 1939. Unfortunately, sincerity and goodness were defeated by the narrow selfishness of the new states. The Little Entente could not bear fruit. The Balkan Entente, another wise political composition, lived only as long as the intelligent King Alexander I of Serbia lived, and the energetic Atatürk (Alpan, 1982: *passim*) they both made the Balkan Entente (Campus, 1980: *passim*; Oșca, 2021: 99-122) and believed in it (Vanku, 1986: *passim*). When the former was assassinated (because he had become uncomfortable with the invasion plans) and when the latter, left alone, also died in 1938, the 1939 world war could be unleashed without fear of any solidary Balkan resistance.

Titulescu’s policy was therefore logical and the only possible one (Titulescu, 1994: *passim*; Titulescu, 2021: 171-240). No one could have foreseen the catastrophic defeat of France in May 1940, nor the sudden alliance of Germany with Russia in August 1939. They were not in the normal logic of a healthy mind. They were surprises. That is why

it can be said that the fixing of our foreign policy was not wrong. But we encountered an unpredictable misfortune. No more. And at the time when I write these lines, the final fate of the weapons is still shrouded in mystery. However, three other principles of his policy were badly inspired: the belief that, thanks to his ability, Russia had given up Bessarabia, his overconfidence in the effectiveness of the League of Nations, and his stubborn opposition to the enthronement of the Habsburgs. Take Ionescu also believed that living well with Russia was an absolute historical necessity, as I have shown elsewhere. But in order to live well with her, how could Titulescu imagine that the Moscow colossus would give up Bessarabia (Dobrinescu, 1996: *passim*; Constantin, 2018: 24-46; Petrencu, 2020: 53-58; Titulescu, 1992) forever only because he agreed with Litvinov (Oprea, 1967: 35-38; Lipatti, 1987: 44-47; Mareș, 2022¹ [Litvinov]: 6), signing an ambiguous protocol?! Through his manifest manifestations of ostentatious cordiality with the Russians (who at that time were feared and detested by France, as well as by England), we gained nothing but their distrust. And at the first opportunity, the Russians showed us, in June 1940, what their true policy was towards us and what naive illusions Titulescu had. Soviet Russia, like Tsarist Russia, has not given up and will not give up even the smallest piece of land it thinks it deserves. Bessarabia is one of them. Russia's friendship, today as well as tomorrow and as always, we will only be able to obtain it by giving up this land, if we want to give up. Therefore, neither Titulescu (if he had lived) nor any other statesman could have avoided the bloody conflict with Russia. As for the League of Nations (Dubicki, 2005: 35-45), it was natural for Titulescu to have an enthusiastic solicitude for it, especially when England and France had the same policy" /2009/ (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 496-497).

Appreciations From Some Foreign Personalities

Tevfik Rüstü Aras (1883-1972 – Turkish politician and diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs /1925-1938/): "Minister, at this table, at which the government of the Republic is happy to celebrate Your Excellency, one cannot help but feel the warm atmosphere surrounding the cooperation thus established between Turkey and Romania (Necip, 1982: *passim*; xxx, 1982: *passim*) for the cause of peace, towards which we have shown a sincere love (...). This friendship was greatly facilitated by an event that preceded it for a short time and that will forever remain historic. In fact, last year, almost at the same time, we were meeting in London for important negotiations, from which came the definition of the aggressor, a definition that we formulated and enshrined, as is well known, in a joint statement.

If this instrument of peace, out of the generous and clairvoyant initiative of the great statesman who is my distinguished and dear friend Mr. Litvinov, could be concluded without too much difficulty, we must admit that it is mainly due to the spirit of conciliation. and the high wisdom of Your Excellency" (May 11, 1934) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 63, 64-65).

Jacques Bainville (1879-1936 – French historian and journalist): "Mr. Titulescu occupies an unparalleled political and moral situation in his country and in Europe. He has the trust of an entire people (Năstase, 2002: 38-49, 65-69, 134-138; Năstase, Potra 2008: 407-412). As soon as Romania sees or suspects a difficulty, it addresses Mr. Titulescu. As a result, he has been Foreign Minister for several days in circumstances

that have no equivalent or precedent. Mr. Titulescu is far from seeking power. In fact, he refused it several times. He was content to be a minister in London and a delegate to the League of Nations, when he resigned last week as a protest against the conduct of negotiations on the Russian-Romanian [non]aggression pact. It was a warning, which resounded throughout the Romanian nation. Immediately Mr. Vaida-Voevod asked him to take over the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and so it is said that, resigned yesterday, he is a minister today and on the way from London to Bucharest he makes a stop at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The alarm bell rang by him, and perhaps more than anywhere else, in Paris” (October 1932) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 111).

Bohuslav Beneš (1901-1977 – Czechoslovak diplomat and journalist; nephew of Edvard Beneš): “In the undeclared but savage war of political ideologies, which has shaken nations and states for 20 years, a few true giants, strong personalities, fearless fighters for a new and better Europe, have managed to maintain their verticality. These men could have organized international peace well if theirs had recognized their value and followed them. Definitely, one of the best was Nicolae Titulescu, the greatest Romanian of our times (Năstase, 2002: 11-16).

Titulescu dies at the time of the biggest crisis in his country. But his remarkable person remained untouched by the mud and dirt of the leading, Nazified groups of the Romanian nation. Even when he was unable to shape his country’s life as Foreign Minister, he saved – thanks to his withdrawal from Romania’s position of honor, alarmed by corrupt and terrorist Nazism (Georgescu, 1966: *passim*; Oprea, 1966: 275-340) – at least the honor of the honest Romanian people, as whoever knew this genius, will remain forever convinced that the Romanian nation will recover from its temporary illness and will re-enter the path that Titulescu led. In Geneva (Năstase, Potra 2008: 365-368, 459-468), I called him Titus, and Titus knew it. He did not care and was the best, most cheerful and cantankerous comrade of the ministers, diplomats, and journalists of the League of Nations. Tall-bodied, slightly brought from behind, in front of whom the tailors stood amazed, with monkey-like shoulders and beautiful and delicate hands, with a high forehead and a worried face and at the same time a young man, always full of life, to Titulescu he was destined either to love his friends, nations, continents, or to hate them to death, knowing how to express both feelings with the same passion. It is already in the public consciousness of the world the role played by Titulescu in the first organization of the Little Entente (Campus, *passim*; Bacon, 1999: 223-231). In his capacity as Foreign Minister, Titulescu belonged to that pleiad of exceptional people in this field, who sincerely endeavored to justly coordinate national aspirations with the needs and interests of the international community. And in this direction, Titulescu had a very difficult mission. Sometimes, at the end of a long telephone conversation with Bucharest, he discovered that his illustrious sovereign was once again thinking of changing his Minister of Foreign Affairs. In such cases, he prefers to go to Geneva or Montreux (Moisuc, 2007: 249-252; Gemil, 2022: 179-180) during the internal crisis of his government to overcome the misfortune of his country in his own mind and in his own person. Fate often decided that a crisis would break out in Bucharest when Titulescu managed to bring Litvinov or other politicians to a deal. All he had to do was curse the whole world and go to the sunny south of France or the mountains of Switzerland. At that moment, we journalists understood how difficult it

was for him to represent a king and a divided nation, even though his conscience commanded him to remain on the international front of sound judgment.

He was a man of collective security, of the Little Entente, and of friendship with Western democracies (Preda, 2021: 390-399; Potra, 2015¹). He was called to this authority by his invincible genius. Romanian, unparalleled worldwide but as a speaker and participant in debates in French, excellent jurist (Grecescu, Popa, 1997: *passim*; Năstase, 2002: 57-60; Năstase, Potra, 2008: 476-483), Titulescu flirted at times with the idea of settling in London as a lawyer, when he would leave politics, given that law and language English was just as familiar to him. When Dr. Beneš was sometimes absent from Geneva, of course I had Titulescu there. He loved the Czechoslovak people as his own people. He held Beneš and Masaryk, and with Edvard Beneš (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 172-173) he was both good and bad at countless international conferences of Europe's largest offensive and defensive diplomatic campaign in post-war politics. By nature, a first-born ballerina, he did not know how to retire in time when his friend or a better man than he was involved. But at the same time, he knew how to fight like a Tartar, whose blood flowed in his veins every time he had a just cause to defend. His eloquence, sentence construction, humor, and cadence of his speeches in League of Nations were unsurpassed (Năstase, Potra, 2008: 459-468)" (March 28, 1941) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 131, 132, 133).

René Cassin (1887-1976 – French jurist, co-authoring of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights /1948/, winner of Nobel Peace Prize /1968/): "It gives me great pleasure to respond to the request of young people in Romania regarding celebrity, especially since in the past I had the opportunity to meet a *real Romanian celebrity*, unanimously appreciated in Europe and which played a significant role in the international political life of those times: this man was called *Nicolae Titulescu*."

Before I met him at the League of Nations, where I worked on dozens of topics, I knew that Nicolae Titulescu was one of the glories of the University of Paris, which proposed him to keep in his faculty. Titulescu, however, as a great patriot who was and how he remained until the end of his days, although he was almost exiled after 1936, he preferred to return to Romania, although he had a great affection for France (Potra, 2014: 450-459; Otea, 2018: 16-21).

What I admired most about Titulescu was his uninterrupted efforts to seek a system of international relations based on equity, equality, and mutual respect (Buzatu (ed.), 1982: *passim*; Năstase, 2002: 27-37, 57-64; Titulescu, Potra, 2008: 450-475; Preda, 2021: 390-399). Unfortunately, the League has not been able than too little to achieve the goals for which it was created. However, this historical imbroglio cannot diminish the merits of those who sincerely and perseveringly, as were Herriot, Briand, Barthou, and Titulescu, they wanted to place the nations in a security system that would protect them from the specter of war. I appreciate that Titulescu's actions were meant to encourage at the League of Nations the resistance, solidarity and a determined attitude against fascist aggression and war" (1971) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 251-252).

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill (1874-1965 – British statesman; several times, Minister, and Prime Minister): "How I First Spoke with him [Winston Churchill], I [Ioan Hudiță /1896-1982/, *Jurnal politic* /Solcanu, 2015: *passim*/] briefly explained my

studies, the situation in education and my membership in the National Peasant Party. I found from the beginning that he knew very well the political situation in Romania, he knew Carol personally (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 228-246), of whom he has the worst opinions, he had heard of Maniu and Vaida (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 379-422) and he had known Ion Brătianu. He asked me what Titulescu was doing and whether he had improved his health. «Here is a first-rate figure in international politics, he says. This man, if he had been listened to, might not have reached Hitler's madness today ((xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 162-163); the pact with the Soviets, which he so fervently envisioned², was true, could not be achieved

² In the conference held in London, in the plenary of the House of Commons, on June 9, 1937, Nicolae Titulescu will argue the need for European states to have at least non-conflicting relations with the USSR, warning that "Should the Soviets feel that they had been abandoned by the Western States, they would be poor diplomats if they did not try to come to a direct understanding with Germany"; he told, among other things, the British parliamentarians (inconclusion, praising also English democracy): "Today the Franco-Russian Assistance Pact is meeting with a new difficulty in regard to the conclusion of military agreements. The Russians want military agreements; the French government hesitates.

I consider it a big mistake not to conclude these agreements immediately. The military agreements would in no way amplify France's obligations for the cases in which she is obliged to go to war.

If France does not consider Soviet Russia to be the victim of an aggression, both the political agreement and the military agreements are dead letters.

But if France considers she should go to war and if no military agreements exist to co-ordinate in advance the Russian and French operations, France enters chaos and risks to lose the war, because of the lack of concerted action beforehand, between her and her ally, Soviet Russia.

That is very dangerous. And the situation makes me more uneasy when I realized at the Soviets may consider the refusal to conclude the military agreements as a tacit cancellation of the Mutual Assistance Pact with France, and therefore, they may be led to seek their security by an understanding with Germany. We must not forget that Hitlerism propaganda is the Germanisation of Central Europe. No contrary propaganda is made by the democratic States. Things have gone so far, that there are many people in Central Europe who admire, as bold and powerful acts, the cruelties that the totalitarian States inflict, because they hear no voice to blame.

We must also remember that, in spite of the struggle of ideology, there are many points of contact between the Germans and the Russians.

The friendship between the heads of the two armies and the intensity of the economic exchanges between the two countries are a proof of it. It must not be forgotten that the Russians and the Germans have traditional ties of friendship and that the Russians only accidentally became allies of France. Before the Great War, the Kaiser made the mistake of not renewing the treaty of reassurance with Russia promoted by Bismarck and this led the Russians to ally themselves with France. In recent years, it was the attacks made by Chancellor Hitler on Communism and his threats, which decided the Russians to sign the Pact of Mutual Assistance with France. And it must be added that the greatest advantage of the Franco-Soviet Treaty is of a negative order: the fact that Soviet Russia will not help the German army with her troops and her raw materials.

Should the Soviets feel that they had been abandoned by the Western States, they would be poor diplomats if they did not try to come to a direct understanding with Germany.

And, in that case, France and Great Britain would find themselves alone, facing a Germany strengthened by having at her disposal all the raw materials from Russia and by the neutrality

because of the opposition of our naive governments (Micu, 2013: *passim*; Scurtu, 2013: 76-85), who believed and continue to believe in the holy mission of Hitler's crazy to liquidate Bolshevism» (September 9, 1938) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 341).

Robert Anthony Eden of Avon (1897-1977 – British statesman; Minister and Prime Minister): “Eden immediately spoke of Titulescu. «By the way, he says, what does Titulescu, my good friend, do to this agile and enchanting mind, and so clairvoyant in international politics; I still wonder how it was possible for your country to dispense with the political activity of this man, who represents a great authority in all international forums?» I [Ioan Hudiță, *Jurnal politic*] explained the current position of Titulescu, who, as a member of the party leads the fight against the dictatorial regime of King Carol (Mareș, 2022: 7). On this occasion, I also showed him the current situation in our country, the total bankruptcy of the royal policy and the country's concern about Hitler's aggressive and warlike policy. We especially insisted on the foreign policy of our party, which has always demanded loyalty to France, England, and the Little Entente and fought the alliance with Poland as long as this country flirts with Germany. I then showed him that we wanted an agreement with the Soviets to settle our territorial disputes and how this was sabotaged by King Carol, who went so far as to brutally oust Titulescu from the government (Năstase, Potra, 2008: 153-182; Potra, 2010: 219-247), who had already reached an agreement with Litvinov” (September 8, 1938) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 536).

Sir Robert H. Greg (1876-1953 – UK Plenipotentiary Minister in Bucharest /1926-1929/): “I am happy to work with a Foreign Minister who knows England so well, so many English personalities and who acquired such a special position in London³” (July 1927) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 111).

of Central Europe. In such case, Germany would be stronger than if she had been victorious in a war in the East, in which the Western Powers had taken no part, for she would have made none of the sacrifices that war implies.

That is why I say: «Take care of the Soviets. If you do not have them with you, it means that you will have them against you».

To conclude the above remarks, I would say: Europe is struggling now to achieve its unity. Europe will obtain unity, either by the victory of the parties of the Right, or by the victory of the parties of the Left.

In the first case, we shall witness a backward step in history for, for some time, the liberties of democracy, the fruit of long struggle and of bitter sacrifice, will be suspended.

In the second case, we shall see a scene of happiness: Europe will be living a healthy democracy, that can conciliate the demands of liberty with those of authority. It is for English democracy to put itself at the head of the great struggle which is beginning to that end. It is English democracy which must save the dignity of the human being. It is for English democracy to dispel the anxiety caused by the fear that dictatorship may spread beyond its present frontiers, that it may install itself everywhere, in every country, to ravish from each one of us the principal reason for which we live: our Freedom” (Titulescu, 2007: 161-162 /*doc.* 133/).

³ Nicolae Titulescu has given numerous conferences in London. In 1937 (Năstase, Potra, 2008: 203-228), he recalled an event in Geneva (where Titulescu was chairman of a subcommittee) in 1923, when Britain opposed Ethiopia's admission to the League of Nations: “One evening about seven o'clock, Lord Halifax rather ironically put me the direct question: «What is our Chairman's opinion?» I made the excuse that it was too late to begin to speak and we made

Gustave Guillaume (1883-1939 – Minister Plenipotentiary of Belgium in Bucharest): “I am moved by the incomparable success you achieved in Geneva for the happiness of Europe and the glory of the Little Entente (Năstase, Potra, 2008: 363-368). I am glad to see today that all my hopes have been dashed: the speech you delivered in Geneva is the most beautiful crown of your admirable diplomatic action” (December 11, 1934) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 144).

Hailé Selassié (1892-1975 – Emperor of Ethiopia /1930-1974/): “Relations between Ethiopia and Romania are not recent. We have known each other for a long time and the knowledge has long since turned into sympathy and friendship. Particularly, I personally will never forget the courageous support I received from Mr. Titulescu (xxx, 1995: 512-514; Potra, 2005: 63-64), then Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania, on the unfortunate day when I asked the League of Nations for help against the fascists who invaded Ethiopia. «What Titulescu did for the Ethiopian people is inscribed in the hearts of all Ethiopians, and the memory of his deeds will live on forever»” (September 27, 1964) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 149).

Édouard Herriot (1872-1957 – French statesman, Prime Minister of France /1924-1926, 1932/): “This minister of a small country is doing politics in a big way. What an amazing man! In foreign policy he is embarked on a light boat ride like a big ship; In domestic politics, he rides on a rotten board which, in the end, gives him rock stability. Amazing man who did not have and will not have anyone like him” (/1965/) II: 158).

Henry Lémery (1874-1972 – lawyer, French /from Martinica/ politician): “«Europe needs Mr. Titulescu today». Evoking the tragic disappearance of some great political figures, such as Albert I, Ion Duca, Chancellor Dollfuss, King Alexander I,

an appointment for the following morning. I went home feeling depressed. I did not know what to do. In the villa near Geneva, where I was staying, there was a fine library. Mechanically I took a book and I opened it at random. I fell on a passage that filled my heart with joy. I was saved. Next day I said to Lord Halifax, «Is Great Britain against the admission of Ethiopia to the League for the simple reason that slavery exists there?» – «Yes», said Lord Halifax. «Then I am in favour of the admission of Ethiopia», I replied, «for slavery is a natural institution, and to prove it, I shall quote not Aristotle, who first said so, but an author whom no Englishman would dare to dispute: *Darwin*. And I opened the book that I had found by chance the evening before and read what it said in substance: ‘ants are accustomed to keep slaves. The ant slave brings food to the mistress ant.

The latter is accustomed to being carried on the back of the ant slave. But a curious thing», remarks *Darwin*, «there are only two kinds of ants which make slaves. There are the ants which belong to the two most liberal nations in the world, Switzerland and Great Britain», «But», adds *Darwin*, as a good Englishman, «The English ants treat their slaves more kindly than do the Swiss ants». Everyone began to laugh. And so I passed rather skillfully the first headland in my diplomatic career. But Lord Halifax did not lay down his arms. He took from his case the agreement prohibiting the importation of arms into Ethiopia, and with documents in support, alleged that Ethiopia had violated it, adding, «And now, quote *Darwin* again, if you can!»

A few days later, agreement having been reached between France, Italy, and Great Britain, I signed the letter by which I informed Ethiopia of her admission into the League” (Titulescu, 2007: 172-173 /doc. 134/).

and appreciating that this is deeply worrying, the new Minister of Justice France [October 15-November 9, 1934] stressed the need to continue the political work currently interrupted by the disappearance of those personalities mentioned above, never forgetting that one should not believe that the virtues and talents at the forefront are inexhaustible. «That is why, deeply moved at the beginning by the unexpected announcement of the resignation of the great Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Titulescu, I then found out with joy that he agreed to resume his high positions. In the face of the tragic lesson of events, the unanimous desire calls to power, with increased authority, the man most capable of command and who is a friend of France. Through the power of his personality, through the brilliance of his services, through the prestige of his intelligence and talent, Mr. Titulescu is not only the most prominent statesman of Romania; he is the director of consciousness of the Little Entente, which is largely his work. He occupies a prominent place in European politics in this regard. With a keen insight, he understood that the three powers to which the treaties had finally given the legitimate territorial status in Central Europe: Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, could only play the erased role, if they remained isolated, while they would by uniting them, they are the equivalent of great power and would play a decisive role in European affairs» (October 21, 1934) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 343-344).

Maksim M. Litvinov (1876-1951 – Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR /1930-1939/): “He was a great diplomat, one of the most illustrious of the period between the two wars. Regarding the relations between Romania and the USSR, Titulescu understood the need for normal relations not only from a diplomatic point of view [diplomatic relations established on February 9, 1934], the only one able to resolve all disputed issues in the spirit of national interests of both countries (Titulescu, 2021: 171-240). He campaigned in all seriousness – I was convinced of this – for a pact of mutual assistance between our countries (which was not officially concluded, due to the dismissal of Titulescu from the Romanian government, on August 29, 1936)” (/1980/) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 353, 354).

Ivan M. Maiski (1884-1975 – Soviet diplomat; Ambassador in London /1932-1943/): “Titulescu always impressed me with his bubbling energy, his excellent knowledge of the situation in Europe, his spiritual language and his clairvoyance in the diplomatic field. Of course, he was a bourgeois politician, and this is often manifested in his opinions, manners, behavior, and way of life – but bourgeois politicians are of two kinds: intelligent and unintelligent. Titulescu was one of the smartest. That’s why I really enjoyed talking to Titulescu about diplomatic events on the agenda. A conversation with him always provided a rich and interesting material for reflection, and sometimes Titulescu often came to London for action and in the years that followed, and each time he used to pass me by. My last meeting with him took place in the summer of 1937, after he was removed from the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs by King Carol. Here, for example, is what I wrote in my London diary on June 16, 1937: «Today I saw Titulescu. He’s been in London for almost a week. During this time, he was able to meet with Chamberlain (Șandru, 1983: 271-274), Eden, Vansittart, Churchill, and other dignitaries and hold two conferences: at the Labor parliamentary faction and at the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs. He gave me

to read the text of his speech at the Labor Party. Everywhere Titulescu spoke of the same thing: peace in Europe and the integrity of the British Empire depends on whether or not a 'peace front' will be created in due course, led by England, France, and the USSR. If this front is created, everything will be great. If not, then humanity in general, and Britain in particular, will have to live a tragedy in two acts: 1) the creation by Germany of a 'Central Europe' and 2) the destruction of the British Empire by 'Central Europe'. The English have to choose very quickly...

Titulescu assured me that his propaganda was an undoubted success, and it seems to be true: the words of the former minister were then confirmed to me from various sources. Among other things, the conference he held in Parliament made a strong impression on Labor. When I asked him about his future plans Titulescu initially told me how Hitler's agents had tried to poison him three times in a row in Switzerland and Bucharest, and then informed me that he would return to Romania in October. It was a dangerous decision, but nothing could be done about it. He could not help but return, because that would mean the end of intense activity and political struggle. Titulescu was still full of enthusiasm and determination.

In reality, things happened somewhat differently than Titulescu had imagined. Hitler was not satisfied with 'Central Europe', but practically conquered Europe; he did not destroy the British Empire but put it under threat of extinction. Titulescu fell into the disfavor of King Carol II and Lupeasca and died in 1941, ill and isolated. Titulescu was a highly talented diplomat, an energetic militant against militarism and aggressive wars" (March 13, 1966) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 376, 378-379).

René Massigli (1888-1988 – French diplomat): "On March 17, 1941 – 20 years have passed – Nicolae Titulescu passed away, in a semi-solitude that was attenuated by the devotion of an admirable wife. In our western countries, his name is not at all familiar to the younger generations, but at least they might know him. In his native Romania, they do not have this chance and his memory will certainly not be evoked today in Bucharest. Reason enough to do it in Paris and to pay homage to the memory of a statesman who was a great Romanian; he was also a friend and ally of our country: the French have no right to forget him.

Titulescu was, with Politis and Beneš, one of those people «too big for their countries»; It was said the day after the war that by the explosion of their talent and the role they were called to play on the international stage, they would give the illusion of a world in which material force and power ceased to regulate relations between nations and instead to assert himself against the law, to be put in his service. It is known what happened to these hopes. At their collapse, Titulescu was one of the first victims; it is sad for a Frenchman to be forced to add that he was largely a victim of our own fault...

His last years will be bitter. Discouraged, ill, he first lived in Switzerland, then settled in Paris; in 1940, he lived on the Côte d'Azur. He died in the darkest hours of the sad spring of 1941, having time to see the extreme consequences of our defeat in 1936. Died in despair? Did he, on the other hand, like others, from that moment on, maintain the conviction that the very prolongation of the struggle itself sealed the fate of Germany? I don't know... But it is easy to imagine what suffering this great patriot would have suffered at the show of his country under the Communist boot: Titulescu died in time" (March 1961) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 408-409).

Jean Lefèvre d'Ormesson (1925-2017 – writer and journalist, Member of the Académie Française, Honorary Member of the Romanian Academy): “Attached to Liberalism and Democracy, to which he was one of the pioneers in this Eastern Europe, who was agitated and soon crucified, Titulescu understood very quickly he had to deal with the dangers in order. Before Churchill himself, he would make the same choice as the greatest Englishman since Disraeli: as fierce an enemy of Communist tyranny as of National Socialist tyranny, he relied on Russia to fight Fascism in his fullest ascension.

Titulescu is, more than anyone, pioneer, and a forerunner. For a long time, his ideas seemed to be overcome by the storms of a relentless history that felt everywhere. Today, this defeated has the aura of a prophet” (March 1991) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 497).

Mihail S. Ostrovski (1892-1947 – Plenipotentiary Minister of the USSR in Bucharest): “What is the fundamental difference between Titulescu and any other foreign Minister who would come in his place? It is an essential one: Titulescu had an international political authority, generally recognized, large enough in Europe, so that, being the Minister of Foreign Affairs, of a small country – Romania –, he would have, first of all, the possibility and his right to be recognized. to have his own political conception, secondly, to inspire and impose his line on both France and England, and finally, thirdly, even if he did not always succeed, he nevertheless promoted his line independently. (His request to include a reference to France in our pact does not change this in any way.) It is true that, for this, he used methods that were specific to him, springing from the Romanian ambiance and traditions: blackmail, the mystery of his actions, the politics of the accomplished fact, etc. and so on You know that one of the «reasons» for Titulescu’s disembarkation from the Cabinet was that «Titulescu is a very big man and a man too big for Romania» (Tătărescu, Inculeț, and many others)” (October 29, 1936) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, II: 500-501).

Joseph Paul-Boncour (1873-1972 – French statesman, Prime Minister /1932-1933/, Minister of Foreign Affairs /1932-1934, 1938/): “We can say that our common policy, pursued with perseverance, pursued by me in Geneva, when I was Minister of Foreign Affairs, pursued by France and pursued by Mr. Titulescu and our allies, is not only being achieved, but is being achieved. Locarno, the definition of the aggressor, the Rome Pact, the Balkan Pact and yesterday the Franco-Soviet Pact, aren’t they guarantees of peace in the sense we want?” (May 1935).

“I can say that I regretted that there was no representative of the government (French, at the «celebration» of twenty years since the death of N. Titulescu, at the Romanian Church in Paris – our note). Titulescu was a great friend of France. He said, «France is my mother». This nervous, impulsive man, however, was clever enough not to upset his friends in England, where he represented his country for many years [1921-1927; 1928-1932]; he had just as kind words for them. The truth is that this Romanian was a Westerner in all his power, loving England, and France, but still preferring France: the cause must be sought in this Latinity that embodies, at the edge of Europe, his country, nourished by our culture and where the most many of the writers and statesmen came to study in France.

(...) With Titulescu, who represented his country without interruption for 15 years and whom I met in these debates in which the destiny of nations was at stake, it was

not always easy. He had moments of anger and excessive susceptibility. He defended the interests of his country with the utmost vigor, sometimes neglecting the repercussions that his views might have on our allies. In a discussion on disarmament and in which he did not agree with the British proposal to reduce credit according to the economic possibilities of each country, I still hear him shouting: «I don't want the Romanian soldier to eat polenta and the English soldier to have tea sandwiches!»

More serious was the controversy, which lasted for several years, with Count Apponyi over the Hungarian options (xxx, 1995¹). It was doubled by the memory of the procedures of this great Hungarian senior – an admirable patriot – compared to the Romanian populations subject to Hungary.

But this nervous man, this spoiled child of success, was, of course, a speaker like any true Latin; he knew how to be brave and direct. One day, after Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia, poor Negus, who had been abandoned by all, was on the rostrum, paid journalists were rude to interrupt him rudely. Titulescu, indignant, rose from his chair and, pointing to him, shouted, «Mr. President, silence these savages!»

Many things will have forgiven him, for in the sometimes hypocritical discussions of the League of Nations (Petrescu, 1981: 377-384), where the tendency was to hide your thoughts, Titulescu often tore the veils and put each one in front of his responsibilities" (June 1961) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 25, 29).

Lucien Romier (1885-1944 – French journalist and historian): «Its popularity is becoming dangerous for Europe». I don't know how popular your Foreign Minister will be in Romania, but his popularity is becoming dangerous for Europe. As for France (Potra, 450-459; Otea, 2018: 16-21), she is now trying a new feeling, that of being jealous that Romanians have the best French speaker in the person of Mr. Titulescu" (May 17, 1935) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 206-207).

Saint Brice (1872-1952 – French journalist): "An unspeakable oratorical art and the sonority of a voice that knows how to dominate" One cannot conceive of a more suitable personality for this function. The chairperson of an assembly, especially an international assembly, must first and foremost have the independence of an arbitrator, the authority of a leader, the flexibility in action, and, more importantly, the subtlety of anticipating difficulties. These qualities, the Romanian statesman and diplomat, who is Mr. Titulescu, possess them in the highest degree and together with them an oratory art hard to surpass and the sonority of a voice that knows how to dominate. Moreover, he has the verve and the spirit that are the most delicate weapons in parliamentary struggles. From the beginning, the «man» asserted himself. He has just stepped down to the presidency, said only a few words of thanks, indispensable, and limited himself to saying that it is time to start the action, there is no time for speeches. Mr. Titulescu interpreted this way 234 the unanimous feelings of a congregation eager not to waste their time with baguettes" (September 15, 1930) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 234-235).

Jan Šeba (1886-1953 – Czechoslovak politician, diplomat, and writer): "Starting with the statement of the British statesman Lloyd George in the House of Commons, who said about the Romanian Foreign Minister that he is the «peace soldier», Jan Šeba stated: Past events and recent evidence that this attribute is justified to the highest degree. Ladies and gentlemen, you all know that peace is not a stable, invariable, and

lasting thing. It cannot be said that by making peace, we will have it forever. Allow me to compare peace with a fire that must always be protected from wind and storms and that must be maintained with good fuels. And Mr. Titulescu must, indisputably, be attributed the quality of soldier specialized in the defense of peace, the tireless animator and guardian of this sacred fire of humanity. My dear colleagues, you have often witnessed that always when E.S. Mr. Titulescu fulfills his function as a defender of peace in Geneva, he is called to return quickly to the country, with the motivation that he is needed here. And when His Majesty's stay in Romania is extended, voices are heard from Geneva that he is needed there as a lawyer or rather as a defender of peace. It is true today, when a very violent wind is blowing around this sacred fire, in order to need in Geneva the formulas whose author is everywhere esteemed is Mr. Titulescu. We are on the eve of the departure of this eminent spokesman for the Little Entente and the Balkan Entente (Campus, 1980: *passim*; Bacon, 1999: 107-123, 235-240), a sincere friend of France and the Soviet Union, and I am sure I am speaking on behalf of all my colleagues here when I wish E.S. Mr. Titulescu good trip and the happiest results in his pacifying action" (December 11 /13/, 1935) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 252).

Wickham Steed (1871-1956 – British journalist and historian): "A few years later I met and became close friends with the great Romanian statesman Titulescu, a very capable lawyer, but, unusually, his legal team did not overshadow his ability as a political figure or as a statesman. I met him at the Spa Conference in 1920. I remember very well how, sitting in a Spa restaurant, I saw someone who looked more like a student at Eton, well dressed, too tall, with a type of face that could have belonged to an intellectual Chinese mandarin. He showed up right away and we got along great. You quickly forgot the impression of his striking youth and became accustomed to admiring the wisdom, the ability to penetrate, the comprehensive vision of the man. Coming to London in 1923 as Romanian minister, Titulescu began to occupy a place not only in London society, but also in the diplomatic world and among British ministers, which hardly another diplomat of his rank and youth would have hoped to have occupy. He had the ability to approach British issues (Dobrinescu, 1991: *passim*) from an essentially British angle. His great talent for advocacy was never more impressive than when he was less apparent. He was a man with a special spirit, whom he never flaunted.

A constructive vision of Europe. Titulescu had a constructive vision of Europe ((Launay, 1993: 17-137; Moisuc, 1982: 18-20; Năstase, 2007: 70). He said that peace would not be and could not be maintained for long unless the countries that became the Little Entente remained together, if Romania and Poland (Bacon, 1999: 215-220) formed a common front, and if Romania came to establish acceptable relations with Soviet Russia. Shortly before he became Foreign Minister in 1932, Titulescu had protested against Russia's refusal to sign a non-aggression pact with Romania until Romania recognized that Bessarabia was a disputed territory (Titulescu, 1992). Titulescu resigned from his post in London; he became Minister of Foreign Affairs in Romania and supported the idea that Bessarabia was not a disputed territory. He was firmly convinced that by addressing the issue properly, Russia could be made to realize that Bessarabia was de facto Romanian territory. At the same time, he helped Dr. Beneš create the Little Entente. He worked very closely with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia

and created what could have been one of the bastions of European peace in especially of the Danube peace. He always insisted that there be the closest relations between Romania and Poland.

There was a point on which I never agreed with Titulescu. He went to Rome quite often and seemed to be impressed by Mussolini. I told him he was wrong. I had only had a 4-hour conversation with Mussolini, which left me with the impression that the man was an absolute murderer. Titulescu believed in the Latin blood and culture ties between Romania and Italy. He had not explored the depth of Mussolini's wickedness. But the time has come when Titulescu had to admit that it is dangerous to share the soup with the devil if you do not have a very long spoon. Hitler had come to power in January 1933.

I believe that it will be a long time before his memory will be erased from the minds of the Romanian people, because there will come a time when Romania will rise up and need all the help that his sons can give him.

Titulescu used to take notes on the spot or immediately after an interview, and then spend part of the night writing in large notebooks an account of all these conversations. He must have had dozens of such notebooks. If they have been preserved, it will be seen that they carry more of the intimate history of Europe between 1920 and 1937 than the notes or memoirs of any other statesman could contain. Sometimes he was so kind that he read some of these pages to me.

And then, those of us who have not forgotten what Titulescu did, thought and tried to do, we will glorify him as one of the greatest politicians in Romania" (July 18, 1942) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 282, 283, 284, 290-291).

Panagiotis Tsaldaris (1868-1936 – Greek statesman, Prime Minister /1932-1935/): "But if the presence of any envoy of your country could be assured of the warmest reception in Greece, your visit, Minister, provokes, as you have found, a very special sympathy and attention. We welcome in the person of Your Excellency not only the eminent European statesman, the creator of an immense work of order and pacification, whose fruitful activity has been noted in all fields of international politics. In you we salute above all the emissary of trust and peace, who at this very serious moment is undertaking a vast act of pacification in the Middle East, and who, without sparing any effort, has devoted himself to the noble mission of peace in this part of Europe (Titulescu, 2017: *passim*; 2021: 171-240).

Your presence among us, Minister, will not only be a symbolic gesture between the two friendly nations that understand, under conditions of common interests, to follow an identical policy. It will allow us to examine all aspects of the situation and find the right means to coordinate our efforts for peace. We have recently, with our neighbor and friend Turkey, done a remarkable job of consolidation; at the same time, we are committed to expanding our friendship with other countries. As for you, in a wider field, you carry out a very great pacifying activity. Our efforts and interests will never conflict; By coordinating them, we will further tighten the safety and calm network we are building in this part of Europe" (October 21, 1933) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 372-373).

Paul Valéry (1871-1946 – French poet and philosopher, Member of the Académie Française): "Titus! He was perhaps the most extraordinary man I have ever met. But

also, the most unique. As, by the way, all people are truly exceptional. The hours spent with him were a delight. I met our good Yvonne Sarcey. We also sometimes met Elena Văcărescu. At one time, when we represented France in the Commission of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, we saw each other more often. Then, by the force of our circumstances and occupations, quite rarely. What amazed me about him, above all, was the exuberance and spontaneity. Usually, people with a hypertrophic sensitivity, with a highly complex and gentle soul mechanism and with such a rich inner life, are withdrawn, imprisoned, loving meditation and weighing their brains for a long time or braking their expansions. Titulescu was of a spontaneity and an almost frantic dynamism. But that wasn't temperamental. In the brain. In his prodigiously sharp mind, the trials unfolded with astonishing speed, everything being weighed, thoughtful, dosed with the precision that cybernetics of the future will have.

I have often regretted that Proust did not know Titulescu. Instead of the cumbersome and ridiculous Norpois, we would have had a prodigious portrait. There were, in fact, some similarities between them. The same fragility, precariousness, health, due to excessive sensitivity and nervousness rather than emotional weakness. The same intense thirst for life that Titulescu seems to have lasted until the last moment. And the same sociability and, above all, brilliance, and seduction in conversation. After listening to Titulescu telling or demonstrating something, you wanted to shout: Bis!" (/1966/) (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 425, 426).

Conclusions

First-rate personality – “genius” (Potra, 2021: 15-24) of Romanian and European diplomacy in the interwar period (xxx Mari figuri ale diplomației românești, 1982: *passim*; Scurtu, 2002: 8-14; Mareș, 43-52), the diplomat and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania (Scurtu, 1982: 79-84, 2002: 538-543; Bacon, 1999: 41-46; Preda, 2021¹: 53-62), the politician (he was also Minister of Finance – Băbălău, 2018: 131-136) Nicolae Titulescu – “our contemporary” (Năstase, 1995), a “Builder of Great Ideals” (Năstase, Potra, 2008), with a foreign policy vision “between Wilsonian idealism and political realism” (Hlihor, 2021: 73-98) –, having had, in his lifetime, numerous appreciations (Agrigoroaie, 1981-1982: 655-668; Agrigoroaie, 1982: 19-55; Lipatti, 1982: 14-16; Grecescu, 1982: 185-246; Botoșineanu, 2006: 145-162; Ecobescu, 2021: 25-42), but also some objections from internal and external political opponents (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 75-83; II: 102-129, 162-165, 256-260, 442-446; III: 9-21, 120-126, 264-270).

His huge personality, of “the brilliant intelligence” /George Enescu, 1945/ (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 543), “the Prince of the Romanian Bar” /Radu Portocală, 1945/(xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, III: 116-118), his ideas about the need to organize the world in terms of peace and security, the stability of borders, it offers real “lessons on the intangibility and spiritualization of borders” (Potra, 2015¹: 25-39; Preda, 2021: 390-399), his active role in the League of Nations (of which he has been president twice) have been recognized by many contemporary personalities.

The international scope of the diplomat and statesman Nicolae Titulescu – with “a pan-European conception of security” (Launay, 1993: 17-137) – was expressed by defending the national interests of the Romanian State, but within the framework of

achieving a climate and institutions of security and European cooperation, in the spirit of the norms of International Law. One of the fathers of the Covenant of the League of Nations (1920); co-author of the Convention on the Definition of Aggression (1933), the building and consolidation of the Little Entente (1920-1921) and the Balkan Entente (1934), the participation in the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932), the establishment of diplomatic relations with the USSR (9 February 1934) and their consolidation within the given international framework – Nicolae Titulescu was dismissed in August 1936 from the leadership of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (when negotiations were underway for a Romanian-Soviet non-aggression pact).

Retired to Switzerland, then to France, to Cannes, where he will be buried at the age of 59 (Oprea, 1966: 367-384; Launay, 1993: 137-145), his dead body being reburied in 1992 in Brașov (Potra, 2013: *passim*), fulfilling his testamentary will (xxx Pro și Contra Titulescu, 2007, I: 380-381, 387-388).

Unfortunately, the marking of the 140th anniversary of the birth of this representative European apostle of peace takes place at a time of disturbing peace and world order – for the maintenance of which he has fought all his life, the “force of law” must prevail over “the law of force”. As pointed out, in 1945, one of his closest collaborators – so-called “Titulescians” (Opriș, 2021: 99-122) –, “If I want to characterize the prematurely ended political activity of Nicolae Titulescu – a brilliant activity of course, but full of torturous efforts and many bitterness – then I find its meaning, without hesitation, in *his perseverant attempt to ensure peace* (Potra, 1966: 124-133; Buzatu /ed./, 1982: *passim*; Turcu, Voicu, 1984: *passim*; Hriscu, 2014: 446-449) *among the peoples of the world* (our emphasizing). Titulescu’s aversion to aggression – which he sought to make impossible – cannot be explained only by his respect for the political and legal order created by international conventions. He understood all too well what war means for mankind, what disasters it can bring, and what innumerable calamities”.

The work and his political-diplomatic and legal principles in international relations are, we express the conviction – all the more so in the context of today’s times –, in a guide that politicians and diplomats can have as a useful historical landmark.

References

1. Agrigoroaiei, Ion (1981-1982). Nicolae Titulescu văzut de contemporani [Nicolae Titulescu Seen by Contemporaries]. *Cercetări istorice* [Iași], XII-XIII, 1981-1982, 655-668.
2. Agrigoroaiei, I. (1982). *Coordonatele activității diplomatice a lui Nicolae Titulescu în perspectiva istoriografică*. In: Gh. Buzatu (ed.), *Titulescu și strategia păcii*. Cuvânt înainte de Mihnea Gheorghiu. Iași: Junimea, 19-55.
3. Alpan P. Necip (1982). *Seçkin bir diplomat Nicolae Titulescu anısına armağan* [Homage in Memory of a Distinguished Diplomat Nicolae Titulescu]. Ankara: Göktürk Kitabevi.
4. Bacon, Walter M. jr. (1999). *Nicolae Titulescu și politica externă a României. 1933-1934*. Traducere de Cosmin Angheloni. Cuvânt înainte de Valeriu Florin Dobrinescu și Kurt W. Treptow. Iași: Institutul European (Coll. *Oglinzi Paralele* 7).
5. Băbălău, Anișoara (2018). Nicolae Titulescu, Finance Minister of Romania. *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*, 13, 131-136.

6. Botoșineanu, Cătălin (2006). Nicolae Titulescu reflectat în literatura memorialistică [Nicolae Titulescu Reflected in the Memorialistic Literature]. *Opțiuni istoriografice* [Iași], VIII, 2, 145-162.
7. Buzatu, Gh. (coord.) (1982). *Titulescu și strategia păcii* [Studii și documente]. Cuvânt înainte de Mihnea Gheorghiu. Iași: Junimea.
8. Buzatu, Gheorghe (1984). Nicolae Titulescu and Transylvania. *Southeastern Europe L'Europe du Sud-Est*, 11, 1, 91-100.
9. Buzatu, Gh. (1984¹). Nicolae Titulescu and European Disarmament. *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D. Xenopol"*, XXI, 53-60.
10. Calafeteanu, Ion (2013). *Nicolae Titulescu: "Nu vreau Basarabia de la ruși"* [Nicolae Titulescu: "I don't want Bessarabia from the Russians"]. In: Ștefan Purici, Dumitru Vitcu (eds.), *Crezul istoriei. In onoare prof. univ. dr. Mihai Iacobescu la 75 de ani*. Iași: Junimea, 379-384.
11. Campus, Eliza (1966). Nicolae Titulescu și politica pentru menținerea integrității teritoriale a României [Nicolae Titulescu and the Policy for Maintaining the Territorial Integrity of Romania]. *Studii. Revistă de istorie*, XIX, 2, 225-250.
12. Campus, Eliza (1980). *The Little Entente and the Balkan Alliance*. Translated from the Romanian by Delia Răzdolescu. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România (Series *Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae*. Études LIX).
13. Constantin, Ion (2018). Lupta diplomatică pentru recunoașterea României Mari. Problema Basarabiei, 1918-1920 [The Diplomatic Fight for the International Recognition of Greater Romania. The Problem of Bessarabia, 1918-1920]. *Arhivele Totalitarismului*, XXVI, 1-2, 24-46.
14. Coposu, Corneliu (1991). Iuliu Maniu – Nicolae Titulescu: o trainică prietenie [Iuliu Maniu – Nicolae Titulescu: A Lasting Friendship]. Interview by Dan Manolache. *Magazin istoric*. New Series, XXV, 7 (292), July, 11-14.
15. Dobrinescu, Valeriu Florin (1991). *Nicolae Titulescu și Marea Britanie*. Iași: Editura Moldova.
16. Dobrinescu, Valeriu Florin (1996). *Diplomatic Struggle Over Bessarabia*. Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies.
17. Dubicki, Andrzej (2005). Z działalności Nicolae Titulescu w Lidze Narodów [Nicolae Titulescu's Activity in the League of Nations]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianis. Folia Historica*, 78, 35-45.
18. Dușu, Mircea (2020). Școala română de drept internațional și provocările unei doctrine naționale în era mondializării. *Studii și Cercetări Juridice*, 9 (65), 1, January-March, 7-49.
19. Ecobescu, Nicolae (2021). Comemorarea lui Nicolae Titulescu – Geneva 1966. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 25-42.
20. Enciu, Nicolae (2017). Nicolae Titulescu despre Basarabia ca element al marii unități etnice românești [Nicolae Titulescu on Bessarabia as an Element of the Great Romanian Ethnic Unity]. Retrieved on February 21, 2018 from <https://www.art-emis.ro/istorie/nicolae-titulescu-despre-basarabia-ca-element-al-marii-unitati-etnice-romanesti>
21. xxx (1995). *Explicațiile date de Nicolae Titulescu cu privire la atitudinea sa de apărare a poporului etiopian în cadrul Societății Națiunilor în iulie 1936* [The explanations given

- by Nicolae Titulescu regarding his attitude of defense of the Ethiopian people within the League of Nations in July 1936]. In: Ioan Scurtu, Constantin Mocanu, Doina Smârcea (1995). *Documente privind istoria României între anii 1918-1944* (Ministerul Învățământului) București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, R.A., 512-514.
22. Gemil, Tasin, Simona Deleanu (eds.) (2022). *Relațiile româno-turce în perioada modernă. Romanian-Turkish Connections in modern times* (Institutul de Studii Avansate pentru Cultura și Civilizația Levantului. Institutul de Turkologie. The Institute for Advanced Studies in Levant Culture and Civilization. The Institut of Turkology). Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană (Coll. *Studii de istorie a Levantului*).
23. Georgescu, Titu (1966). *Nicolae Iorga împotriva hitlerismului*. București: Editura Științifică.
24. Grecescu, Ion (1982). *In memoriam Nicolae Titulescu*. Studiu introductiv, texte alese, traduceri. București: Editura Politică.
25. Grecescu, Ion, Vasile Popa (1997). *Nicolae Titulescu. Gândirea juridico-diplomatică* [Nicolae Titulescu the Legal-Diplomatic Thinking]. Chișinău: Editura Concernul Presă al Republicii Moldova.
26. Hlihor, Constantin (2021). Nicolae Titulescu și arhitectura de securitate a Europei. Între idealism wilsonian și realism politic. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 73-98.
27. Hriscu, Marius (2010). *Nicolae Titulescu și Conferința dezarmării* [Nicolae Titulescu and the Disarmament Conference] (1932-1934). In: Gh. Buzatu, Marusia Cîrstea, Horia Dumitrescu, Cristina Păiușan-Nuică (eds.). *Iluzii, teamă, trădare și terorism internațional = 1940. Omagiu Profesorului Ioan Scurtu* (Muzeul Vrancei. Coll. *The Romanians in World History – vol. 250*). Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg, vol. I: 168-180.
28. Hriscu, Marius (2014). *Actualitatea gândirii diplomatice titulesciene* [The Topicality of Titulescu's Diplomatic Thought]. In: Marusia Cîrstea, Sorin Liviu Damean, Lucian Dindirică (eds.), *Gheorghe Buzatu in memoriam*. Târgoviște: Cetatea de Scaun, 446-449.
29. Launay, Jacques de (1993). *A cincea valiză. Titulescu și Europa*. Versiune românească de Stelian Țurlea. București: Editura Agni.
30. Lăcustă, Ioan (1995). Paris, iunie 1937. Întrevederi necunoscute Titulescu – Maniu. *Magazin istoric*. New Series, XXIX, 6 (339), 26-29.
31. Lipatti, Valentin (1982). Titulescu văzut de contemporani. *Magazin istoric*, XVI, 4 (181), 14-16.
32. Lipatti, Valentin (1987). Dialogul Titulescu – Litvinov. *Magazin istoric*, XXI, 12 (249), 44-47.
33. xxx *Mari figuri ale diplomației românești: Nicolae Titulescu* (1982). Colectiv de coordonare: Aurel Duma, Dumitru Aninoiu, Vasile Șandru, Constantin I. Turcu. Studiu introductiv Ștefan Andrei. București: Editura Politică.
34. Mareș, Nicolae (2021). 17 martie 2021 – 80 de ani de la trecerea în veșnicie a Diplomatului nepereche – Nicolae Titulescu. Titulescu inedit. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 43-52.

35. Mareș, Nicolae (2022). Carol al II-lea – Nicolae Titulescu (I-II). *Opinia Națională*, 29, 988, 25 January, 7; 989, 1 February, 7.
36. Mareș, Nicolae (2022¹). Titulescu și Basarabia [I, III, IX, X]. *Flacăra lui Adrian Păunescu*, XXII, 8 (1043), 25 February-3 March, 6; III: [Litvinov], 10 (1038), 11-17 March, 6; IX: Constantin Vișoianu, 16-17 (1044-1045), 22 April-5 May, 3; X: Încurajarea de către Polonia a Ungariei și Bulgariei în tendințele lor revizioniste [Encouragement by Poland of Hungary and Bulgaria in Their Revisionist Tendencies], 18 (1046), 6-12, 2.
37. Mareș, Nicolae (2022²). George Potra – fiu credincios, adoptiv al lui N. Titulescu [George Potra – Titulescu's Faithful and Adopted Son]. *Constelații diamantine*, XIII, 5 (141), 36.
38. Micu, Gabriel (2013). *Bessarabia, Romania, and the Great Powers' Geopolitics (1914-1947)*, București: Pro Universitaria [Edition in Romanian – Chișinău: Pontos, 2011].
39. Moisuc, Viorica (1982). Un mare slujitor al Europei. *Magazin istoric*, XVI, 6 (183), 18-20.
40. Moisuc, Viorica (2007). *Istoria relațiilor internaționale până la mijlocul secolului XX*. Ediția a III-a (Universitatea Spiru Haret. Facultatea de Relații Internaționale și Studii Europene): București: Editura Fundației România de Măine, București.
41. Moisuc, Vioica (2009). *Nicolae Titulescu și Înțelegerea Balcanică*. In: *Caietul Simpozionului Zilele Nicolae Titulescu*. Ediția a 18-a. Slatina: Muzeul Județean de istorie și Artă Olt, 10-16.
42. Năstase, Adrian (2002). *Nicolae Titulescu – contemporanul nostru. Notre contemporain*. Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită. [First Edition: 1995.] București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu, Regia Autonomă "Monitorul Oficial".
43. Năstase, Adrian (2007). *România europeană. Un proiect social-democrat*. Prefață de Christoph Zöpel. București: Editura Mondo Media.
44. Năstase, Adrian, George G. Potra (2008). *Titulescu – Ziditor de Mari Idealuri* [Titulescu – Builder of Great Ideals]. Ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită. [First Edition: 2007.] București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
45. xxx (1982). *Nicolae Titulescu 1882-1982. Romanyalı Büyükle Bir Yurtsever, Diplomat ve Devlet Adamı. Türkiye'nin İçten ve Sürekli Dostu* [A Great Romanian Patriot, Diplomat, and Statesman. A Sincere and Persistent Friend of Turkey]. Ankara: Habora Kitabevi Yayınları.
46. Oprea, Ion M. (1966). *Nicolae Titulescu*. București: Editura Științifică.
47. Oprea, I.M. (1967). Iulie 1936. Titulescu – Litvinov. O pagină a relațiilor româno-sovietice. *Magazin istoric*, I, 1, 35-38.
48. Oprescu, G. (1966). Prestigiu european: Titulescu la Londra, Paris și Geneva cu Valéry, Herriot, Gilbert Murray. *Secolul 20*. Revistă de literatură universală, 3, 107-113.
49. Opriș, Ioan (2021). Vasile Stoica – diplomatul titulescian. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 99-122.
50. Oșca, Alexandru (2021). Nicolae Titulescu și cooperarea în folosul păcii în Balcani. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 99-122.
51. Otea, Ionela (2018). Nicolae Titulescu. Between French Politicians and the Four-Power. *Romanian Journal of Historical Studies*, I, 16-21.

52. xxx *Perspectives* (2021). Titulescu European Foundation. Number dedicated entirely to Nicolae Titulescu; coordinating: Dumitru Preda, II, 1 (3) [256 pp.+ill.].
53. Petrencu, Anatol (2020). Nicolae Titulescu despre importanța Tratatului privind recunoașterea suveranității României asupra Basarabiei [Nicolae Titulescu on the Importance of the Treaty of the Romania's Sovereignty over Bessarabia]. *Revista de istorie a Moldovei*, 3-4 (123-124), July-December, 53-58.
54. Petrescu, Nicolae (1981). Diplomatul român Nicolae Titulescu președinte al Societății Națiunilor, recunoaștere a prestigiului României [Romanian Diplomat Nicolae Titulescu, Elected President of the Nation's Society, a Proof of Romanian's Prestige]. *Muzeul Național*, V, 377-384.
55. Potra, George G (1966). Un mare dialectician al păcii. *Secolul 20*. Revistă de literatură universală, 3, 124-133.
56. Potra, George G. (1982). International Press Reverberations of Nicolae Titulescu's Purge from the Romanian Political Life (29 august 1936). *Revue Roumaine d'Études Internationales*, XVI, 4-5 (60-61), 379-384.
57. Potra, George G. (2001). *Titulescu. Spre Țara Dreptilor*. Slatina: Editura Fundației "Universitatea pentru toți".
58. Potra, George G. (2002). Ion Antonescu nu răspunde la scrisoarea lui Titulescu. *Dosarele Istoriei*, VII, 3 (67), 37-45.
59. Potra, George G. (2003). 2000 de documente inedite. Stelian Popescu către Nicolae Titulescu. *Magazin istoric*, XXXVII, 6 (435), 21-23.
60. Potra, George G. (2005). Titulescu alături de sfinți (Într-o frescă necunoscută din Addis-Abeba). *Magazin istoric*, XXXIX, 11 (464), 63-64.
61. Potra, George G. (2010). Internal Intrigue against Nicolae Titulescu. Irrepressible Enmities, Hostile Force, Ways, and Means of Action. *The Annals of Academy of Romanian Scientists. Series on History and Archaeology*, 2, 219-247.
62. Potra, George G. (2013). *Titulescu după 50 de ani din nou acasă*. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
63. Potra, George G. (2014). *Demiterea lui Nicolae Titulescu văzută de Quai D'Orsay* [The Dismissal of Nicolae Titulescu Viewed by Quai D'Orsay]. In: Marusia Cîrstea, Sorin Liviu Damean, Lucian Dindirică (eds.), *Gheorghe Buzatu in memoriam*. Târgoviște: Cetatea de Scaun, 450-459.
64. Potra, George G. (2015). *Nicolae Titulescu. Arhive pierdute. Dosarul unei recuperări*. Alba Iulia: Altip.
65. Potra, George G. (2015¹). La leçon de Titulescu sur l'intangibilité et la spiritualisation des frontières. *The Annals of Academy of Romanian Scientists. Series on History and Archaeology*, 7, 1, 25-39.
66. Potra, George G. (2016). *Titulescu. Neuitarea geniului*, vol. 1. Brăila: Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăilei "Carol I".
67. Potra, G. George (2021). Titulescu – Neuitarea geniului. Discurs de acceptare a Premiului internațional "Nicolae Titulescu" pe anul 2010 (4 noiembrie 2011). *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 15-24.

68. Potra, George G., Gh. Buzatu, Valeriu Dobrinescu, N. Dascălu (1982). *Un eșec al păcii globale: demiterea lui N. Titulescu* [A Failure of Global Peace: The Dismissal of N. Titulescu]. In: Gh. Buzatu (ecoord.), *Titulescu și strategia păcii*. Cuvânt înainte de Mihnea Gheorghiu. Iași: Junimea, 275-329.
69. Preda, Dumitru (2021). *Nicolae Titulescu: The Link Between the European Security and the International Security. The heritage of a Political Vision and Construction*. In: xxx *Proceedings of the International Scientific International Conference Strategies XXI*. The Sixth Annual Conference of the National Defence College Romania and the New Dynamics of International Security (Romanian Ministry of National Defence. “Carol I” National Defence University. National Defence College). Convenors: Colonel Doina Mureșan, Ph.D. Associate Professor Alba-Iulia Catrinel Popescu. June 25, 2021, Bucharest, Romania, 390-399.
70. Preda, Dumitru (2021¹). Nicolae Titulescu: Primul ministeriat la Afacerile Străine (1927-1928). *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu Cultural Foundation], II, 1 (3): 53-62.
71. xxx (2007). *Pro și Contra Titulescu*. Ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită. Ediție îngrijită, selecție, cuvânt înainte și postfață, note biografice, adnotări și explicații, indice de George G. Potra, Vols. 1-2-3. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
72. Rădulescu, Savel (1969). *Nicolae Titulescu (1882-1941)*. In: xxx *Diplomați iluștri*. București: Editura Politică, I: 371-435.
73. xxx (1995¹). *Replica lui Nicolae Titulescu la discursul lui G. Bethlen, președintele Partidului Maghiar (3 decembrie 1935)*. In: Ioan Scurtu. *Istoria României în anii 1918-1940. Evoluția regimului politic de la democrație la dictatură*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, R.A. (Coll. *Pagini de istorie*), 224-225.
74. Scurtu, Ioan (1982, 2002). Nicolae Titulescu Romania's Minister of Foreign Affairs (1932-1936). *Analele Universității București. Istorie*, XXXI, 79-84; also – In: *Studii de istorie*. București: Ars Docendi, 538-543.
75. Scurtu Ioan. *Istoria României în anii 1918-1940. Evoluția regimului politic de la democrație la dictatură* (1995). București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, R.A. (Coll. *Pagini de istorie*).
76. Scurtu, Ioan (2002). Nicolae Titulescu. Activitatea diplomatică. *Dosarele istoriei*, VII, 3 (67), 8-14.
77. Scurtu, Ioan (2002). Titulescu. Viața și activitatea politico-diplomatică (repere cronologice). *Dosarele istoriei*, VII, 3 (67), 4-7.
78. Scurtu, Ioan (2013). Basarabia în documente semnate de Marile Puteri (1920-1947). *Revista de istorie a Moldovei*, 1 (93), January-March, 76-85.
79. Scurtu, Ioan, Constantin Mocanu, Doina Smârcea (1995). *Documente privind istoria României între anii 1918-1944* (Ministerul Învățământului) București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, R.A.
80. Șandru, D. (1983). *A. Chamberlain and N. Titulescu*. In: *Anglo-Romanian Relations after 1821*. Eds.: Gh. Buzatu, Al. Pascu. *Supplement IV of Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D. Xenopol” Iași*, 271-274.

81. Șandru, D., Bușe, Constantin, Lupu, N.Z. (1982). *N. Titulescu și Liga Națiunilor*. In: Gh. Buzatu (ecoord.), *Titulescu și strategia păcii*. Cuvânt înainte de Mihnea Gheorghiu. Iași: Junimea, 159-219.
82. Solcanu, Ion I. (2015). *Ioan Hudiță. Istoric, om politic și autor de jurnal*. București: Editura Enciclopedică.
83. Titulescu, Nicolae (1992). *Basarabia pământ românesc* [Bessarabia Romanian Land]. Ediție îngrijită, studiu introductiv de doctor în drept Ion Grecescu. București: Editura Rum-Irina.
84. Titulescu, Nicolae (1994). *Romania's Foreign Policy (1937)*. Edited by George G. Potra and Constantin I. Turcu (Titulescu European Foundation). București: Encyclopaedic Publishing House.
85. Titulescu, Nicolae (1996). *Pledoarii pentru pace*. Ediție îngrijită de George G. Potra și Constantin I. Turcu, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 1996.
86. Titulescu, Nicolae (2003). *Opera politico-diplomatică (iulie 1927–iulie 1928)*. Partea I, Partea a II-a. Volum îngrijit de George G. Potra și Costică Prodan. Au colaborat: Daniela Boriceanu, Delia Răzdolescu, Cristina Păiușan. Cuvânt introductiv de Adrian Năstase. Prefață de George G. Potra și Costică Prodan. Notă asupra ediției George G. Potra. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
87. Titulescu, Nicolae (2004). *Opera politico-diplomatică. Corespondență, vol. I (1921–1931)*. Partea I, Partea a II-a. Volum îngrijit de George G. Potra. Colaboratori: Delia Răzdolescu, Gilbert Monney Câmpeanu, Daniela Boriceanu, Cristina Păiușan. Cuvânt înainte de Adrian Năstase. Prefață de George G. Potra. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
88. Titulescu, Nicolae (2007). *Opera politico-diplomatică. 1 ianuarie 1937-31 decembrie 1937*. Partea II. Volum îngrijit de George G. Potra. Colaboratori: Delia Răzdolescu, Daniela Boriceanu, Ana Potra, Gheorghe Neacșu. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
89. Titulescu, Nicolae (2017). *Politica externă a României (1937)*. Ediția a doua, cu o prefață de Adrian Năstase. București: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române.
90. Titulescu, Nicolae (2021). Scrisoare confidențială adresată Regelui Carol al II-lea, privind relațiile româno-ruse (sovietice), 9 martie 1940 [Confidential Letter to King Charles II on Romanian-Russian (Soviet) Relations, March 9, 1940]. *Perspective* [Bucharest: Titulescu European Foundation], II, 1 (3): 171-240.
91. xxx *Titulescu. Un mare Român, un mare European, un mare Contemporan*. O restituire foto-documentară realizată de George G. Potra, Cristina Păiușan, Dumitru Preda. Cuvânt înainte de Adrian Năstase (2002). București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
92. Turcu, Constantin I., Ion Voicu (1984). *Nicolae Titulescu în universul diplomației păcii*. Cuvânt înainte de prof. Jacques Freymond. București: Editura Politică.
93. Vanku, Milan (1986). *Nicolae Titulescu, promotor al politicii de pace și colaborare în Balcani 1920-1936*. Cuvânt înainte și adnotări: Viorica Moisuc. București: Editura Politică.
94. Zidaru, Marian (2019). *The History of International Relations. From Antiquity to Modernity. A Level Course*. București: Editura Etnologică.

A SHORT HISTORY OF PANDEMICS

*Alin Gabriel Ionescu**†, Mihaela Ionescu***†, Adina Dorina Glodeanu***, Teodor Nicusor Sas****†, Cristin Constantin Vere******

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.05

Abstract

Humanity is constantly being exposed to numerous infectious agents, and proof exists since ancient times. Various viruses, bacteria, fungus or parasites affect all living species and may cause sickness, by triggering reactions of the host tissues to them and to the toxins they produce. Following a process of natural selection, humans have adapted by active infection and developed natural immunity which, in some cases, may be transmitted from breast milk as passive immunity. Pandemics are defined as the rapid spread of an infectious disease over a wide region, several continents or worldwide, affecting a substantial number of humans in a short period of time. The first attempts to fight pandemics were represented by empirical treatments; nowadays, technology and science are our closest allies, with vaccines, modern medication and proper follow-up. Still, the lack of education, a potential distrust in science and beliefs in superstitions of their peers remains the most difficult obstacle to overcome in the fight against pandemics. It is certain that other pandemics will come again, and humanity must always be prepared to fight them, therefore it is very important to invest in science and education, in order to emerge victorious in the following battles.

Key words: *pandemics, plague, infectious diseases, COVID-19*

* Lecturer, MD, PhD, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Faculty of Medicine, History of Medicine Specialisation, No. 4-6, Petru Rares Street, Dolj County, Phone: 0040724911230, Email: alin.ionescu@umfcv.ro

** Lecturer, PhD, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Medical Informatics and Biostatistics Specialisation, No. 4-6, Petru Rares Street, Dolj County, Phone: 0040723979710, Email: mihaela.ionescu@umfcv.ro

*** Lecturer, MD, PhD, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Faculty of Medicine, Internal Medicine Specialisation, No. 4-6, Petru Rares Street, Dolj County, Phone: 0040723497084, Email: adina.glodeanu@umfcv.ro

**** Lecturer, MD, PhD, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Faculty of Medicine, Radiology Specialisation, No. 4-6, Petru Rares Street, Dolj County, Phone: 0040723361271, Email: teodorsas@yahoo.com

***** Professor, MD, PhD, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Faculty of Medicine, Gastroenterology Specialisation, No. 4-6, Petru Rares Street, Dolj County, Phone: 0040740671449, Email: cristin.vere@umfcv.ro

Corresponding author: Dr. Adina Dorina Glodeanu

† These authors contributed equally to this work

Introduction

Infectious diseases have followed the evolution of life on our planet. All living species are prone to be infected by various viruses, bacteria, fungus or parasites that can cause sickness. Infection represents the invasion of living tissues of an organism by disease-causing agents, followed by their multiplication and by the reaction of the host tissues to them and to the toxins they produce. An infectious disease is defined as a disease resulting from an infection. Along our evolution from the beginning of life until modern humans, we entered in contact with numerous infectious agents. By a process of natural selection, we've adapted by active infection and developed our natural immunity which, in some cases, can be transmitted from breast milk as passive immunity.

The word epidemic has a Greek origin from ἐπὶ *epi* "over or above" and δῆμος *demos* "people" and is defined as the rapid spread of the disease to many people in a given population, in a short period of time. Pandemic comes also from Greek πᾶν *pan*, "all" and δῆμος *demos*, "people" and represents an epidemic of an infectious disease that has spread over a wide region, for example on several continents or worldwide, affecting a substantial number of humans. As demonstrated by archaeological findings before recorded history and by numerous written accounts, pandemic outbreaks have decimated societies and pushed political systems to the brink of economic collapse, wiped out entire populations and left empty cities, in some instances turned the tide and determined outcomes of wars. Paradoxically, from all the suffering and pain they have caused, human societies were pushed towards new innovations and advances in sciences. Major breakthroughs came in medicine and public health.

Tuberculosis

One of the first pandemics that still plague humans is Tuberculosis (TB), an infectious disease caused by *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. TB mainly affects the lungs, but it can be in other organs. Worldwide, it is in top ten causes of death. According to World Health Organization data, in 2019 alone 1.4 million people worldwide died directly from TB-related causes which makes it the main cause of mortality of a single infectious agent over HIV / AIDS. From the same data, in 2019, it is estimated that another 10 million people worldwide contacted *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and became ill. In 2020 the WHO estimated an increase of another 200,000 to 400,000 TB-related deaths, which would bring the total annual figure to 1.8 million (same as in 2012). This high mortality rate is associated with the lockdown during the COVID pandemic, which drastically reduced the hospitalization rate of patients with TB. Estimations for the following period, until 2025 maintain also the death toll between 1.4-1.6 million deaths per year. Another big problem is drug resistance, which becomes more serious with each year.

Even though flesh and organs decays after death, bones can still preserve evidence of disease and information about the person. Archaeological finds of ancient human bones have demonstrated the presence of specific bone lesions associated with TB. Thus, we know people who lived more than 35000 years ago suffered from this infection.

Pott's disease or Tuberculous spondylitis is named after the British surgeon Percivall Pott, who first described it in the late 18th century. It is the most dangerous form of tuberculosis, and it is a progressive bone destruction that leads to vertebral collapse and skeletal kyphosis. Most often are affected the lower thoracic and upper lumbar vertebrae areas of the spine. Ancient bones with these specific lesions have been unearthed by archaeologists all over the world, thus we may conclude that TB is one of the oldest known pandemics that still is present today.

Smallpox

Smallpox was an infectious disease, today considered eradicated through vaccination, which is caused by one of two virus variants, Variola major and Variola minor. The earliest description of smallpox symptoms, as early as 1500 BCE, is found in Atharva-Veda, a medical textbook from ancient India (Henderson & Preston, 2009: 334). Ancient manuscripts from around 1122 BCE describe the presence of the disease in ancient China (Henderson & Preston, 2009: 334). In 2016, a group of researchers who studied the Egyptian mummy of Ramses V, who died more than 3000 years ago around 1145 BCE, concluded that the pharaoh had skin marks specific to smallpox (<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/mummies-smallpox-virus-dna-lithuania-health-science>). Some scholars and historians believe that the disease may have reached Europe in 165 CE, and that it had caused the Antonine Plague that swept through the Roman Empire between 165–180 CE (Duggan, Perdomo, & Piombino-Mascali, 2016: 3412).

One of the most definitive descriptions of smallpox was written by Persian physician, Rhazes (Abū Bakr Muhammad Zakariyyā Rāzī 854-925), in his *Kitab fi al-jadari wa-al-hasbah* (The Book of Smallpox and Measles) in which he was the first to differentiate smallpox from measles and chickenpox (Otri, Singh, & Dua, 2008: 1324).

In Europe, during the early Middle Ages, there were recorded several smallpox outbreaks, but they were mostly limited. However, due to the growth of Europe's population and its increased mobility marked by the start of the Crusades, helped the spread of smallpox that will become well established there. By the 15th century, smallpox was common on the entire European continent, where it had a mortality rate as high as 30%. Of particular historical importance is the endemic occurrence of smallpox in Europe, because in the next centuries through successive exploration of the world and colonization by different European nations, the disease was spread to other nations. As a result, by the 16th century, smallpox had become one of the predominant causes of morbidity and mortality throughout much of the known world (Fenner, Henderson, & Arita, 1988: 1409).

The first efforts to fight the disease were recorded by the Chinese author Wan Quan (1499–1582) in his book *Dòuzhēn xīnǎ* published in 1549, in which he talks about smallpox inoculation - a practice that was developed in China during the 10th century. Inoculation consisted of powdered smallpox scabs that were blown with the help of a tube up the noses of healthy people. After this procedure, they would then develop a mild case of the disease and from then on were immune to it. The technique did have a mortality rate between 0.5-2.0%, but that was considered acceptable by comparing with the high mortality rate of smallpox (30%) (Needham, 2000: 154).

Edward Jenner (1749-1823) was an English physician who created and developed the smallpox vaccine and popularized vaccination. He introduced the terms vaccine and vaccination, which originated from *Variolae vaccinae*, a term coined by Jenner to refer to cowpox. The cowpox is a zoonotic virus that was responsible for a milder form of smallpox in humans, who stimulated the human organism to produce antibodies that offered immunity for Variola viruses. The results of his research were published in 1798 in his work on vaccination: *Inquiry into the Variolae vaccinae known as the Cow Pox*, in which he explained the beneficial effect of vaccination with cowpox to provide protection (immunity) to human smallpox. Even with a vaccine in hand, 150 years later around 2 million people died each year of smallpox. In 1967, the WHO intensified the global smallpox eradication by increased vaccination campaigns all over the planet. After all these efforts and after intense verification activities, the global eradication of smallpox was certified, by a commission of eminent scientists on 9 December 1979 and subsequently endorsed by the World Health Assembly on 8 May 1980, thus putting an end to an almost 1800 years pandemic (Fenner et al., 1988: 1980).

Plague of Athens

The first pandemic recorded in history was the Plague of Athens (430 BC). Thucydides (c. 460 – c. 400 BCE) was an Athenian historian and general who described the plague in his book *History of the Peloponnesian War*. The Plague of Athens was a pandemic that devastated the city-state of Athens in ancient Greece during the second year of the Peloponnesian War. The disease spread through Libya, Ethiopia and Egypt, passing through the city walls of Athens while being besieged by Spartan armies. Scholars believe that the disease was brought by sailors and it entered Athens through the city's port, Piraeus, the sole source of food and supplies. At the moment the plague erupted, an Athenian victory was still within reach, but all changed when the plague killed an estimated 75,000 to 100,000 people, around one quarter of the city's population and was a decisive factor in their defeat by the Spartans. Among the victims was Pericles, the leader of Athens. The plague had two recurrences, in 429 BC and in the winter of 427/426 BC (Littman, 2009: 467).

Much of the eastern Mediterranean also saw an outbreak of the disease. According to Thucydides the illness debuted with symptoms in the head as it worked its way through the rest of the body. He also describes in detail the symptoms victims of the plague experienced: fever, redness and inflammation in the eyes, sore throats leading to bleeding and bad breath, sneezing, dysphonia, coughing, vomiting, pustules and ulcers on the body, extreme thirst, insomnia and diarrhoea. Around 30 pathogens have been considered as having caused the plague, but in January 2006, researchers at the University of Athens confirmed the presence of Rickettsia responsible for typhus, thus identifying the cause of the disease (<https://www.newswise.com/articles/plague-of-athens-medical-mystery-may-be-solved>).

Antonine Plague

The Antonine Plague of 165 to 180 CE, also known as the Plague of Galen (129 – c. 200/c. 216) after the physician who described it, was an ancient pandemic that affected the Middle East and the Roman Empire. The pandemic occurred during the

reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius (161-180 CE). Ancient sources agree that the plague first appeared in the winter of 165–166, during the Roman siege of the Mesopotamian city of Seleucia, and it was brought to the Roman Empire by legionaries who were returning from the campaign. The roman historian, Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330, - c. 391/ c.400), in his book *Res Gestae* noted that the plague spread to Gaul and to the legions stationed along the Rhine. Another ancient author, Eutropius (363–387), stated that a large proportion of the empire's population died from this outbreak (McNeill, 1976: 49).

The famous roman physician Galen left us a description of the epidemic in his treatise *Methodus Medendi*. He claimed the disease to be "great" and long-lasting. As for symptoms, he mentioned fever, diarrhoea and pharyngitis, as well as a rash that appeared on the skin and was sometimes dry and sometimes pustular. The rash appeared on the ninth day of illness. On the grounds of his description scientists suspected it was either smallpox or measles.

From the works of the roman historian Lucius Cassius Dio (c. 155 – c. 235), we know that the disease recurred 9 years later, in 189 CE, and only in Rome it caused up to 2000 deaths daily, with a mortality of 25%. Historians and scholars put the total death count between 5.000.000 up to 10.000.000. In some areas, the disease killed as much as one third of the population and devastated the Roman army (Smith, 1996). The ancient world would never recover from the blow caused by the plague that visited it. Its effects will be felt in the next century.

Plague of Cyprian

The Plague of Cyprian was a pandemic that afflicted the Roman Empire from 249 to 262 CE. It is named after the Christian bishop of Carthage, Cyprian (210-258), who described it in his work "*Mortality*". From his book, we find out that the plague manifested with diarrhoea, vomiting, sore throat, fever and gangrenous lesions that appeared on the hands and feet. Scholars consider that it could have been caused either by smallpox, pandemic influenza, or a viral haemorrhagic fever like the one caused by the Ebola virus. The pandemic might have started from Ethiopia, after it had spread through North Africa to Egypt, and from here to Rome and later to the north of the European continent. Recurrent outbreaks of the plague have appeared in the next three centuries. Filled with fear, the city dwellers fled to the countryside to get rid of the infection, but unfortunately thus they helped spread the disease even more. Between 250 and 262, at the height of the outbreak, it was said that around 5,000 people died in Rome every day; even though the numbers might be exaggerated, they show the high mortality rates of the disease (Harper, 2015: 260).

The plague is believed to have caused a dramatic reduction in the workforce for food production and the needs of the Roman army, severely weakening the empire. Where once there were cultivated fields, now everything was abandoned. As a desperate measure to please the gods, the roman emperor Traianus Decius (c. 201 – 251) issued an edict ordering everyone in the Empire to perform a sacrifice to the Roman gods and take an oath for the well-being of the emperor. Because the Christians refused to take this oath toward the gods, this triggered the "Decian persecution" that led to the criminalization of Christians by making them culprits for the plague.

The high mortality rate in the European population due to the two pandemics (Antonine plague and Plague of Cyprian) are indicators that the population hadn't been previously exposed to these infectious agents and hadn't any immunity (Harper, 2015: 260).

The recurrent plagues contributed to the Crisis of the Third Century, also known as Military Anarchy, which occurred between the years 235 and 284 CE, and was a period in which the Roman Empire nearly collapsed. The plagues that had decimated the Roman army left the Empire weak and almost unable to defend against barbarian invasions and migrations into the Roman territory. All this led to political instability with at least 26 claimants to the title of emperor, which further led to civil wars, peasant rebellions, debasement of currency and economic depression (Potter, 2004: 85).

Plague of Justinian

The Plague of Justinian affected the Byzantine Empire from 541 to 549 and it is the first outbreak of the first bubonic plague pandemic in history. Historians also name it the Early Medieval Pandemic that began with the Plague of Justinian in 541 and continued to reappear until 750 or 767. From surviving documents of the period, scholars consider that there were at least fifteen or eighteen major waves of plague following the Justinian's plague (Sarris, 2007: 132).

The pandemic manifested especially in the Mediterranean Basin where it caused a high number of infections in Constantinople, the Byzantine Empire's capital. From here it also spread to the Near East where it severely affected the Sassanid Empire who will never recover from this blow, and 100 years later it will be conquered by the Muslims. Another direction the plague spread was towards Northern Europe.

In many ancient societies, people believed that various angry or displeased spirits and gods were responsible for the occurrence of diseases and disasters that punished those that deserved their wrath. In the case of Justinian's plague, the Byzantine historian Procopius of Caesarea (c. 500–565), in his book *History of the Wars*, left us an account of this pandemic. He correctly identified the origins of the disease in China and north-eastern India, from where it spread by land (Silk Road) and sea trade routes to Egypt, from where it entered the Byzantine Empire through Mediterranean ports. Despite his remarks on the role of geography and trade in spreading the plague, Procopius blamed Emperor Justinian, declaring him either a devil or invoking God's punishment for his wrong ways.

In fact, the disease is caused by the bacterium *Yersinia pestis*. The Bubonic plague is mainly spread by infected fleas from small animals, especially rats, cats, dogs, but it may also be transmitted through exposure to the body fluids from a dead plague-infected animal or human (Plague Fact sheet N°267, 2014). One to seven days after exposure to the bacteria, flu-like symptoms develop, these include fever, headaches, and vomiting, as well as swollen and painful lymph nodes occurring in the area closest to where the bacteria entered the skin. Occasionally, the swollen lymph nodes, known as "buboes", may break open (Plague Fact sheet N°267, 2014).

There are three types of plague, depending on the route of infection: bubonic plague, septicemic plague, and pneumonic plague (Plague Fact sheet N°267, 2014). Procopius, in a passage closely modelled on Thucydides description of the plague of

Athens, recorded that at its peak 10000 people died daily only in Constantinople alone, but historians doubt the accuracy of this figure, and the true number of deaths will probably never be known. Procopius also noted that bodies were left stacked in the open because there was no room to bury the dead. Funeral rites were often left unattended to, and the entire city smelled like the dead. Some historians believe the first plague pandemic was one of the deadliest pandemics in history, resulting in the deaths of an estimated 15 to 100 million people during two centuries of recurrence, a death toll equivalent to 25–60% of Europe's population at the time of the first outbreak (McCormick, 2007: 312).

As a result of the high number of people infected by the plague in the countryside, farmers could not take care of crops and the price of grain rose in Constantinople. Because the emperor Justinian had expended huge amounts of money in wars against the Vandals in the region of Carthage and the Ostrogoths' kingdom in Italy and financed the construction of great churches, such as Hagia Sophia, the empire's gold reserves were almost depleted. As the empire tried to fund these projects, the plague caused tax revenues to heavily decline due to the massive number of deaths and the disruption of agriculture and trade. All this forced the emperor to adopt new taxes that made him more unpopular and impacted the empire's economy.

The plague's long-term effects on European and Christian history were enormous. As the disease spread to port cities around the Mediterranean, the struggling Goths were reinvigorated and their conflict with Constantinople entered a new phase. The plague weakened the Byzantine Empire at a critical point, when Justinian's armies had nearly retaken all of Italy and the western Mediterranean coast, almost succeeding in reuniting the Western Roman Empire with the Eastern Roman Empire. But the pandemic put an end to all this and the two would never be reunited. Historians have concluded that this event marked the beginning of the Dark Ages, by spreading dogmatism and diminishing science (Sarris, 2007: 132).

Leprosy

In the 11th century, it began a leprosy pandemic that affected Europe. Leprosy had been mentioned for centuries in ancient Indian texts of the Atharva-veda (600 BCE). From antiquity leprosy was believed to be a punishment from God that was affecting all family members. This belief led to moral judgments and the ostracization of victims that were excluded from the communities. For hundreds of years in human history, leprosy was greatly feared because it causes visible disfigurement and disability, it was incurable, and people and physicians alike commonly believed to be highly contagious. Now we know that leprosy is a slow-growing bacterial disease caused by *Micobacterium leprae*. It is spread between people but it is necessary an extensive contact, like in families (Suzuki, Akama, & Kawashima, 2012: 129). In fact, leprosy has a low pathogenicity, and 95% of people who contract *Micobacterium leprae* do not develop the disease, completely different from the medieval beliefs (Worobec, 2008: 537).

The first Ecumenical Conclave in 325 assembled by Constantine the Great in Nicaea decided to close all temples dedicated to pagan healing Gods and to establish Christian charity institutions near monasteries. One of these was the leprosarium dedicated for patients with leprosy who would be kept there. Leprosy became a

pandemic in Europe in the Middle Ages favoured by the high mobility of people and armies during the crusades. This led to the construction of numerous hospitals and colonies for leprosy patients.

Common symptoms present in the different types of leprosy include a runny nose, dry scalp, eye problems, skin lesions, muscle weakness, reddish skin, with smooth, shiny, diffuse thickening of facial skin, ear, and hand. Other symptoms include loss of sensation in fingers and toes, thickening of peripheral nerves, a flat nose due to destruction of nasal cartilage that can determine changes in phonation. Leprosy can affect people in different ways (Expert Committee on Leprosy - Eight report, 2012: 12). The average incubation period is 5 years. People may begin to notice symptoms within the first year or up to 20 years after infection. The first noticeable sign of leprosy is often the development of pale or pink coloured patches of skin that may be insensitive to temperature or pain (Expert Committee on Leprosy - Eight report, 2012: 12).

The Black Death

The Black Death is the deadliest pandemic recorded in human history. The Black Death started in 1346 in Asia and ravaged Europe between the years 1347 to 1353. It was the second from the three plague pandemics after the plague of Justinian. According to scholars, it was responsible for between 75 up to 200 million deaths in Eurasia and North Africa. The origin of the Black Death is still disputed by historians. Most scholars agree that the pandemic originated either in Central Asia or East Asia. From here it has reached Crimea in 1347. Then, it spread through the Mediterranean Basin on board of the Genoese slave ships where it was most likely carried by fleas living on the black rats that lived on these boats. Soon after, the infection was carried to Africa, Western Asia and to the rest of Europe via the harbour in Constantinople, and from Sicily it spread to the whole Italian Peninsula. There is evidence that once it came ashore, the plague was mostly spread by fleas which cause pneumonic plague and through person-to-person contact via aerosols associated with coughing in pneumonic plague. Thus, scholars explain the very fast inland spread of the epidemic, which was faster than would be expected if the primary vector was the rat fleas' infection that causes the bubonic plague.

The disease is caused by the bacterium *Yersinia pestis*. This infection most commonly causes bubonic plague, but it can also progress to a septicemic or pneumonic form. Symptoms of the disease include fever of 38-41°C, headaches, painful aching joints, nausea and vomiting, and a general feeling of malaise. If left untreated, 80% of those that contract the bubonic plague die within eight days (Olea-Ricardo & Christakos, 2005: 303). There are many contemporary accounts of the patient's symptoms, but unfortunately they provide different descriptions and are often imprecise. The most commonly noted symptom was the appearance of buboes, named in some account *gavocciolos*, (swollen lymphatic ganglia) located in the groin, neck, and armpits, which oozed pus and bled when opened.

When Cardinal Colonna died of plague in 1348, his physician noted a distinct form of the disease, that infected the lungs and manifested with respiratory problems, and named it pneumonic plague. Its symptoms included fever, cough, and blood-tinged sputum. As the disease progresses, sputum becomes free-flowing and bright

red. Pneumonic plague has a mortality rate of 90% to 95% (Olea-Ricardo & Christakos, 2005: 303).

Septicaemic plague is the least common and the deadliest of the three forms, with a mortality rate near 100%. Symptoms of septicaemic plague include high fevers, above 40°C, and the presence of purple skin patches (purpura resulted from disseminated intravascular coagulation). In the case of pneumonic and particularly septicaemic plague, the progress of the disease is so rapid and the patient dies before the development of buboes (enlarged lymph nodes) (Olea-Ricardo & Christakos, 2005: 303).

Contemporaries have described the disease in Latin as *febris pestilentialis*, *infirmetas pestifera*, *morbus pestiferus*, *morbus pestilentialis*, *mortalitas pestis* or simply *pestilentia*. The Latin expression *mors nigra*, "black death", was used in 1350 by the Belgian astronomer, Simon de Couvin, in his poem *De iudicio Solis in convivio Saturni*, which attributes the origin of the plague to an astrological conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn (Antoine, 2008: 114).

The most authoritative contemporary account that was widely believed, is found in a report written by the professors from the Medical School in Paris, for King Philip VI of France. This report blames the heavens for this plague, in the form of a conjunction of three planets that took place in 1345, which caused a "*great miasma in the air*". The theory of miasma had been enunciated by Hippocrates in the 4th century BCE, and it stated that a harmful form of "*bad air*", also known as *night air* was responsible for the appearance of diseases. The theory stated that the epidemics were caused by miasma, which came from rotten organic matter.

The theory of miasma was, according to Hippocratic and roman medicine, usually associated mainly with the spread of contagious diseases. Special physicians called *plague doctors* were trained to help the sick. People of the Middle Ages believed, like in ancient times, in the Hippocratic four humours theory blood (made by the heart), phlegm (made by the brain), yellow bile (made by the pancreas) and black bile (made by the liver). Based on this theory, the blood was hot and wet as air, phlegm was cold and wet as water, the yellow ball was hot and dry as fire, and the black bile was cold and dry as earth. Health was the result of humoral balance. The disease occurred as a result of excess or deficiency of one or more moods. So, according to this, they usually practiced bleeding and used other remedies, such as putting frogs or leeches on the buboes to "rebalance the moods". The main task of the doctor, in addition to treating people with the plague, was to write down and keep public records of plague deaths (Antoine, 2008: 114).

Unfortunately, all their efforts proved ineffective. Some people thought it was the end of the world and gathered in religious processions where they flogged themselves, the so called flagellaty. Others abandoned all moral and got drunk, ate and committed numerous other less honourable acts. People become suspicious on strangers and different people who were blamed for spreading the disease so many innocent lives were taken. In some cities, Jews were blamed for the plague and in consequence were killed. In all aspects in was terrible, cities were filled with dead bodies, condemned criminals were put to bury the dead and so on numerous occasions there were burglaries, murders. Some accounts say the living walked the streets like living dead, waiting for the day their turn comes. And above all ruled only Death, nobody was excepted or safe.

After the Black Death, it took 100 years for the population to recover. Villages were emptied, cities and fields looked abandoned, but slowly life reappeared.

The first steps in fighting diseases were taken. From the 14th century, begins the quarantine of ships that arrived in ports, in order to protect the local population. Port authorities have begun asking ships arriving in Venice from infected ports to anchor 40 days before docking. The origin of the word quarantine has its origin in the Italian "*quaranta giorni*", or 40 days (Benedictow, 2005).

The year 1492, the Columbian exchange brought to The New World beside armies, Christianity and diseases. After the arrival of the Spaniards in the Caribbean, diseases such as smallpox, measles and bubonic plague have been transmitted among native populations. Without prior exposure to these pathogens, and therefore without immunity, these diseases devastated the natives. Some historians estimated that up to 90% of the local population has died.

One such example was recorded after the arrival of Christopher Columbus (1451-1506) on the island of Hispaniola. Upon his landing, he met the Taino population who was estimated around 60000. By 1548, after the introduction of smallpox by one of the sailors and forced labour, there were less than 500 survivors (Córdova, 1990: 1550). In the coming centuries of colonisation and exploration, this scenario will be repeated all over the world.

The great plague epidemic in London (1665-1666) took place in the context of the second plague pandemic that started with the Black Death, which spanned for three centuries. It was characterized by intermittent bubonic plague epidemics. It originated in Central Asia and was brought to Europe and England by sailors. It included related diseases, such as pneumonic plague, and lasted until 1750. Scholars estimate that it killed, in just 18 months, about 100000 people, almost a quarter of London's population (Barbieri, Drancourt & Raoult, 2021: e25). As the disease spread through the city, the nobles and rich were the first to leave London. Soon after, business begun to close, and the merchants fled also the city. Daniel Defoe (1660-1731) left us an account of the pandemic in his "*A Journal of the Plague Year*": "There was nothing to be seen but wagons and wagons, with goods, women, servants, children, wagons full of people of the best kind, and horsemen escorting them, and all hastening to leave." As the plague spread throughout the summer, only a small number of priests, doctors and pharmacists remained to cope with an increasing number of victims. Plague doctors wore a special suit consisting of an ankle-length overcoat and a beak mask, often filled with sweet or strong-smelling substances (usually lavender), along with gloves, boots, a wide-brimmed hat, and a cape. The wide-brimmed leather hat indicates the profession. They had wooden sticks to show areas that needed attention and to examine patients without touching them, and were also used to keep people away, to remove clothes from the sick without touching them, and to take a patient's pulse [Barbieri et al., 2021: e25].

Cholera

The first cholera pandemic started in 1817 and was the first in a series of seven that will span for 150 years. This first wave of this digestive infection had its origins in the Russian Empire where it is estimated that it killed a million people. Some historians consider that Napoleon's invasion of Russia, which led to a high number of victims,

overlaid with the famine caused by war, contributed to this pandemic. The infection is caused by the bacterium *Vibrio cholerae* and it spreads through feces that infect water and food. The fact that many people drank water from ponds, which served as reservoirs and the lack of treatment of drinking water greatly, facilitated its spread. Also, seafood shipped long distances can spread the disease (Sack DA, Sack RB, & Nair, 2004: 233).

The primary symptoms of cholera are profuse diarrhoea and vomiting of clear fluid. The disease starts suddenly, ranging from half a day to five days after ingestion of the *Vibrio*. The diarrhoea is frequently described as "rice water" due to its colour and may have a fishy odour. An untreated person with cholera may produce between 10 to 20 litres of diarrhoea a day. If the severe diarrhoea is not treated properly, it can lead to life-threatening dehydration and electrolyte imbalances. Without treatment, severe cholera kills around half of the infected individuals (Sack et al., 2004: 233).

From the Russian Empire, the bacterium was brought by British soldiers to India where it killed more millions of people. The vast expansion of the British Empire and its merchant navy favoured the spread of cholera in Spain, Africa, Indonesia, China, Japan, Italy, Germany and America, where it is estimated that it killed 150000 people alone. A major step forward in fighting the disease was made by the physician and pioneer medical scientist John Snow (1813–1858). In 1854 he published a paper in which he noted a link between cholera outbreaks and drinking of contaminated water (Rosenberg, 1987: 62).

In 1885, a Spanish physician Jaume Ferran i Clua (1851-1927) developed a cholera inoculation, but it was controversial and was rejected by several investigation commissions. In July 1892, a bacteriologist Waldemar Haffkine (1860-1930) successfully developed the first human cholera vaccine. With this new weapon against the disease, he started a massive inoculation program in British India where cholera ravaged (Hawgood, 2007: 19). Despite vaccination and new drugs, cholera outbreaks are still reappearing even today.

The third plague pandemic was a major bubonic plague pandemic that started in 1855. The first cases were diagnosed in Yunnan, China. This episode of bubonic plague would eventually spread to all inhabited continents, and ultimately led to more than 12 million up to 15 million deaths in India and China, with around 10 million victims in India alone, making it one of the deadliest pandemics in history (Stenseth, 2008: 774). Scholars who studied casualty patterns concluded that the waves of this late-19th-century/early-20th-century pandemic may have come from two different sources. The first was primarily bubonic and it had spread all around the world through ocean-going trade and by transporting infected persons and rats. The second consisted of a more virulent strain, which was primarily pneumonic characterized by strong person-to-person contagion. According to WHO, this plague pandemic was considered active until 1960, when the number of casualties dropped to 200 per year worldwide (Prentice & Rahalison, 2007: 1207). Since then, every year plague deaths have continued at a lower level.

Russian Influenza Pandemic

The Russian Influenza Pandemic that started in October 1889 to December 1890 is considered one of the deadliest pandemics of the 19th century responsible for around 1 million deaths. This devastating flu pandemic started in Siberia and spread to Kazakhstan. Soon after, it arrived in Moscow and from here it went to Finland, Poland and the rest of Europe. The following year it had reached the Americas and Africa. By the end of 1890, around 360000 people had died in America. Recurrences of this disease will appear in March to June 1891, November 1891 to June 1892, winter of 1893–1894, and early 1895. The infection was spreading very fast, sustained by ocean trade and railways. Such an example is how it had spread along the Trans-Caspian railway, which enabled it to spread farther into Samarkand by August, and by October 3200 km away at Tomsk.

Some people believed that the disease could spread through telegraph wire and so numerous telegraph posts were burned. The signs and symptoms of the infection were fever or low-grade fever, chills, cough, dyspnoea, physical asthenia, rhinorrhoea, pharyngitis, muscle aches, headache. Scientists do not know for sure what agent was responsible for the pandemic, it was speculated to be influenza A virus subtype H2N2 or H3N8, but newer genetic research incriminates the human coronavirus OC43 (Valleron, Cori, & Valtat, 2010: 8781) (Taubenberger, Morens, & Fauci, 2007: 2025).

There was no standard treatment for this infection, so physicians prescribed quinine and phenazone, as well as small doses of strychnine associated with larger doses of whisky and brandy. Based on the belief that the body would not produce as much heat with less food, many people recommended fasting in order to “starve” the fever.

Spanish Flu

The Spanish flu or the 1918 influenza pandemic was an exceptionally deadly global influenza pandemic which was caused by the influenza A virus H1N1.

The pandemic started in 1918 and ended in 1920 and it came in four waves. The first wave of the pandemic is conventionally marked as having started on 4 March 1918, with the second wave in the second half of August 1918, a third wave in January 1919 and the fourth in the spring of 1920.

Scientists estimated that around 500 million people had been infected by this virus in four successive waves, with a death toll between 20 million and 50 million, or more broadly from a conservative 17 million to a possible high of 100 million. Having more fatalities than during all four years of World War I, it is one of the deadliest pandemics recorded in human history.

The infection was first identified in Europe, the United States and parts of Asia before spreading rapidly around the world. Due to censorship after World War I, only reports from telegraph services in neutral countries could speak about the infection. So an account of an outbreak of influenza in Madrid in the spring of 1918 led to the pandemic being called the "*Spanish flu*". At that time, there were no effective drugs or vaccines to treat this deadly strain of flu. Most patients presented only the typical flu symptoms of sore throat, headache, and fever, especially during the first wave (Mills, Robins, & Lipsitch, 2004: 906). However, during the second wave of the pandemic, the condition was much more severe, often complicated by bacterial pneumonia, which was often the cause of death (Mills, Robins, & Lipsitch, 2004: 906). Many studies on

influenza outbreaks have demonstrated that mortality is higher among the very young and the very old, with a higher survival rate for those in between.

Interestingly, the Spanish flu pandemic caused a higher-than-expected mortality rate for young adults. Some researchers consider that the virus triggered a cytokine storm caused by the strong immune reactions of young adults, whereas the weaker immune systems of children and elderly adults prevented this phenomenon (Morens & Fauci, 2007: 1028). Other scholars blame instead the effects of the recent war which caused malnourishment of soldiers, overcrowded medical camps and hospitals, poor hygiene that promoted bacterial superinfection (Brundage & Shanks, 2007: 1718).

The 1918 Spanish flu was the first of four flu pandemics caused by influenza A virus H1N1; the most recent one took place in 2009 and is known as the swine flu pandemic.

Asian Flu

The Asian flu pandemic started in 1957 and lasted until 1958 with sporadic recurrences that lasted until 1968. The disease was caused by influenza A virus subtype H2N2. The first cases were reported in southern China's Guizhou province in late 1956 or in early 1957. Soon new cases appeared in the neighbouring province of Yunnan in late February or early March 1957 (Strahan, 1994: 201). By the middle of March, the flu had spread all over China and from here to United States and the United Kingdom. In six months, there were already 140000 deaths. A second wave followed in early 1958, causing another 1.1 million deaths worldwide. The microbiologist Maurice Hilleman (1919-2005) obtained samples of the virus and started research for a vaccine. After the first trials were successful, a vaccine was created. The rapid deployment of the vaccine helped contain the pandemic (Jackson, 2009: 623). With his vaccine, Hilleman may have saved hundreds of thousands of lives.

HIV/AIDS

Human immunodeficiency virus infection and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV / AIDS) pandemic started in 1981 and it is still ongoing. The retrovirus that causes the disease was first identified in 1981. Researchers believe that HIV originated in a virus from chimpanzees that appeared in West Africa in the 1920s. The virus destroys the patient's immune system, and death occurs through infections that the body would normally fight. The early symptoms of those infected with HIV include fever, headache and inflammation of the lymph nodes. When symptoms disappear, carriers become extremely infectious through blood and genital fluids. In evolution, the disease progresses to the destruction of T lymphocytes and failure of the immune system. These late symptoms of infection are referred to as AIDS and are often associated with unintended weight loss. The infection is spread primarily by unprotected sex, reuse of hypodermic needles contaminated blood transfusions and from mother to child during pregnancy, delivery, or breastfeeding. Body fluids like saliva, sweat or tears do not transmit the virus. According to WHO in 2020, about 37 million people worldwide were living with HIV and in that year alone there were 680000 related deaths (AIDS epidemic update: December 2007).

Treatments have been created to reduce the progression of the disease, but nevertheless around 35 million people worldwide have died of AIDS since its discovery and no cure has yet been found.

Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome

The Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) pandemic of 2003 is a viral respiratory disease of zoonotic origin caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-CoV-1). The virus has its origin in bats, from where it has spread to cats and later to humans. SARS has its origins in China from where it has spread to 26 countries. A total of 8096 people were infected, with 774 recorded deaths. SARS symptoms include respiratory problems, dry cough, fever and headache and may evolve to pneumonia (Feng, de Vlas, & Fang, 2009: 13). The virus is spread by respiratory droplets from coughing and sneezing. The fast response of authorities and the introduction of quarantine measures have proved effective, and the infection was stopped and has not reappeared since.

COVID-19

COVID-19 (2020 – present) is a current pandemic that has started in 2019 and until now has come in four waves of infection. COVID-19 is caused by a new strain of coronavirus that has not been previously identified in humans. The first case was reported in China on November 17, 2019, in Hubei Province, but was unrecognized. Eight more cases appeared in December, with researchers indicating an unknown virus. Many physicians learned about SARS COV 2 when ophthalmologist Dr. Li Wenliang (1985-2020) defied government orders and shared information with other doctors.

On February 11, 2020, the infection was officially named COVID-19 and on 11 March 2020 WHO announced that it is officially considered a pandemic after it has spread in three months in 114 countries, where it infected over 118000 people. Symptoms include respiratory problems, fever and cough that can lead to pneumonia and death. Like SARS, it spreads through respiratory droplets. Without an available vaccine, the virus spread beyond China's borders, and by mid-March, it had been identified in more than 163 countries. On 10 January 2020, the SARS-CoV-2 genetic sequence data was shared through GISAID, and by 19 March, the global pharmaceutical industry announced a major commitment to address COVID-19. The current COVID-19 vaccines are widely credited for their role in reducing the spread, severity, and death caused by COVID-19 (Subbarao, 2021: 1123).

As of March 28, 2022, more than 483 million cases have been confirmed worldwide, with more than 6.1 million deaths attributed to COVID-19. On the other hand, 4.53 billion people are fully vaccinated, while 5.07 billion people are partially vaccinated.

Conclusion

As we have tried to show in this paper, in which only some of the pandemics that have affected humanity have been discussed, infectious diseases have been with us since ancient times. If, at the beginning, we fought through a process of natural selection and empirical treatments, now technology and science are our closest allies. However, the lack of education, distrust in science and superstitions of their peers remains the most difficult obstacle to overcome in the fight against pandemics. It is certain that pandemics will come again, which is why it is very important to invest in science and education, in order to emerge victorious in the battles that will come.

References

1. Antoine, D. (2008). The Archaeology of "Plague". *Medical History*, 52(S27): 101-114.
2. Barbieri, R., Drancourt, M., Raoult, D. (February 2021). The role of louse-transmitted diseases in historical plague pandemics. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 21(2): e17–e25.
3. Benedictow, O.J. (March 2005). The Black Death: The Greatest Catastrophe Ever, *History Today*, 55(3).
4. Brundage, J.F., Shanks, G.D. (2007). What really happened during the 1918 influenza pandemic? The importance of bacterial secondary infections. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 196(11), 1717-1718.
5. Córdova, K.A. (1990). Hispaniola and Puerto Rico: Indian Acculturation and Heterogeneity, 1492–1550.
6. Duggan, A.T., Perdomo, M.F., Piombino-Mascali, D., Marciniak, S., Poinar, D., Emery, M.V. (December 2016). 17th Century Variola Virus Reveals the Recent History of Smallpox. *Current Biology*, 26(24): 3407-3412.
7. Feng, D., de Vlas, S.J., Fang, L.Q., Han, X.N., Zhao, W.J., Sheng, S. (November 2009). The SARS epidemic in mainland China: bringing together all epidemiological data. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 14(s1): 4-13.
8. Fenner, F., Henderson, D.A., Arita, I., Ježek, Z., Ladnyi, I.D. (1988). The History of Smallpox and its Spread Around the World. World Health Organization.
9. Hawgood, B.J. (February 2007). Waldemar Mordecai Haffkine, CIE (1860-1930): prophylactic vaccination against cholera and bubonic plague in British India. *Journal of Medical Biography*, 15(1): 9-19.
10. Harper, K. (2015). Pandemics and Passages to Late Antiquity: Rethinking the Plague of c. 249-70 described by Cyprian, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 28, 223-60.
11. Henderson, D.A., Preston, R. (2009). Smallpox - the Death of a Disease: The Inside Story of Eradicating a Worldwide Killer (1st ed.). Prometheus Books.
12. Jackson, C. (2009). History lessons: the Asian Flu pandemic. *British Journal of General Practice*. 59(565), 622-623.
13. Levitt, E.B., Allen, I., Smith, M.A. (2015, December 4). Plague of Athens: Another Medical Mystery Solved at University of Maryland. University of Maryland Medical Center. Retrieved February 10 2016, from <https://www.newswise.com/articles/plague-of-athens-medical-mystery-may-be-solved>.
14. Littman, R.J. (October 2009). The plague of Athens: epidemiology and paleopathology. *The Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine*, 76(5), 456-467.
15. McCormick, M. (2007). Toward a Molecular History of the Justinianic Pandemic, in Lester K. Little (ed.), *Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541–750*, Cambridge University Press.
16. McKenna, M. (2016, December 8). Child Mummy Found With Oldest Known Smallpox Virus. National Geographic Society. Retrieved December 9 2016, from <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/mummies-smallpox-virus-dna-lithuania-health-science>
17. McNeill, W.H. (1976). *Plagues and Peoples*. New York Anchor Press.

18. Mills, C.E., Robins, J.M., Lipsitch, M. (December 2004). Transmissibility of 1918 pandemic influenza. *Nature*, 432(7019): 904-906.
19. Morens, D.M., Fauci, A.S. (April 2007). The 1918 influenza pandemic: insights for the 21st century. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 195(7): 1018-1028.
20. Needham, J. (2000). Science and Civilisation in China: Volume 6, Biology and Biological Technology, Part 6, Medicine. Cambridge University Press.
21. Olea-Ricardo, A., Christakos, G. (2005). Duration assessment of urban mortality for the 14th century Black Death epidemic. *Human Biology*, 77(3): 291-303.
22. Otri, A.M., Singh, A.D., Dua, H.S. (October 2008). Abu Bakr Razi. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. 92(10): 1324.
23. Potter, D.S. (2004). The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180–395 Routledge history of the ancient world. Psychology Press.
24. Prentice, M.B., Rahalison, L. (April 2007). Plague. *Lancet*, 369(9568): 1196-1207.
25. Rosenberg, C.E. (1987). The cholera years: the United States in 1832, 1849 and 1866. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
26. Sack, D.A., Sack, R.B., Nair, G.B., Siddique, A.K. (January 2004). Cholera. *Lancet*, 363(9404): 223-233.
27. Sarris, P. (2007). Bubonic Plague in Byzantium: The Evidence of Non-Literary Sources. in Lester K. Little (ed.), Plague and the End of Antiquity: The Pandemic of 541–750, Cambridge University Press.
28. Smith, C.A. (1996). Plague in the Ancient World. *The Student Historical Journal*.
29. Stenseth, N.C. (2008). Plague Through History. *Science*, 321(5890): 773-774.
30. Strahan, L.M. (1994). An oriental scourge: Australia and the Asian flu epidemic of 1956. *Australian Historical Studies*, 26(103): 182-201.
31. Subbarao, K. (July 2021). The success of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines and challenges ahead. *Cell Host & Microbe*, 29(7): 1111-1123.
32. Suzuki, K., Akama, T., Kawashima, A., Yoshihara, A., Yotsu, R.R., Ishii, N. (February 2012). Current status of leprosy: epidemiology, basic science and clinical perspectives. *The Journal of Dermatology*. 39(2): 121-129.
33. Taubenberger, J.K., Morens, D.M., Fauci, A.S. (2007). The Next Influenza Pandemic. *JAMA*. 297(18): 2025.
34. UNAIDS. AIDS epidemic update: December 2007.
35. Valleron, A.J., Cori, A., Valtat, S., Meurisse, S., Carrat, F., Boëlle, P.Y. (11 May 2010). Transmissibility and geographic spread of the 1889 influenza pandemic. *PNAS*. 107(19): 8778-8781.
36. World Health Organization. (November 2014). Plague Fact sheet N°267.
37. World Health Organization. (2012). Expert Committee on Leprosy - Eight report. World Health Organization.
38. Worobec, S.M. (2008). Treatment of leprosy/Hansen's disease in the early 21st century. *Dermatologic Therapy*. 22(6): 518-537.

THE HISTORY AND CREATION OF THE AGENDA 2030: DESIGNING THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

*Daniel de la Rosa**

*Silvia Carrascal Domínguez**

10.52846/AUCSI.2022.1.06

Abstract

This article analyzes and studies the history and background of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Firstly, a historical journey has been made to understand the evolution and development of education up to the arrival of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development action plan. In this way, a timeline was presented that reflects the path taken by the United Nations and the international community to arrive at To reach this new international framework. In this line, the post-2015 agenda, conferences, summits and international decades have been examined, as they were decisive events for the adoption of the SDGs. A official UN documents and programmes were analysed, demonstrating the enormous volume of documentation that has been published on the subject. There is no better way to understand the international interest generated by the proposed topic than to read the "Preamble1" of Resolution A/RES/70/1, 25September 2015, Transforming our world: the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In this document you can find the new proposal for a better and higher quality future for all people on the planet.

Key words: *History, Sustainable, Development, Goals, Agenda*

1. A historical journey before the creation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

1. 1. International conventions that led to the creation of the SDGs

The UN celebrates decades - ten-year cycles to achieve specific goals - with the aim of making specific events have a greater international impact. This section looks at different decades that have left their mark on the current international SDG proposal, specifically those related to inclusive learning and attention to diversity.

Thanks to the First United Nations Development Decade (1960-1970), measures and programmes were created to eliminate illiteracy, hunger and disease; a clear commitment to achieve inclusive education for all. Different conferences and campaigns were organised: the *Conference on the Problems of Economic Development* - where conclusions were gathered from the least developed countries -, the *World Campaign against Hunger, Disease and Ignorance*, and the *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*. In this context, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was created in 1965 with the aim of supporting countries, promoting change, facilitating access to knowledge and democratic governance, reducing poverty, promoting crisis prevention and recovery, protecting the environment, promoting sustainable energy and providing solutions to eliminate HIV/AIDS. (Castillo, 2007). This agenda, as will be

* Professor of Social Responsibility, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Phone: 0034636835483, Email: Ruiz/d.delarosa@ufv.es

* * Lecturer in Education, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Phone: 0034610788190, Email: sicarras@ucm.es

seen below, was central to the elaboration and development of the MDGs and SDGs. This decade, unlike the following ones, did not have goals and targets, nor did it have a body in charge of monitoring compliance with the measures adopted, which made it difficult to achieve.

After the evaluation of the first measures, it was noted that the goals set had not been reached; therefore, in view of the needs, the Second United Nations Development Decade (1971-1980) was proclaimed. (Naciones Unidas, 1970). The resolution contains terminology, ideas and approaches that are linked to today's SDGs, such as goals and targets, as well as review and assessment.

In order to alleviate the hunger situation in the 1970s, the *World Food Conference* was created and adopted the *Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition*, which laid the foundation for the SDGs 1 and 2. (Programa Mundial de Alimentos, 2009).

In this context of inequality, the General Assembly convened its sixth special session in 1974, during which it adopted the *Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order "based on equity, equality, sovereignty, independence, common interest and cooperation of all states"*. The final proposal was made up of twenty principles on which a new order should be based. A very relevant fact in this document is this call for a new order, as it is based on the same criteria that the SDGs propose today.

The review of these periods, according to the experts, had failed, since the goals were not met, as the UN General Assembly itself pointed out, and therefore proposed the Third United Nations Development Decade (1981-1990), which set out new strategies to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Jackson (2007) The General Assembly itself also noted this, and therefore proposed the Third United Nations Development Decade (1981-1990), which set out new strategies for reducing inequality between countries and eliminating poverty and dependence on rich countries. (Naciones Unidas, 1981). Months later, the UN Commission on Human Rights set up a group of governmental experts to review and evaluate the implementation of the new international development strategy. This group was tasked with studying the scope and content of the right to development and proposing ways to ensure the realisation of economic, social and cultural rights. The importance of this decade for the SDGs is undeniable, as it sets goals, targets and monitoring (measurement is increasingly present, which will help with self-criticism).

In 1986, the resolution entitled *Declaration on the Right to Development* was adopted. Its ten articles are a declaration of intent that calls for a return to the origins of the UN Charter. This expert group is very similar to the current Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDG). The group's objectives include: developing an indicator framework for global monitoring; providing technical support for their application; ensuring the use of agreed and harmonised definitions; reviewing methodological developments on indicators and their metadata; and working in an open, inclusive and transparent manner. These targets demonstrate that the current SDGs have absorbed the best of all these years.

This declaration offers a transcendental definition for the object of study, that of the right to development, which they define as follows:

It is a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of all individuals and peoples, on the

basis of their participation in development and in the fair distribution of the benefits resulting therefrom.... (Naciones Unidas, 1986b, p. 1).

This concept is not specific to the UN, as it is first found in the *General Conference of the International Labour Organisation*, known as the Declaration of Philadelphia (ILO, 1944). They have a very extensive development that will be analysed in detail in later sections and goes as far as the 2030 Agenda.

Continuing with the proposed historical development, in the 1990s the Fourth United Nations Development Decade (1991/2000) was approved. In this decade, the previous mistakes and all the vocabulary of the new international economic order were left behind, but years later a negative evaluation was made again, this time blamed on the unforeseen events of the world economy. (Del Castillo, 2000).

García (2017) speaks of three stages in the UN regarding human rights education: an intuitive first stage (1948-1993), a second stage of awareness-raising (1993-2004) and a final stage of consolidation and projection (2004 onwards). (Muñoz, 2016). As it is not only the development decades discussed in the previous pages that have influenced the SDGs, we will now examine other decades whose contribution to the 2030 Agenda is relevant, maintaining the chronological order established so far.

The first of the decades to be mentioned was the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004). This decade came about at the suggestion of the *Vienna World Conference* in 1993, a discussion of which will follow later. During this period it was the only global mechanism for dissemination, research and education, until the advent of the MDGs and their goal two, "basic education for all". (Magendzo, 2006).

With this decade, the importance of equitable and real education for the UN is once again evident. The document brings us closer to the wording of ESD, where human rights are specifically mentioned as a pathway to sustainable development. The resolution of the decade proposes a pathway for political leaders to put action plans in place. It also sought to minimise adult basic education by promoting education systems that seek to develop people on the basis of the common good and human rights. (Naciones Unidas, 1996c).

The proposal made was very similar to the 2030 Agenda. The plan of action explains the bases, principles and objectives, but what is most interesting for this study is the explanation for the implementation of the programme and the evaluation, which is undoubtedly the basis for the MDGs and SDGs in terms of education. On this occasion, the UN would produce a document with different methods to call for action in the respective countries, an approach that is maintained with the SDGs, as each government has autonomy for its involvement and implementation (United Nations, 1997). This time, two periods of evaluations were carried out, in a first half (Naciones Unidas, 2000b) and the final (Naciones Unidas, 2004b).

Following these evaluations, the World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005-present) was proclaimed with the aim of continuing to work on the objectives set out in the decade just analysed and to consolidate the idea that education is a powerful tool for making human rights a reality and their fulfilment. This programme is developed in different stages that help to understand the proposal of education in which everyone is included:

1. The first phase (2005-2009) (UNESCO, 2006b) focuses on the primary and secondary education systems. At this point, the need for a broader and more systematic national vision is raised. (UNESCO, 2010a). At this point, the MDGs were at the halfway point and focused on meeting their targets. Goal two of the global proposal sought to achieve primary school enrolment for all the world's children, a drive to achieve equal education for all. With the advantages that time has given us, nowadays it is scarce to stick to the number of students enrolled in order to promote equitable education, since the best way to achieve this would be to know the number of students who complete the educational process.
2. The second phase (2010-2014) focuses on human rights education for higher education and training programmes for learners. The new global goals, which were to follow the MDGs, were already beginning to be worked on, and one of the main improvements was to increase cooperation between agencies of all kinds. (UNESCO, 2010b). If comprehensive, rights-based education was to be pursued, universities had to be involved.
3. The third phase, (2015-2019) was dedicated to strengthening the implementation of the first two phases and promoting human rights training for media professionals and journalists (United Nations, 2014c).

Following the proposed timeline, different decades that laid the foundations for the SDGs are analysed. Thus, the first (Naciones Unidas, 1997b) and second (Naciones Unidas, 2007c) United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty, 1997/2006-2008/2017. In the first half of the first decade, the MDGs had already been adopted. The first of these related to poverty eradication, a clear evidence of the influence of this decade on the MDGs. The assessment of the first decade called for more time, more uniformity in progress and a holistic approach - in short, a broader vision for solving the problem. (Naciones Unidas, 2007a). During the second decade, more emphasis was placed on efficient coordination and on contributing to the achievement of the SDGs, which, unlike the previous ones, would be reflected in the first two, *End Poverty* and *Zero Hunger*. (Naciones Unidas, 2010a).

In 2001, the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World was proclaimed - the continuation of the aforementioned United Nations Decade for Human Rights - which deepens both the concept of a *culture* of peace as a transdisciplinary project (Naciones Unidas, 1997a) and the concept of *education for sustainable development*. This decade transformed the way of thinking about children and generated a movement for peace that was reflected in the SDGs. (Gonzalo, y Gorjón, 2011).

Three of the articles that make up this document are relevant to this study: the first, which recognises the culture of peace as a set of values, attitudes, traditions, behaviours and lifestyles based on sustainable development; the fourth, which states that education is fundamental to achieving it; and the eighth, which argues that NGOs and other areas involved in education are key agents in achieving this culture. In the proposed action plan, similarities have been noted with target 4.7 which, as will be seen

below, deals with global citizenship; indeed there are references to promoting human rights, gender equality, tolerance, participation and solidarity. (Naciones Unidas, 1999).

UNESCO played a key role in demonstrating that education is the fundamental reference in the construction of such a culture of peace (Cabello *et al.*, 2016).

Another decade that influenced the creation of the SDGs was the United Nations Literacy Decade: Education for All (2003-2012). "Literacy: a path to freedom". As can be read in the "Preamble" of resolution A/RES/56/116 adopting this decade, Member States are urged to advance the right to education for all and to foster the conditions for learning to reach everyone at every moment of their lives.

This document is relevant for its inclusion of all the initiatives on education that the UN had open and for the invitation to defend them jointly. The intention of this period was to promote the achievement of the six Education for All (EFA) goals - discussed in the following pages - as well as to extend education to those who do not have access to it, and in particular to adults.

In UNESCO's first mid-decade assessment, the results were optimistic - increased literacy rates and increased awareness of the importance of education - but the same document acknowledged that progress was not enough, as millions of children were still out of school. (UNESCO, 2009b).

Other documents derived from this decade set out the guidelines for monitoring and measuring the goals, aspects that are basic to the 2030 Agenda:

- Resolution A/RES/63/154 and A/RES/61/140. They provided guidance on how to achieve better results and urged international agencies and governments to continue their work. (Naciones Unidas, 2007b; 2009a). The inclusive education proposal, within the SDGs, also provides a roadmap for achieving the outcomes.
- Resolution A/RES/59/149. Requesting reports on the implementation of the International Plan of Action every two years. (Naciones Unidas, 2005a). This initiative is maintained in the 2030 Agenda, an action plan through which countries can carry out voluntary reviews of their progress.
- Resolution A/RES/57/166 and A/RES/56/116. It welcomed the proposal and called for accountability to the decade, as well as flexibility for each country to adapt them according to its needs (United Nations, 2003; 2002a). Flexibility was one of the important lessons to be learned in order to achieve the global proposals.
- Resolution A/65/183. Proposed that a final assessment be made of the activities carried out by Member States and other stakeholders to achieve the goals of the decade (Naciones Unidas, 2011).

The last decade to be mentioned in order to understand the current UN educational approach is the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014). The following pages explain this action plan and its contribution to the concept of *education for sustainable development*, which is key to this study.

1.2 UN international conferences that contributed to the creation of the sustainable development goals

Different conferences have been selected since 1990, a date that has been chosen because it is the date that the previous global MDG agenda established as the starting line for assessing results. The conferences that have been researched are relevant, because they emerge as a change of strategy in approaching development and trying to meet the goals. (Sotillo, 2015; 2018).

It is necessary to go back a few months before the date on which the analysis of the summits and conferences began, as the Convention on the Rights of the Child had already entered into force and been ratified. This international treaty - which is obligatory and binding on the signatory countries, which must implement all the rights it recognises - is the most widely ratified in history, with 192 member countries having signed.

This convention was followed by the World Summit for Children, one of the first summits to call for international support for children. (Naciones Unidas, 1990) was one of the first summits where an international call was made to join in the support of children. The indications offered were for developing countries. At that time, cooperation was north-south, there were no common objectives, and the countries with the most resources were proposing solutions to countries with socio-economic difficulties. The global proposal of the SDGs, in contrast to other plans, calls on all citizens and all future generations.

Another conference that must be cited in order to understand the Agenda is the United Nations *Conference on Environment and Development*. (Naciones Unidas, 1992). Here, the interests of all were sought in order to create a new global partnership. The declaration understood the concept of *sustainability as a* path to a more balanced world, and called for the "eradication of poverty", goal 1 of the MDGs, and created Agenda 21, which consisted of a plan of global, national and local actions to be carried out by UN entities, the governments of its Member States and individual groups. The MDGs and SDGs have tools and programmes similar to Agenda 21 to achieve the stated goals. The declaration cited the right to development, linking law, development and sustainability, concepts that will stabilise over time until they become indivisible.

The next world conference that contributed to the research was the *World Conference on Human Rights*, which, in its paragraph six, underlined the link between development and human rights: "The World Conference on Human Rights reaffirms the right to development [...] as an integral part of fundamental human rights" (United Nations, 1993, p. 5). (Naciones Unidas, 1993. p. 5).

The following year, the *International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD)* took place at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. (Naciones Unidas, 1994). In this case, principle five addressed social, economic and political development as a way to improve the quality of people. It also highlighted education as a key factor in sustainable development and specified that there was an interdependent relationship between education and demographic and social change.

Another summit of note was the World Summit for Social Development, which was intended to be a summit of hope, commitment and action. The summit acknowledged the influence of the above summits, which demonstrates the relevance and contribution of the above events. This congress based social development on

human dignity, human rights, equality, respect, peace, democracy, mutual accountability and cooperation. (Naciones Unidas, 1995b).

Following the proposed timeline, the *Fourth World Conference on Women* took place, whose influence is direct, as it is present in MDG 3: *Promote gender equality and empower women* and SDG 5: *Gender equality*. (Naciones Unidas, 1995d). This conference was a milestone in the fight for equality. (Giménez Armentia, 2007) It is relevant to highlight the document's commitment to promoting "people-centred sustainable development, including sustained economic growth, through basic education, lifelong learning, literacy and skills training, and primary health care for girls and women", a proposal very similar to that of the SDG 5: Gender Equality. (Naciones Unidas, 1995d, p.13) a proposal very similar to that of target 4.7 discussed in this study.

Before concluding this overview, it is necessary to mention the *Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements*. This conference recognised a worldwide deterioration of settlements and living conditions, and stated that cities should be places where people can live with dignity, good health, happiness and hope; objectives similar to those set by the social entities we are working with in this study. As a result of the conference, it is worth highlighting the Habitat Agenda, which maintains the line of strengthening local institutions in order to achieve the objectives and proposes a plan to achieve the agreements. (Naciones Unidas, 1996a). It is relevant that the declaration recognises that:

A new era of cooperation is dawning, the era of a philosophy of solidarity. (...) The hope of a common future and an exhortation to engage in an enterprise of undoubted value and interest, that of building together a world in which all live in a secure home with the promise of a decent life in dignity, good health, safety, happiness and hope (United Nations 1996, p. 9).

From this conference and its conclusions there were references in the MDGs, not only behind SDG 7: *Ensure environmental sustainability*, which would be self-evident, but also in SDGs 2, 4 and 5, where the MDGs would be central to their achievement. SDG 11 takes up the work of these two conferences, but concern for the planet is one of the five central axes of goals 6, 12, 13, 14 and 15.

After analysing the meetings mentioned in the previous pages, the clearest precedent emerges in terms of its form, model and methodology: the MDGs. Following its success and hope, in the words of its secretary, Ban Ki-Moon, in the foreword to the 2015 MDG Report, "there is no doubt that we can fulfil our shared responsibility to end poverty, leaving no one behind, and create a world of dignity for all" (United Nations, 2015, p. 3).

The document accepted that there was still a long way to go, but recognised that global action works and is the only path to a balanced future and a life of dignity for all (Naciones Unidas, 2015b).

The turn of the century was a good time for the 189 countries to consider new strategies and to return to the roots of the UN. Resolution 53/202, adopted on 17 December 1998, agreed to hold the UN Millennium Assembly in the year 2000. This was the largest gathering of heads of state and/or government ever held in the world.

The report that helps to understand the new objectives is *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21ST Century* (A/54/2000). (Naciones Unidas, 1998b).

The concern of the time was to rethink the UN and its international role. The document analysed the situation of the world through a journey from the creation of the UN to sustainability, seeking the greatest support from the civilian population while renewing the UN.

Within this framework, it was decided to organise the Millennium Summit. (Naciones Unidas, 2000c) The Millennium Declaration (A/RES550/L.2), which aimed to "achieve a more peaceful, prosperous and just world". The document called for the responsibility of all based on human dignity; an idea that reinforces and reaffirms the UN's thinking, as this declaration was based on previous conferences.

1.3 The World Summit: The Millennium Goals.

The Millennium Summit was a moment of international coordination, illusion and hope in every sense. It was believed from the outset that it would be possible to achieve the goals set and that the world would be turned around. These goals focused on specific problems and their success surprised many, even transforming the agenda of world leaders. (Stiglitz, 2015). Ban Ki-Moon (2015) acknowledged in the final report of the goals that they had generated the most successful anti-poverty movement in history. The new global agenda created new rules of the game so that all countries could work together towards the common goal of eradicating poverty and hunger and improving the quality of life of all the world's citizens. The MDGs epitomised basic needs and fundamental rights that no person should be without. (Villamil y Romero, 2011).

The initiative - spearheaded by Kofi Annan - was presented as a way to take action by conveying the interconnectedness of many problems and the possibility of achieving a better world. (Ministerio de Educación, 2009). The first official reports already foresaw that more work was needed, although the results were improving. (Sachs, 2005).

To monitor the eight proposed goals, an interagency Interagency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators, the IAEG MDGs, was established under the UN Secretary General's Bureau for Economic and Social Affairs, which also includes governmental and statistical agencies. These agencies were responsible for preparing data to monitor progress. Their tasks also included defining methodologies and technical issues to assist in the reading and presentation of the data. (CEPAL, 2010). The work of this group was essential to provide meaningful analysis of the results. (Naciones Unidas, 2013a). It is relevant that so much emphasis is placed on measurement and monitoring, as this study pursues the same objective.

Necessarily, because of its direct relationship to the analysis under study, a detailed analysis of the assessment of MDG 2: *Achieve universal primary education* has been carried out, which is essential for a complete view of the construct proposed here. This goal is the prelude to what will happen years later with the SDGs.

Education, from this moment on, was conceived as the axis of human development, an idea present in the approach of the MDGs, although, as mentioned above, the fact that it is part of human rights obliged to achieve full compliance. The right to education is directly related to the development of people and their growth; it has to do with increasing the quality of life at all levels. (Naciones Unidas, 2005b).

The goals set were threefold: to ensure that they could complete a full cycle of primary education, net enrolment rate in primary education, and proportion of pupils

starting grade 1 who reach the last grade of primary education. These proposals were a milestone because they presented a concrete way of working with clear and concise objectives that would help an optimal evaluation of the process.

This proposal was heavily criticised for being ill-considered and going against the universality of education. (González-Geraldo, 2015) However, as shown in different evaluations, enrolment rates during the years in which the MDGs were active increased by 8 %, as well as school absenteeism decreased by 43 %, which would reflect the improvement in these areas. However, much work remained to be done, because 59 million children were still out of school - 53% of whom were girls - and another 124 million children in the world were unable to complete primary school. (Naciones Unidas, 2015a).

It was recognised, following this objective, that not only the school is an engine of change, but that learning takes place in communities and families, a relevant idea, as the fieldwork carried out in this study is very much community-based. (UNICEF, 2007) This is a relevant idea, since the fieldwork carried out in this study is very much community-based. Education, necessarily, had to go hand in hand with the other goals, as it is the necessary pillar to end poverty. The EFA conferences, discussed in detail below, clearly influenced the approach to this goal (Alonso and Atienza, 2005).

The MDGs did not create legal obligations for states, but - as we have seen - political commitments, which meant that in some countries they were not taken seriously enough. It can be concluded that the achievements were too concrete and did not address the totality.

This section should not end without a brief qualitative assessment of these global commitments. These goals generated international confluence, led the way to end inequalities, gave visibility to the problem, upheld the belief in the responsibility of each individual for the eradication of problems and placed education on global agendas. It was, until then, the most important commitment to improve living conditions (Amnesty International, 2010). The goals allowed for the consolidation of the measurement and quality of the processes proposed to achieve the goals. This form of measurement generated a scientific basis that has consolidated the monitoring and follow-up of the SDGs.

Criticism and proposals for improvement were not slow in coming. The targets set to achieve the goals were very general, unambitious, and left many global problems off the agenda; as stated in the conference *From the MDGs to the SDGs: Analysis and critical appraisal of the new 2030 Agenda* (Unceta *et al.*, 2012).

The social partners did not allow the deadlines to expire in order to carry out the corresponding evaluation. It was clear that there were disparities in meeting the goals (Progress for Children, 2010). Vandemoortele (2002) The MDG drafter stated that his intention was not to formulate an agenda for international development and that the proposal was based on assumptions about historical trends in global progress, which seems to indicate a flaw in the approach. Others emphasised more strongly that the goals had to be tailored to the different realities of countries. (Cecchini *et al.*, 2006).

They were also reproached for the lack of a global study where programmes were not only made for the countries of the South, but for all of them equally. (Sanahuja, 2016). Another of the experts who spoke of the lights and shadows of these objectives

was (García Olmedo, 2015) The expert, who asserted that progress was uneven and that the project was ineffective in tackling the most serious problems, such as hunger and poverty, also criticised the lack of a global study in which programmes would not only be made for the countries of the South, but for all of them.

Results in education were not positive, and progress was timid; this is evident in the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015: Did we make it?* on the outcomes of the Dakar Plan of Action. While it has to be said that the data on out-of-school enrolment and gender parity were encouraging, they were not. (Naciones Unidas, 2015b).

Mention should be made of the report that the Secretary-General issued prior to the adoption of the SDGs entitled *The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty and Transforming Lives by Protecting the Planet*. (Naciones Unidas, 2014a). It was a demand from countries for the full range of contributions to the post-2015 development agenda, a moment Ban Ki-Moon used to speak of a "crossroads of history" and to take stock of the contributions of previous decades.

2. The process of elaborating the sustainable development goals: Post-2015 Development Agenda

Before analysing the 2030 Agenda, it is necessary to mention the conferences and working documents that defined the SDGs. From the beginning of the drafting of the 2030 Agenda, the United Nations wanted to put 62 working teams at the service of the project - in addition to other stakeholders such as the European Union, the G-77, regional groups, the G-20 - and thus rectify previous mistakes, such as not taking into account civil society and other social actors (Sanahuja, 2013).

Three years before the SDGs were approved, the process known as the Post-2015 Development Agenda began. This process, as Gómez Gil states (2018) This process, as Gómez Gil states, began before a comprehensive evaluation of the previous goals had been carried out, thus lacking precise proven certainties that would make it possible to improve on the previous international agenda and its errors.

29 intergovernmental processes were launched from September 2012 to December 2015. A Sustainable Development Solutions Network (hereafter SDSN) was created. This network - which was one of the initiatives to promote sustainable development and design and implement the post-2015 global agenda - was organised into 12 technical working groups.

In order for the new agenda to have an international character and involve everyone, reports were commissioned that marked the path to the 2030 Agenda. A collective action solution was the only possible and effective way to address the new challenges of the era; a developed and collateral vision where sustainability was the guarantee was demanded. (Millán, 2015).

Numerous different reports were created to work towards new objectives to overcome the mistakes of the previous international plan (see table 1).

Table 1

Preparatory reports on the sustainable development goals

Name of the report	Year
The future we want for all of us	2012
A new global partnership: eradicating poverty and transforming economies through sustainable development	2013
A million voices: the world we want. A sustainable future with dignity for all	2013
Good education	2013
Start the global conversation	2013
Global commitment to inclusive and sustainable development: considerations on the post-2015 development agenda	2013
A life of dignity for all: accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and advancing the UN post-2015 development agenda.	2013
Open Working Group of the General Assembly on the Sustainable Development Goals	2014
The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty and Transforming Lives while Protecting the Planet	2014
Sustainable Development starts with education: how education can contribute to the proposed post-2015 goals.	2014
Universal commitment to human and sustainable development: Spain's position on the post-2015 Development Agenda	2015

Source: own elaboration.

Below is an analysis of the different reports presented in Table 1 to understand their contribution to the SDGs. In the report *The Future We Want for All*, the aim was to support the consultation and participation process, which is important to involve and engage society in the achievement of the proposed goals. The report recommended building on the principles of human rights, equality and sustainability, as well as calling for shared responsibility and political commitment, with concrete goals and targets to enable progress to be measured (United Nations, 2012).

At that time post-2015, the global *Education First* initiative was born. (UNESCO, 2016d) which aimed to accelerate *progress towards the* Education for All (hereafter EFA) goals and the MDGs and to promote quality, relevant and transformative education. The initiative focused on three priorities: getting all children into school, improving the quality of learning and promoting global citizenship. (Naciones Unidas, 2012). These documents emphasise the centrality of education - post-2015 sustainable development begins with education and is essential to achieving the goals (UNESCO, 2014d) - making inclusive education and learning two of the pillars of the new proposal.

Another publication that affected the creation and drafting of the SDGs was the report *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development* in this case it was commissioned to make recommendations for the post-2015 Development Agenda. This report is relevant because it would bring together what

would later become known as the 5 Ps, goals that focused on the planet, people, peace, prosperity and partnerships.

The next document presented was *A Million Voices: The World We Want A sustainable future with dignity for all*. This report was the result of a global consultation of more than one million people. Importantly for this project, there was a particular focus on the views of the poor and marginalised. In terms of global citizenship and inclusive education, it is also a relevant report, as vulnerable children were mentioned. It referred to the importance of establishing policies and plans to support disadvantaged people and their basic competences to achieve optimal personal development in line with the environment. The document added the need to support children in non-formal education settings. (Naciones Unidas, 2013c).

There are also references to education for sustainable development as a framework for including sustainability and global citizenship training. The consultation was led by UNESCO and UNICEF, regional meetings were held, with NGOs and high-level experts, and these were followed by a global thematic consultation. It is important to note, within the framework of this study, that *good education* was by far the item that aroused the most interest, as can be seen in the report summarising the results. (ONU, 2013d). The same report reflected the participants' clamour to go beyond the quantitative. Another valuable report was *Inicia la conversación global*, a document analysing the votes that had been taken so far, over a period of one year.

The report *An action agenda for sustainable development* supports the four dimensions of society: economic development, social inclusion, environmental sustainability and good governance. Relevant is the call for the support of non-formal education programmes as a tool for the achievement of the goals. (Red de Soluciones para el Desarrollo Sostenible, 2013). In the same year, the document *A life of dignity for all: accelerating progress towards the millennium development goals and advancing the UN post-2015 development agenda* was also presented. (Naciones Unidas, 2013c) which included the recommendation to create a universal, integrated and human rights-based agenda for development for all.

It is in this context that UNESCO's *General Conference* emerged, where the "Education Strategy 2014-2021" was adopted, with four strategic objectives: to help develop education systems that foster high quality and inclusive lifelong learning, to empower learners to be creative and responsible global citizens, and to promote EFA and define the future education agenda. The wording of its overarching goal is very similar to that of SDG 4: "*Ensure equitable and inclusive quality education and lifelong learning for all by 2030*", which shows the strong influence of these conferences on the final outcome.

Another important report was that of the *Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals*, which already read the proposal for the SDGs as they are now known (Naciones Unidas, 2014b).

Also noteworthy is the document *The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty and Transforming Lives by Protecting the Planet*, which compiles all the contributions to the Post-2015 Development Agenda. This report is the starting point for the SDGs. (Naciones Unidas, 2014a).

This was the year 2015, when it was necessary to take a break and assess whether the proposed goals had been achieved. The General Assembly recognised some important advances, but was categorical in stating that there were many people who continued to suffer from poverty and hunger.

Another report related to this study is *Sustainable Development Begins with Education: How education can contribute to the proposed post-2015 goals*. This document highlighted the pivotal role of education in the new agenda, being the starting point for the new goals and an enabler for the achievement of the new targets. It reviewed the relationship of education to the 16 proposed goals and concluded that education accelerates progress and is key to development. (UNESCO, 2014d).

The working paper *Global Commitment to Inclusive and Sustainable Development: Considerations on the Post-2015 Development Agenda* also stands out as a text that highlights the contribution of the MDGs and the path opened up by the UN to set a universal agenda in which everyone had a contribution to make. According to this study, the MDGs succeeded in drawing international attention to the problems that were now everyone's responsibility and that could be measured within a specific timeframe. As improvements, they called for the need for everyone to take ownership of the goals by involving everyone in the goals, accepting the heterogeneity of societies and identifying their priorities, which would make the markers more pluralistic and flexible. (Alonso *et al.*, 2013).

3. Conclusions

The new international framework proposed by the United Nations through its Sustainable Development Goals aims to empower citizens to take a leading role in the construction of fairer cities. A roadmap that currently allows all people to be included in progress in a comprehensive and cross-cutting manner.

The legal structure is not simple, as each country had to work on its goals from its diversity, without binding character or legal effects. Although the proposal goes beyond the borders of each country, the goals have to be achieved by all countries. In fact, there is only one purpose, but two territorial frameworks for action. (García Maties, 2016).

In 2016, UNDP published *From MDGs to Sustainable Development for All: Lessons Learned from 15 Years of Practice*, a document that captured the lessons from the MDGs and improvements in education, health and citizen prosperity. (PNUD, 2016).

The MDGs were central to the creation of the next international agenda. They offered many lessons that were kept in mind, such as the need to adapt to the reality of each country, to create flexible documents and frameworks, and to focus on the relationship of all institutions and people so that change comes from within.

This led to the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the most ambitious global agenda adopted by the international community to call for collective action around common goals for people, planet and prosperity. (Gómez Gil, 2018) Its intention was to strengthen universal peace and access to justice; as well as to achieve the participation of all to encourage all of humanity to move in the same direction and thus achieve the goals that were not achieved in the previous proposal.

As demonstrated, the current proposal is an improvement over the previous plan. This research and historical review shows that an attempt has been made to change

some of the mistakes of the past. One of the greatest achievements has been the involvement of civil society in the creation and design of the 2030 Agenda. This can be seen in the sympathy aroused in citizens for each of the goals. Another important benefit has been the inclusion of all countries, the most developed and the least developed. We have understood that change will only be possible to the extent that governments around the world and citizens promote sustainability in all areas.

The history and creation of the SDGs demonstrates that the 2030 Agenda makes complete sense and meets criteria that are at the origin of the United Nations. The proposed goals respond to current problems and seek to generate change.

References

1. Alonso, J. A., Ayuso, A., Carrasco, J., Costrafeda, A., Díaz de Sarralde, S., Fernández, L., Gayo, D., Larrú, J. M., Lumbreras, J., Mataix, C., Ravina, L., y Sánchez, E. (2013). Compromiso global por un desarrollo incluyente y sostenible: Consideraciones sobre la Agenda post-2015. Secretaría General de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo. -http://bibliotecadigital.aecid.es/bibliodig/es/catalogo_imagenes/grupo.cmd?path=1006020
2. Alonso, J.A y Atienza J (2005). Los objetivos del Desarrollo del Milenio. ¿Cómo hacer que la deuda externa favorezca el cumplimiento de los ODM? *Documentación social*, N° 136, p89-102
3. Amnistía Internacional. (2010). *De las promesas a los hechos*. Amnistía Internacional.
4. Cabello, P., Carmona, S., Gorjón F. J., Iglesias, E., Sáenz López, K., y Vázquez Gutiérrez, R. (2016). Cultura de paz (1.^a). Patria.
5. Castillo, O. (2007). El desarrollo, progreso o ilusión?: Aportes para el debate desde el ámbito rural. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana
6. Cecchini, S., Rodríguez, J., y Simoni, D. (2006). La medición de los objetivos de desarrollo del milenio en las áreas urbanas de América Latina. CEPAL
7. CEPAL. (2010). Vacíos y discrepancias estadísticas en los indicadores ODM
8. Del Castillo, A. M. (2000). Universidad y cooperación al desarrollo: Nuevas perspectivas para la docencia, la investigación y la intervención social. EDITUM.
9. García Maties, R. (2016). Las entidades locales y los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Algunas notas sobre la naturaleza jurídica de la Agenda 2030. *Reala*, Nueva Época, 5, 96-105
10. García Olmedo, F. (2015). Luces y sombras en el cumplimiento de los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Mileni. *Revista de libros*. <https://www.revistadelibros.com/blogs/ciencia-al-alioli/luces-y-sombras-en-el-cumplimientode-los-objetivos-de-desarrollo-del-mileni>
11. Giménez Armentia, P. (2007). Un estudio de la IV Conferencia Mundial sobre las mujeres. *Revista Comunicación y Hombre*, 3, 81 a la 94
12. Gómez Gil, C. (2018). Objetivos de desarrollo sostenible (ODS): Una revisión crítica. *Papeles*, 140, 107-118
13. González-Geraldo, J. L. (2015). Educación, Desarrollo y Cohesión Social. Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla La Mancha
14. Gonzalo Quiroga, M., Gorjón, F., y Sánchez García, A. (Eds.). (2011). Métodos alternos de solución de conflictos. Dykinson: Universidad Rey Juan Carlos.

15. Jackson. (2007). Antecedentes de los objetivos de desarrollo del Milenio: Cuatro decenios de lucha en pro del desarrollo en las Naciones Unidas. Crónica ONU. <https://unchronicle.un.org/es/article/antecedentes-de-los-objetivos-de-desarrollo-del-milenio-cuatro-decenios-de-lucha-en-pro-de>
16. Magendzo, A. (2006). Educación en derechos humanos (1.a). LO
17. Millán, N. (2015). Un Análisis de la Agenda Post 2015 desde la Perspectiva de la Coherencia de Políticas para el Desarrollo. Relaciones Internacionales, 28, 81-103
18. Ministerio Educación. (2009). Educar para el desarrollo sostenible
19. Muñoz Ramírez, A. (2016). Movilización contra educación para la ciudadanía y los derechos humanos. Universidad de Salamanca.
20. Naciones Unidas. (1970). Segundo Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para el desarrollo. [http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/2626%20\(XXV\)](http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/2626%20(XXV))
21. Naciones Unidas. (1981). Tercer Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/35/5>
22. Naciones Unidas. (1986a). Declaración Derecho al Desarrollo. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/41/128>
23. Naciones Unidas. (1986b). Declaración sobre el derecho al desarrollo. http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/SP/AMeetings/17thsession/GA_declaration41-128_sp.pdf
24. Naciones Unidas. (1990). Declaración Mundial sobre la supervivencia, protección y desarrollo de los niños. <https://www.unicef.org/wsc/declaration.htm>
25. Naciones Unidas. (1992). Declaración de Río sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo. <http://www.un.org/spanish/esa/sustdev/documents/declaracionrio.htm>
26. Naciones Unidas. (1993). Conferencia Mundial Derechos Humanos Viena. <http://www.cinu.org.mx/temas/dh/decvienapaccion.pdf>
27. Naciones Unidas. (1994). Informe de la Conferencia Internacional sobre la Población y el Desarrollo. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N95/231/29/PDF/N9523129.pdf?OpenElement>
28. Naciones Unidas. (1995b). Cumbre mundial sobre desarrollo social. <https://undocs.org/es/A/CONF.166/9>
29. Naciones Unidas. (1995d). Informe de la Cuarta Conferencia Mundial sobre la Mujer. [https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/Beijing %20full %20report %20S.pdf](https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/Beijing%20full%20report%20S.pdf)
30. Naciones Unidas. (1996a). Conferencia sobre los Asentamiento Humanos. https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/12040_Habitat_II_report__Spanish.pdf
31. Naciones Unidas. (1996c). Plan de acción para la educación en la esfera de los derechos humanos-lecciones para la vida. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N97/008/05/PDF/N9700805.pdf?OpenElement>
32. Naciones Unidas. (1997a). Cultura de paz. <https://undocs.org/es/A/RES/51/10>

33. Naciones Unidas. (1997b). Primer Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Erradicación de la Pobreza. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/51/17>
34. Naciones Unidas. (1998b). Reforma de las Naciones Unidas: Medidas y propuestas. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/52/850>
35. Naciones Unidas. (1999). Declaración y Programa de Acción sobre una Cultura de Paz. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/53/243>
36. Naciones Unidas. (2000b). Informe de la Alta Comisionada de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos sobre la evaluación de mitad de período de los progresos hechos para alcanzar los objetivos del Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación en la esfera de los derechos humanos (1995–2004). <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/640-/40/PDF/N0064040.pdf?OpenElement>
37. Naciones Unidas. (2000c). Organización de la Cumbre del Milenio de las Naciones Unidas. <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/54/281>
38. Naciones Unidas. (2002). Informe de la Cumbre Mundial sobre el Desarrollo Sostenible. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02-/636/96/PDF/N0263696.pdf?OpenElement>
39. Naciones Unidas. (2004b). Informe sobre los logros y los fallos registrados en el Decenio y sobre las futuras actividades de las Naciones Unidas en esta esfera. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G04/112/39/PDF/G0411239.pdf?OpenElement>
40. Naciones Unidas. (2005a). Decenio de las Naciones Unidas de la Alfabetización: La educación para todos. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/485/23/PDF/N0448523.pdf?OpenElement>
41. Naciones Unidas. (2005b). Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio, una mirada desde América Latina y el Caribe.
42. Naciones Unidas. (2007a). Actividades del Primer Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Erradicación de la Pobreza (1997-2006). <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/62/267>
43. Naciones Unidas. (2007b). Decenio de las Naciones Unidas de la Alfabetización: Educación para todos. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/502/86/PDF/N0650286.pdf?OpenElement>
44. Naciones Unidas. (2007c). Segundo Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Erradicación de la Pobreza (2008-2017). <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/62/205>
45. Naciones Unidas. (2009). Decenio Internacional de una cultura de paz y no violencia para los niños del mundo, 2001-2010. http://fund-culturadepaz.org/spa/DOCUMENTOS/DECLARACIONES,%20RESOLUCIONES/Decenio_Internacional_cultura_de_paz_y_no-violencia.pdf
46. Naciones Unidas. (2010a). Actividades del Segundo Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Erradicación de la Pobreza (2008-2017). <http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/65/230>

47. Naciones Unidas. (2011). Decenio de las Naciones Unidas para la Alfabetización: Educación para Todos. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/523/55/PDF/N1052355.pdf?OpenElement>
48. Naciones Unidas. (2012). El futuro que Queremos para Todos. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/unttrep_ort_sp.pdf
49. Naciones Unidas. (2013a). Estadísticas e indicadores para la agenda de desarrollo post-2015.
50. Naciones Unidas. (2013b). Declaración y programa de acción de Viena.
51. Naciones Unidas. (2013c). Una vida digna para todos: Acelerar el logro de los objetivos de desarrollo del milenio y promover la agenda de las Naciones Unidas para el desarrollo después de 2015. <http://undocs.org/sp/A/68/202>
52. Naciones Unidas. (2013c). Una vida digna para todos: Acelerar el logro de los objetivos de desarrollo del milenio y promover la agenda de las Naciones Unidas para el desarrollo después de 2015. <http://undocs.org/sp/A/68/202>
53. Naciones Unidas. (2014a). El camino hacia la dignidad para 2030: Acabar con la pobreza y transformar vidas protegiendo el planeta. <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/publications/files/2015/01/SynthesisReportSPA.pdf>
54. Naciones Unidas. (2014a). El camino hacia la dignidad para 2030: Acabar con la pobreza y transformar vidas protegiendo el planeta. <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/publications/files/2015/01/SynthesisReportSPA.pdf>
55. Naciones Unidas. (2014b). Informe del Grupo de Trabajo Abierto de la Asamblea General sobre los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. <http://archive.ipu.org/splz-e/unga14/owg-s.pdf>
56. Naciones Unidas. (2014b). Informe del Grupo de Trabajo Abierto de la Asamblea General sobre los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/68/970&referer=/english/&Lang=
57. Naciones Unidas. (2015a). Informe 2015 ODM. https://www.un.org/es/-millenniumgoals/pdf/2015/mdg-report-2015_spanish.pdf
58. Naciones Unidas. (2015b). Objetivos de desarrollo del milenio. Informe de 2015. file:///C:/Users/Daniel %20de %20la %20Rosa/Downloads/UNDP_MDG_Report_2015.pdf
59. Naciones Unidas. (2015b). Objetivos de desarrollo del milenio. Informe de 2015. file:///C:/Users/Daniel %20de %20la %20Rosa/Downloads/UNDP_MDG_Report_2015.pdf
60. PNUD. (2016). Desde los ODM hasta el desarrollo sostenible para todos. http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/SDGs/Spanish/ES_f_UNDP_MDGs-to-SDGs_web.pdf
61. Programa Mundial de Alimentos. (2009). El Hambre y los mercados: Serie de Informes sobre el Hambre en el Mundo 2009. Earthscan.
62. Red de Soluciones para el Desarrollo Sostenible. (2013). Una Agenda de Acción para el Desarrollo Sostenible. <http://unsdsn.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/02/Una-Agenda-de-Accion-C3-B3n-para-el-Desarrollo-Sostenible.pdf>

63. Sachs, D (2005). Invirtiendo en el desarrollo. Un plan práctico para conseguir los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio. https://www.urv.cat/media/-upload/arxiu/catedra-desenvolupament-sostenible/Informes%20VIP/-unmp_plan_practico_para_conseguir_los_obj_de_des_del_milenio.pdf
64. Sanahuja, J. A. (2013). El reto de la pobreza en un mundo en cambio. Fundación cultura de paz. Universidad Autónoma.
65. Sanahuja, J. A. (2016). De los objetivos del milenio al desarrollo sostenible: Naciones Unidas y las metas globales post-2015. Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales (ICEI), Universidad Complutense.
66. Sotillo, J. A. (2015). El reto de cambiar el mundo. La Agenda de 2030 de Desarrollo Sostenible. Catarata
67. Stiglitz, J. E. (2015). La gran brecha: Qué hacer con las sociedades desiguales. Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial España.
68. Unceta, K., Martínez, M. J., y Zabala, I. (2012). La crisis de la cooperación al desarrollo: Los ODS, la agenda del desarrollo y el papel de la AOD. Centro de documentación Hegoa, 31.
69. UNESCO. (2006b). Plan de acción: Programa Mundial para la Educación en Derechos Humanos, primera etapa. UNESCO. <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/PActionEducationsp.pdf>
70. UNESCO. (2009b). Decenio de las Naciones Unidas de la Alfabetización. Marco de Acción Estratégico Internacional. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001840/184023s.pdf>
71. UNESCO. (2010a). Evaluación final de la aplicación de la primera etapa del Programa Mundial para la educación en derechos humanos. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/-493/14/PDF/N1049314.pdf?OpenElement>
72. UNESCO. (2010b). Proyecto de plan de acción para la segunda etapa (2010-2014) del Programa Mundial para la Educación en Derechos Humanos. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G10/151/51/PDF/G1015151.pdf?OpenElement>
73. UNESCO. (2014d). El desarrollo sostenible comienza por la educación. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002305/230508s.pdf>
74. UNESCO. (2014d). El desarrollo sostenible comienza por la educación. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002305/230508s.pdf>
75. UNESCO. (2016d). Educación para la ciudadanía mundial: Preparar a los educandos para los retos del siglo XXI. UNESCO Publishing.
76. UNICEF. (2007). Estado Mundial de la Infancia 2007: La mujer y la infancia. <https://www.unicef.org/colombia/media/2451/file/Estado%20Mundial%20de%20la%20Infancia%202007.pdf>
77. Vandemoortele, J. (2002). Are we Really Reducing Global Poverty? http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website00801/WEB/PDF/ARE_WE_RPD
78. Villamil, L. C., y Romero, J. R. (2011). Los objetivos de desarrollo del milenio de las Naciones Unidas: ¿en dónde estamos y para dónde vamos? Revista Lasallista de investigación., 8(1).

**DAN BERINDEI (NOVEMBER 3, 1923-DECEMBER 23, 2021)
– THE OLD DEAN OF TODAY’S ROMANIAN HISTORIANS,
NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF SOCIETY AND THE COUNTRY,
OF THE AUTHENTIC HISTORICAL VALUES THAT HE HAS SERVED
ALL LIFE**

*Stoica Lascu**

Towards the end of last year, near the Nativity of the Savior, Romanian historiography and culture suffered an irreplaceable loss – the heart of historian Dan Berindei, member of the Romanian Academy, the dean of age and moral-scientific authority of Clio’s servants, stopped.

He represented a professional standard and an indisputable landmark of our Historiography¹, of the Romanian culture in general from the last over half a century. The volumes and studies of his reign, marked mainly by the history of modern Romania in the European context, are consistent scientific-documentary landmarks, unaltered by the passing of the years, validated by time and generated by readers.

Renowned historian of European stature, academician Dan Berindei, the patriarch of the last decades of Romanian Historiography, was also Doctor Honoris Causa of “Ovidius” University – since November 2007, at the suggestion of the Faculty of Theology – when he declared, among other things, in front of the audience from the Senate Hall, that “History is not a hunchbacked old woman. She is an immortal old woman, who must make us understand, comfort us. It must continue to be a great lesson”.

Member of many academic and professional societies, from the country and abroad – including a founding member of the Romanian Society of Historical Sciences – the scientist Dan Berindei represented a national consciousness of today’s Romanian society, the country and the authentic historical values it he has served with devotion and honesty for over seven decades; an exemplary of a true scientist, appreciated as such by the general public and his confreres², and a patriot anchored in the realities of the times with which

* Professor, PhD, Associate Member, Academy of Romanian Scientists; email: lascust@gmail.com

¹ To be seen – v o c e (signed by G.P. /Georgeta Penelea/), in Ștefan Ștefănescu (coord. [ed.]), *Enciclopedia istoriografiei românești*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1978, p. 56; quite recently – v o c e (signed by R.T. /Raluca Tomișan Spinei, Dorina N. Rusu (coord.), *Enciclopedia reprezentanților scrisului istoric românesc* [The Encyclopedia of the Representatives of the Romanian Historical Writing] (Academia Română. Secția de Științe Istoric și Arheologie). Coordonatori [Eds.] ..., ... Vol. I (A-C), Suceava: Editura Karl A. Romstorfer a Muzeului Național al Bucovinei, 2021, pp. 225-226 (v o c e underestimated, unfortunately, in relation to the value and abundance of the author’s writings, respectively in relation to other presences within *Enciclopedia...*).

² These ones gave to him in the past years two volumes-homage Horia Dumitrescu (coord. [ed.]), *Omagiu istoricului Dan Berindei*. Cu prilejul acordării titlului de doctor honoris causa [On the Occasion of the Award of the Title of Doctor Honoris Causa] (Universitatea Craiova – Catedra de Istorie. Muzeul Vrancei. Coll.: *O viață pentru istorie* [A Life for History]), Focșani: Editura D.M. Press, 2001 /688 pp./; respectively – Ștefan Ștefănescu, Florin Constantiniu, Dorina N. Rusu

he was a contemporary; his books, marked by the history of the national renaissance (beginning with the 1821 Revolution led by Tudor Vladimirescu) and the consolidation of the Modern Romanian State (born January 24, 1859) remain landmarks of our historiography – such as: *Orașul București, reședință și capitală a Țării Românești 1459-1862* [Bucharest, Residence and Capital of the Romanian Country 1459-1862] (1963, 2012), *Din începuturile diplomației românești moderne* [From the Beginnings of Modern Romanian Diplomacy] (1965), *Reforma agrară din 1864* [Agrarian Reform of 1864] (1967), *L'Union des Principautés Roumaines* (1967), *Bălcescu* (1969), *L'année révolutionnaire 1821 dans les Pays Roumains* (1973), *Mihail Kogălniceanu, Texte social-politice alese* [Mihail Kogălniceanu. Selected Socio-Political Texts] (1967), *Epoca Unirii* [The Age of Union] (1979, 2000), *Pe urmele lui Nicolae Bălcescu* [In the Footsteps of Nicolae Bălcescu] (1984), *Cultura națională română modernă* [The Modern Romanian National Culture] (1986), *Călători români pașoptiști* [Romanian Travelers of 1848 Generation] (1989), *Revoluția română din 1821* [The Revolution Romanian Revolution of 1821] (1991), *Societatea românească în vremea lui Carol I* [The Romanian Society in the Time of Carol I] (1992), *Diplomația românească modernă* [Modern Romanian Diplomacy] (1995), *Revoluția română din 1848-1849: Considerații și reflecții* [The Romanian Revolution of 1848-1849: Considerations and Reflections] (1997), *Românii și Europa în perioadele premodernă și modernă* [Romanians and Europe in the Premodern and Modern Times] (1997), *Portrete istorice ale românilor* [Historical Portraits of Romanians] (2001), *Les Roumains et la France au carrefour de leur modernité* (2002), *Istoria Academiei Române, 1866-2006: 140 de ani de existență* [History of the Romanian Academy, 1866-2006: 140 Years of Existence] (2006); a.o.

At the death of this prolific and valuable historian, the Bureau of the Presidium of the Romanian Academy showed: "Born on November 3, 1923, in Bucharest, he did his first private studies, then at the «Clemența» School and at the «Spiru Haret» High School. He is a graduate of the Faculty of History and Philosophy, Department of History, University of Bucharest, with the title *magna cum laude* and Doctor of History, with a thesis on "The city of Bucharest, residence and capital of Wallachia (1459-1862)". After graduating, he became a researcher and scientific secretary at the Institute of Balkan Studies and Research (1946-1948), then assistant at the Institute of History and Philosophy of the Romanian Academy (1948-1952).

In 1952-1955 he was abusively removed from scientific research by the ruling communist regime. He was recalled in 1955 and worked as a principal researcher at the «Nicolae Iorga» Institute of History of the Romanian Academy for 45 years. He served as Scientific Secretary and Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council. After 1990 he was able to develop a teaching career, being an associate professor at the Faculty of History of the University of Bucharest, at the «Politehnica» University of Bucharest and the «Hyperion» University of Bucharest.

He is a specialist in the modern history of Romania and the author, alone or in collaboration, of over 90 volumes and over 700 articles and studies published in prestigious scientific journals in the country and abroad, in which he addressed issues

(coord. [eds.]), *Identitate națională și spirit european. Academicianul Dan Berindei la 80 de ani*, București: Editura Enciclopedică, 2003 /734 pp./.

related to political and social history. of the 19th century (the revolutions of 1821 and 1848, the Union of Principalities, the War of Independence), the economic history, the history of culture, of journalism, of the city of Bucharest, the history of diplomacy and international relations.

He was secretary of the National Committee of Romanian Historians (1977-1993) and its president (1993-2015). Member of the Romanian Society of Historical Sciences, Association of International Law and International Relations, Heraldry, Genealogy and Sigilography Commission of the Romanian Academy (vice-president 1971-1981, president since 1981). For his exceptional career as a historian and professor, he was elected *doctor honoris causa* of the universities of Craiova (2001), «Ovidius» of Constanța (2007), «Valahia» of Târgoviște (2009) and the West University of Timișoara (2009). The Romanian Presidency awarded him two high state orders: the National Order «Star of Romania» in the rank of Knight (2002) and the National Order «Star of Romania» in the rank of Officer (2016).

And at his catafalque, Professor Răzvan Theodorescu (B. May 22, 1939) (close friend), member and Vice-President of the Romanian Academy, highlighted the significance of the works of the late historian: “In an almost centennial existence, full of remarkable intellectual successes, but also of painful trials – sometimes hard to imagine, but which he overcame with dignity, courage and confidence in destiny – Dan Berindei dedicated his talent and science to illuminating the founding episodes and leading personalities of Romanian modernity, from gaining independence, from Cuza and Carol I to Bălcescu and Kogălniceanu. In fact, this descendant of a boyar family, who contributed a lot to the building and defense of Romania, was the historian of the 1848 Generation – this is the title of his reception speech in what was his second home, the Romanian Academy, which he served -with devotion, with elegance, I would even say selflessly.

Dan Berindei, member of the Romanian Academy since 1991, its Vice-President in two terms, president and Honorary President of the Section of Historical Sciences and Archeology for almost 30 years, after 35 years remarkably illustrated the research team of the Institute of History «Nicolae Iorga» and chaired the National Committee of Historians, is the scientist who gave us dozens of books and hundreds of studies, but also the most extensive history of the Academy, which contributed essential and clairvoyant to the publication of the ten academic volumes of The history of the Romanians, who brilliantly represented the national science abroad.

We will never forget how, in 1980, the World Congress of Historical Sciences in Bucharest was able to be a success, despite the vicissitudes of time, thanks to the diplomacy and intelligence of our friend.

Lover of country and people, generous and cultured, close to young people, wise and forgiving when misunderstood by some, the Academician Berindei – the last great donor of the Academy – leaves the memory of a senior, of a venerable patriarch, illustrating an entire era with its lights and shadows, one that contemporaries and descendants will always remember with respect and piety”.

In recent decades, especially, the illustrious missing person has made public, in several interviews – as well as in a valuable volume of independent confessions – crumbs from life, judgments on historical events and personalities (including contemporary ones).

Some examples

“I was concerned (during the difficult period of the early 50’s – our note) about my professional career. My father was convicted because he had joined the resistance movement. My father-in-law, Ioan Hudiță [August 1, 1896-March 21, 1982], a former minister from the National-Peasant Party, was pursuing an increasingly contrary policy. He spent eight years in prison without a sentence. My wife was caught carrying a note from her mother from an already convicted person. With so many family members in prison, in the fall of 1952, I was released from the Institute of History.

It was a real struggle to be able to maintain your intellectual honesty, not to let ideology shape the past. History was cataloged (especially in the 1950s – our note) from the beginning, it had to be rewritten. England and France were imperialist powers, Ion Brătianu was a traitor to the country. You were not allowed to write well about such things. You had to find a corridor, sneak in, like a historian. I, for one, was very concerned with social unrest. They had been a reality in our history, but they were also interested in the regime. It was all about treating the way it was, not being forced to change history. By the time you got to the censorship, it was already nice, you talked for a while, and you were told where to sweeten a form. In 1958, I even had a scandal in Scânteia magazine, about a communication I had made, in which I claimed that the radical liberals C.A. Rosetti and Ion Brătianu had been partisans of the agrarian reform, which took place in 1864. It was a terrible heresy in their eyes, they rubbed me a lot on this matter, and later, in 1964, I came back with exactly the same theses, suddenly accepted.

If today were a situation like in my father’s youth, how many of the foreign students would come back to enroll? No one. Everyone here would flee abroad. Everyone’s dream is to leave. Everyone wants to do something just for himself, no one wants to do anything for the country. My kids are gone, too, from the ’70s. The girl [Ruxandra – B. April 12, 1951] got married in the Netherlands, she is retired from the Dutch state. The boy [Mihnea – March 22, 1948-June 19, 2016] is in Paris. They ran away from a totalitarian system. Who came back after 1989? Dinu Giurăscu [February 15, 1927-April 27, 2018] and Neagu Djuvara [August 18, 1916-January 25, 2018]! No, we don’t have patriots anymore! We no longer have a collective conscience and no national education. The country is scattering” (2012).

In another conversation, also in 2012: “*You said that a re-evaluation of Marshal Antonescu is needed. What do you mean?* Well, we’re witnessing the re-evaluation of Horthy nowadays. Why would Antonescu be worse than Horthy? In Horthy’s time, the Holocaust was in full swing, while in Antonescu’s time, Jews from the Old Kingdom or those from Northern Transylvania received Romanian passports and were able to leave. So the measure is not equal. In Antonescu’s time it was also said «Stop!» Of course, the loss of life, the responsibility for certain actions must be emphasized. But in history this is what happens! If you consider Napoleon’s responsibility, you will find hundreds of thousands of young people from all European nations dead! But on the other hand, it has left a modern Europe. He laid the foundations of today’s Europe. In history, measure must be measure. *Are Romanians ready to accept the positive parts as well?* I think they are too prepared! Well, he was seen a few years ago, when he was ready to come out on top in a top with great Romanians. It is forbidden from above, so to speak,

from elsewhere. *Is this opposing community too vocal?*: There is a Jew, Teșu Solomovici, who wrote a massive volume, with good and bad, to an extent, objectively, about Antonescu. It's a very delicate matter and things are not very settled yet. It will be seen in two or three generations. The more you distance yourself, the more you calm down. *Do you think that King Carol II is in a similar situation?*: I wrote about Carol II that he was a king of Culture. He was smart and realized how important culture is to a smaller people. But he was short as an Assyrian king. Good cheese in a dog's bellows. I blame Queen Marie for preparing a king. Ferdinand was tormented by his uncle. He didn't want to be king, it was the last thing in this world he wanted, but he obeyed, he had nothing to do. He was educated, he was sent, county by county, to military units, to town halls. He didn't like it, but it worked. This debt has been inculcated in him. This is what Carol II understood with Mihai: he did the Palatine School for him and so on. But he was raised a little in the field, so to speak. Queen Marie was wonderful for her national unity, for her conduct during the war, and so on, but Carol II could have been a wonderful king. In fact, even the old King Carol, in 1913, said that his grandchildren are Romanians: they drink, swear, borrow money and do not give it back (laughs)".

And regarding the qualities that a historian should have in the scientific research of events and facts, the great Romanian historian showed (in 2012): "In order to get as close to the truth as possible. If you start from a sentence, from a preconceived idea, the chosen path is wrong from the beginning. Secondly, the analysis must be started from the fullest or widest possible knowledge of the sources. Obviously, the historian can come up with solutions to fill the information gaps, but he can never ignore the existing sources. These sources must also be approached critically and not accepted without rigorous scrutiny; in many cases, these may include falsehoods and manipulations, as well as partisan views of issuers. Thirdly, the historian must start to build his vision on the historical moment or on the personality in question, knowing the approached topic, but also parallel situations and, at the same time, the general framework. Nicolae Iorga's intuitions often surprise us to a large extent today, because they relied on extraordinary knowledge, his memory being able to store a huge amount of information, which made up a permanent "raw material" that with his brilliant intelligence, out of common, he could use them in different ways. Often, not benefiting in his time from some sources, which would be discovered later, Iorga is able to intuit the missing piece of the puzzle, which would later be confirmed! Science and good faith, passion and detachment from partisan visions or preconceived ideas ensure the success of historiographical research work".

We believe that the gratitude of today's generations of Clío's servants for his scientific work and the national-cultural messages expressed in his historical writing and the public attitudes clearly exposed – "Throughout my life I had only one landmark: Romania!" (2018) –, now, with the disappearance of the great Romanian scientist, it can be materialized by recalling the appreciations of some important representatives of our Historiography.

Thus, two decades ago, another great Romanian historian, Florin Constantiniu (April 8, 1933-April 14, 2012), corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, showed that, "In his person, Romanian historiography finds a pillar of resistance for eternity", and underlined: "Academician Dan Berindei is unquestionably a high-class

specialist whose contributions have ensured considerable progress in understanding the modern period of Romanian history, especially the Tudor Vladimirescu Revolution, the Revolution of 1848 and, especially, the Union era. In the post-war period, the dimensions of the work of academician Dan Berindei were never surpassed by anyone. A lively, permanent, competent presence, which gave brilliance to Romanian historiography and brought respect to foreign personalities. Because, present at numerous colloquia and congresses, Dan Berindei was a brilliant representative of the Romanian school of history, who found in him an unparalleled ambassador.

A scientist, academician Dan Berindei, descendant of an illustrious family, has consistently manifested himself as a supporter and defender of great national values. He is a real fighter – in the noblest sense of the word – for the defense of the Romanian national identity and values, especially when they are ignored or denigrated. In the spirit of the best traditions of Romanian historiography, illustrated by the great chroniclers and A.D. Xenopol, Nicolae Iorga, and Gheorghe I. Brătianu, the academician Dan Berindei defend the past and the dignity of the Romanians against the «fables» of the malevolent. This position is all the more admirable today, in the conditions of a harmful offensive, which, under the pretext of eliminating the «myths» from the national history, aims, in fact, to undermine the national consciousness”.

Then, to the present day, Professor Ioan-Aurel Pop (B. January 1, 1955), president of the Romanian Academy, emphasized (in 2018) that Academician Dan Berindei configured in his work “the portrait of Modern Romania”, and that “Balance model and of behavior, he was always at the center of the culture of his people, whom he endeavored to serve and make known always”.

Also, from Constanța, Professor Valentin Ciorbea (B. October 12, 1946) highlighted the ties of the late deceased with Dobrogea: “He left us a rich historiographical work focused on the thorough research of the modern period in the history of Romania. He loved Dobrudja, which he met, as he confessed to us, at the age of 4-5, when he was brought by his parents to Mangea Punar, today Costinești, on which occasion he admired dozens of eagles approaching the car they were traveling in. This emotional memory will stay in his memory forever.

About Dobrudja he wrote that «it is our window to the seas of the world, resuming its old traditions of civilization. Archaeological discoveries confirm the succession of so many nations into its land. From the ancient Greek cities to the traces of Roman and Byzantine rule – Dobrudja being the territory of the country longest part of the empire – to those of the first Christians, or to Dobrotici, Mircea, to the memory of the long Ottoman rule, the province has a rich past historic”.

From Sibiu, Professor Rudolf Gräf (B. January 26, 1955) (director of the Institute for Socio-Human Research) reported: “From the first studies published after the war, he researched the role of the intellectuals, the majority of aristocratic origin, formed in Paris or in other university cities in Europe, in the work of building the nation and of the modern Romanian state in the service of which he felt throughout his life as a researcher and scientist. Dan Berindei was an old-fashioned scholar, a scholar as he is hardly profiled today, in the service of national goals he considered fundamental to the state, a state in which we find Hegelian ideas or even those of Treitschke, immutable and beyond good or evil, necessary. He also found time to support

research into the history of national minorities, especially the German minority, by appreciating and supporting the work of researchers or research institutions pursuing this goal. In this sense, the Sibiu Institute for Socio-Human Research, and its researchers, but also its associate researchers or collaborators are deeply grateful to him. I am in the assent of my colleagues to express in this way the regret of the members of the Institute of Socio-Human Research in Sibiu for the loss suffered by the Romanian Academy, of the scientific world in Romania and to extend condolences to all those who stayed close to him”.

And from Târgu-Mureș, Professor Cornel Sigmirean (B. June 7, 1956) paints a large portrait of the one who was, among other things, “traveling ambassador of Romanian historiography, present at all world history congresses”, pointing out his personality and trajectory. The first study was published in 1945 in the «Revista Istorică Română», dedicated to the participation of young Romanians in Paris in the Revolution of February 1848. Other studies followed, published in 1947 in the «Revista Istorică Română», in «Arhiva Românească», and in «Hrisovul». From 1947 he was banned from publishing, being forced to leave the Institute of History. The truth is that history and, of course, historians and jurists were the main victims of the Communist regime in the 1950s. It was reintegrated in 1955, at the beginning of the 60's then a relaxation, a partial liberalization in terms of culture, which allowed the marginalized Romanian elites until then, to return to research institutes, to reintegrate into the cultural life of the country. In 1959 he published his first book, *Documente privind Unirea Principatelor* [Documents on the Union of Principalities].

Then followed the book *Aspecte militare ale răscoalei populare din 1821* [Military Aspects of the Popular Uprising of 1821] and *Orașul București, reședință și capitală a Țării Românești. 1459-1862* [The City of Bucharest, Residence and Capital of Romanian Country. 1459-1862], a work that represented the doctoral thesis of the future Academician. A book that symbolically reconnected with one of his ancestors, Dimitrie Berindei, who wrote the first modern study dedicated to the city of Bucharest. The subject of the book, republished in 2012, represented for the young historian of that time, in 1962, a way to avoid the historiographical canons of the regime. The history of Bucharest is a book based on archival documents, chronicles and travel notes, a book about the ancient past of the city, about the economic, military, geographical and political factors that imposed it as the capital of Wallachia, about the history of the city after 1495, in a chronological presentation with the major events that marked its evolution until 1862, when it became the capital of Romania. In an impressive editorial succession, the historian Dan Berindei published research covering a wide range of topics, dedicated to the long Nineteenth Century (...); *Portrete istorice ale românilor. Domni, regi, eroi, cărturari, oameni politici, literați* [Historical Portraits of Romanians. Princes, Kings, Heroes, Scholars, Politicians, Writers], written in the idea that: «Models are needed more than ever», History of the Romanian Academy, more recently the book *Genealogy and society*, a book with an autobiographical character. To the work of the historian are added the volumes of historical sources on the modern period of Romania, the great syntheses of history, of which we mention the contribution to the two treatises on the history of Romania, from 1964 and 2003, to the last as author of volume VII/I and project coordinator.

Part of the last years he dedicated to the publication of *Jurnalului politic* of his father-in-law [Ioan Hudiță's Political Journal], 12 volumes, with Notes, Index, and Introductory Study.

He has published 90 books, as an author or coordinator, 550 studies, over 700 articles, hundreds of lectures, all in a constant effort to understand and explain the nineteenth century, a world in a unprecedented change process, with significant recoveries for Romanians. From the first studies published after the war, he researched the role of the intellectuals, the majority of boyar origin, formed in Paris or in other university cities of Europe, in the work of building the nation and the modern Romanian state.

Traveling ambassador of Romanian historiography, present at all world history congresses. For over 50 years, Dan Berindei has been a true itinerant ambassador of Romanian historiography, present at all world history congresses. He has given dozens of lectures at international scientific meetings, contributing to the knowledge of Romanian history in university and academic circles in Europe.

An activity that earned him well-deserved international recognition: full member of the European Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, full member of the Polish Academy of Sciences and Letters in Krakow, member of the Modern Society of French History, the International Heraldry Confederation, of the International Commission on Slavic Studies, of the International Commission on the History of International Relations, of the Austrian Society for the History of the Eighteenth Century, of the Society of South-Eastern Europe in Munich, etc. He was among the historians who participated in the creation of the volumes *L'Esprit de l'Europe*, coordinated by Antoine Compagnon and Jacques Seebacher.

At the national level, his recognition came especially after 1989: Visiting Professor at the Faculty of History of the University of Bucharest (in 1990), Corresponding Member of the Romanian Academy in 1991, and Full Member since 1992, Honorary President of the Section of Historical Sciences since 2005, Vice-President of the Romanian Academy. As Editor-in-Chief he edited the journals: «Memoriile Secției de Științe Istorice și Arheologice a Academiei Române», «Revue Roumaine d'Histoire», «Studii și Materiale de Istorie Modernă», and was a member of the editorial boards of some profile magazines from the country and abroad: «Historia Urbana», «Anuarul Institutului de Cercetări Socio-Umane din Tg-Mureș», Cahiers «Charles Fourier» (Besançon), «Revue d'Europe centrale» (Strasbourg – Paris), a.o.

He was a tutelary authority of the Romanian historical science of the last decades, consistent with the research of history based on primary sources, on archive documents, in the tradition of erudition promoted by the Romanian interwar school, but receptive to everything that represents new research methods today. Reflecting on historical research, Dan Berindei emphasized that history «is not and should not be a pamphlet or a settlement of accounts but should be a scientific work based on a set of sources, and should not be treated preferentially and selectively, but to present *sine ira et studio*, with objectivity, the studied historical processes».

They are beliefs resulting from the vast experience gained as a historian, based on the belief that history must be the basis of education of every citizen in order to fully give him the feelings of belonging and identity. «Without this foundation of national education – said *Dan Berindei* – we cannot talk about conscious citizens who love their country, want to contribute to its progress and to defend it and its interests».

Man of the City, Academician Dan Berindei started researching history from the premise that the nation and its existence as an ideal of community exist through the culture of tradition, of national values, as identity elements of the Romanian people. Historians, he said in a recent book, have a duty to maintain the nation's memory, defend it and assert it abroad”.

Remarkable personality of our Historiography from the second half of the Twentieth Century and the beginning of the Third Millennium, the historian and the man of culture, the patriot Dan Berindei also ennobled the Romanian Culture in its European dimension, and its disappearance leaves an irreplaceable place. Remain it, however, dozens of books and hundreds of his studies which, together with his firm national-cultural attitudes, constitute valuable scientific and methodical and ideational guidance for Clio's young servants, for the whole of Romanian society in these turbulent times.

Sorin Liviu Damean (coordinator), *Elites and mechanisms of power in the Romanian space (15th-20th centuries)*, Craiova, Universitaria Publishing/ Cluj-Napoca, University Press Publishing, 2021, 197 p.

At the University of Craiova, on 10th and 11th December 2020, it took place the second national conference on „Elites and mechanisms of power in the Romanian space (15th-20th centuries)”, with the participation of twenty-two historians and researchers in the field from several university centers and research institutes in the country. The conference was a scientific event „designed in the perspective of an interdisciplinary approach, with thematic and chronological subjects, starting from the Romanian Middle Ages, going through institutional and social modernization and reaching contemporaneity” (p. 7). As a result, some of the works presented at the conference are gathered in this volume, to which nine authors contributed, from five cities (two from Bucharest, two from Iași, one from Târgoviște, three from Craiova and one from Thessaloniki) belonging to two countries (Romania and Greece), under the coordination of Professor Sorin Liviu Damean, dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Craiova, organizer and host of the conference.

From the point of view of the studied period, the nine studies, placed chronologically in the book, can be divided into three levels depending on the age of reference and the subject approached.

The first three deal with aspects from the medieval period toward pre-modernity, with references to the Wallachia and Moldavia. Ovidiu Cristea, *Oath and „Oath-breaker”*, deals with *The power struggles in Wallachia of the beginning of the 16th century in the vision of Saint Niphon's life* (pp. 9-28). Maria Magdalena Székely addresses the theme of *Kinship, memory and social status in medieval and pre-modern Moldavia* (pp. 29-56), and Radu Cârciumaru presents *A forgotten history, namely A communist horse and the last vandalizing action of the Court of Targoviste* (pp. 57-70, also contains color illustrations). The authors' inclination towards historical studies in the geographical area of their own existence is noticeable.

The next two studies reach the end of the modern period. Sorin Liviu Damean presents the personality of *Titu Maiorescu – the political man* (pp. 71-77). Known mainly as a junimist, literary critic and esthetician, Maiorescu's biography cannot be completed without a competent approach to his role and place in pre-war Romanian politics, which the author does. Liviu Brătescu's study – *The Romanian political elite and the development of civil society. Objectives and mechanisms (late 19th and early 20th century)* (pp. 78-104) – focuses on cultural, political and social associationism.

The last four studies are related to the contemporary period. Monica Neagu presents two female biographies: *Alexandrina Cantacuzino and Maria Glogoveanu – leaders of the interwar feminist movement* (pp. 105-134, also contains color illustrations). Mihai Ghițulescu continues his work in this field with *Attempts at electoral reform in interwar Romania (1928-1933)* (pp. 135-153). Marusia Cîrstea also makes a contribution to the history of Romanian-English relations with *Elite soldiers in the Romanian Legation in London (1923-1930)* (pp. 154-186, it also contains three annexes of documents). And finally, Apostolos Patelakis concludes the volume with an essay on *Ion Brad – The diplomat writer (1929-2019)* (pp. 187-197).

Viewed in terms of content and presentation form, the volume contains six studies and three biographies. Some are more extensive, while others are essays focusing on more specific aspects. The present collection is intended to provoke dialogue, argumentative debate and critical thinking among both specialists in the field and readers interested in history. Both in terms of the range of topics and chronological length, these studies can satisfy a wide variety of curiosities. And the authors are good penmanship, which is evident from the manner of analysis and interpretation as well as the way they are written.

The volume comes with some notable pluses. Firstly, the diversity of authors. This diversity is due to the area of research (medievalists, modernists and contemporaryists), the wide geographical area and the expertise of each. Secondly, the small size of the book, which makes it easy to read and attractive to the audiences interested in such historical readings. The language of the authors, even if it is scientific and specific to this type of writing, is accessible to understanding. And thirdly, the illustrations, which enrich certain studies, are rendered in colour. The studies do not contain bibliographies, but do contain critical apparatus.

We also mark a minus. The contribution of a Transylvanian historian would also have been welcome, alongside the historians from Moldavia and Wallachia already mentioned. Perhaps the next volume will take this into account.

The volume was published in collaboration with two university publishing houses, namely: Universitaria Publishing in Craiova (which also produced the actual printing) and University Press Publishing in Cluj-Napoca, in order to ensure a wider distribution in the university academic environment.

The volume will most likely be continued as new editions of this conference are organised, in which the research of the participating historians participate will be disseminated. Therefore, we cannot but agree with the opinion of the volume's coordinator, who states that „it was the intellectual and political elite who, throughout history, shaped society, proposed paradigms that became reality, and promoted institutional innovation and critical thinking in the fields of science and culture”. (p. 7).

The coordinator and authors deserve to be appreciated, and the publication of the volume is to be welcomed.

Bogdan Emanuel Răduț

Ioan Opriș, *Pagini din istoria diplomației românești* [Pages from the History of Romanian Diplomacy], Editura Altip, no place [Alba Iulia], 2020, 290 pp.; ill., facs., tab. ISBN 978-973-117-679-6

The signatory of this book (B. June 9, 1942), a prominent figure in Romanian museology of the last half century – Honorary Member of Romanian Academy of Scientists –, is a prolific and valuable author of several volumes on the history of Romania in the Twentieth Century, and especially on the history and management of museum institutions, of national heritage, including – *Ocrotirea patrimoniului cultural. Tradiții, destin, valoare* [Protection of Cultural Heritage. Traditions, Destiny, Value] (1986), *Istoria muzeelor din România* [History of Romanian museums] (1994), *Comisiunea Monumentelor Istorice* [The Commission of Historical Monuments] (1994), *Alexandru Lapedatu în cultura românească* [Alexandru Lapedatu in Romanian culture] (1996), *Anton Golopenția. Un destin frânt* [Anton Golopenția. A Broken Destiny] (1998), *Muzee și colecții din România* [Museums and Collections in Romania] (2002), *Istoricii și Securitatea* [The Historians and Security], I-II (2004, 2006), *Aurel Decei sau destinul disperării* [Aurel Decei or the Destiny of Despair] (2004), *Managementul muzeal* [Museum Management] (2008), *Vasile Stoica în serviciul României* [Vasile Stoica in the Service of Romania] (2008), *Colecționism, muzeologizare, patrimonializare* [Collecting, Museologizing, Patrimonialization] (2013), *Prezențe culturale românești în lume 1950-1970* [Romanian Cultural Presences in the World 1950-1970] (2012), *Istoricul Emil Panaitescu și Școala Română de la Roma* [Historian Emil Panaitescu and the Romanian School in Rome] (2014), *Muzee și colecții din România* [Museums and Collections in Romania] (2015), *Gemenii Lapedatu. Istorie și finanțe* [Gemini Lapedatu. History and Finance] (2016), *Vasile Stoica. O emblemă națională în pușcărie* [Vasile Stoica. A National Emblem in Prison] (2021).

This book addresses another side of Romanian history; following a thorough archival investigation – the meticulousness of knowledge from archival sources is a characteristic of the author (former museographer and museum manager, specialist in museotechnics, also a Professor at the University “Wallachia” in Targoviste) – results in a unique overview of human resources (*recte*, diplomats and consuls) who constituted, over the decades, the backbone of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania (from the 1880s, until the establishment of the Republic, December 30, 1947). As the author specifies from the very first lines, “In this volume I did not insist on the direction of a factual and eventful history of Romanian diplomacy. We have not pursued - as distinguished historians have masterfully done – the role of great personalities – as a Mihail Kogălniceanu, I.G. Duca, Nicolae Titulescu, Nicolae Petrescu-Comnen or Gr. Gafencu, in order to keep ourselves within the limits of exceptionality – but we have gathered the contributions of the least distinguished in the first diplomatic line, but at the same time very important. Collecting such contributions bring, we hope, an extra light and understanding on the account of the Romanian diplomatic approach. Of course, to these are added those already known through thorough works and studies, but these can also be hopefully developed by future research. But I was looking for, through the aspects of individual biographies – especially from the documents kept in the Diplomatic Archive – we sought to identify the contributions to the constant, daily

and personalized approach of many professionals sent to represent Romania for more than a century” (p. 13).

The structure of this large volume – very richly illustrated, with suggestive facsimiles of documents and photo illustrations – is as follows: *Ministerul Afacerilor Străine – o țintă ideală a multor tineri valoroși* [Ministry of Foreign Affairs – An Ideal Target for Many Valuable Young People] (pp. 17-31), *Construind cu migală punți de înțelegere* [Carefully Building Bridges of Understanding] (pp. 32-40), *Diplomația în Primul Război Mondial* [Diplomacy in the First World War] (pp. 41-65), *I.I.C. Brătianu și Pacea* [I.I.C. Brătianu and the Peace] (pp. 66-76), *Demersul diplomatic pentru recuperarea unor bunuri culturale* [The Diplomatic Approach for the Recovery of Some Cultural Goods] (pp. 77-91), *Generația Unirii și serviciile ei diplomatice* [The Union Generation and its Diplomatic Services] (pp. 92-160), *Diplomația României la răscrucea anilor '40* [Romanian Diplomacy at the Crossroads of the 1940s] (pp. 161-178), *Intellectualii merituoși la Ministerul Propagandei Naționale* [Meritorious Intellectuals at the Ministry of National Propaganda] (pp.179-236), *Diplomația tranziției postbelice* [The Diplomacy of Post-War Transition] (pp. 237-252).

De asemenea, el include *Anexe* [Annexes] (pp. 253-267) – facsimile archival documents, other than the one inside the text, and maps –, *Bibliografie* [Bibliography] (pp. 277-278), and *Indice* [Index /selective/] (pp. 279-288), as well as *Summary* (pp. 289-290).

The author summarizes, among other things: “After the national union was made – through the full agreement al the union of Bessarabia, Bucovina, Transylvania and Banat with the Romanian kingdom –, signed on the 1 of December 1918, the diplomacy got the mission to internationally impose the country and consolidate its reputation, but especially to correct or tone down unfair critics, revanchist interpretations, negative evaluations made on the nation and its positive abilities.

At the same time with the Union, many new people entered diplomacy, representing the united provinces, admirable knowers of their realities, speakers of foreign languages (Slavic, Hungarian, German) critically needed for the demarches of bilateral relationships normalization, good patriots. The new generation of Great Union diplomats made the proof of remarkable intellectual qualities, being able to negotiate at a high level, representative for Greater Romania. Through their services, in the third and fourth decades – a period that was evaluated as a benchmark of national development – Romania affirmed itself at international level, serving through illustrious diplomats (N. Titulescu, I.G. Duca, N. Petrescu-Comnen, Gr. Gafencu) the League of Nations and its peace policy” (pp. 289-290).

Throughout the volume, in addition to the references to a number of well-known diplomats or people of culture and science (“eminent personalities”) who were active at a certain time in the Romanian diplomatic apparatus (Marcu Beza, Martha Bibescu, Caius Brediceanu, Alexandru Busuioceanu, Emil Cioran, N. Ciotori, Matila Costiescu-Ghika, Aron Cotruș, Alexandru Cretzianu, Carol Davila, Dimitrie Dimăncescu, Trandafir G. Djuvara, Mircea Eliade, Grigore Gafencu, Eugen Filotti, Radu Irimescu, Alexandru Em. Lahovary, C. Langa-Rășcanu, Ion Lugoșianu, Nicolae Mișu, Frederic Nanu, Emil Panaitescu, Ioan N. Papiniu, Vespasian Pella, Sever Pop, Vasile Stoica, Viorel V. Tilea, Constantin Vișoianu, Elena Văcărescu, a.o), the author enriches the image of the history of the diplomatic apparatus Romanian by mentioning, sometimes

at length, the names and activity of some diplomats and the career consul, less or not known at all – “the history of the country through the little ones”, as N. Iorga used to say –, which the author brings back them to the ramp of history – Constantin Brăiloiu, Dimitrie Buracu, N.B. Cantacuzino, Gh.C. Derussi, Radu Flondor, Constantin G. Costa Foru, Vanghele Hrisicu, Al. Lambrino, C. Pădeanu, Al. Pencovici, Gherasim Pinte, Alex. Ranette, Iosif Schiopul, Octavian C. Tăslăuanu, N. Vello, and many others.

Although narrower in pages, the last chapter, in particular, brings a relevant series of information attesting to the avatars that the Romanian diplomatic corps went through after August 23, 1944 (Romania’s accession to the Allied Coalition, until the end of 1947 (abolition of the Monarchy): “the agitation [*vânzoleala*] in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs [*Centrala Externelor*] increased in the summer and fall of ’44 due to front pressure and the aftermath of the military coup on August 23” (p. 239), leading Embassy or Legation leaders (such as the newly appointed Iorgu Iordan, Mihail Ralea, Tudor Vianu, Grigore Moisil, Simion Stoilov – all well-known academics) to complain, due to lack of staff, about the difficulties faced by diplomatic missions in their operation.

Modestly entitled *Pages from...*, this rich documentary volume of Professor Ioan Oprea is a solid documentary contribution to the knowledge of the history of Romanian diplomacy (especially the diplomatic and consular corps).

Tasin Gemil, *Tătarii. Relații cu otomani și români* [The Tatars. Relations with the Ottomans and Romanians], Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2021, 430 pp.; facs., maps ISBN 978-606-37-1138-1

The volume published last year by the well-known Romanian historian (B. September 21, 1943) (honorary member of the Romanian Academy of Scientists), European Turkologist, the most prominent personality of the Tatar ethnic group in Romania, is a very useful overview of the explicit in the title. It is all the more important, as it also contains texts in English – the interested scientific media can thus get acquainted with the Romanian contributions to the history of the Tatars. As the savvy reader already knows, the present historian was – and is – at the same time a tenacious and honest activist for the organization, after the fall of the totalitarian regime, in December 1989, of his ethnicity; for, no less, the research and knowledge of the “true” history of the Tatars, distorted for centuries for politico-imperialist reasons (and to the lack of Tatar specialists).

Indeed, this is what the author points out in the study *Problema etnogenezei tătarilor. The Issue of Tatar Ethnogenesis* (published in 1989, revised in 1994): “The question of the formation of modern Tatar people has not, thus far, been subjected to sufficient unbiased scholarly research. For almost 250 years to date, the Tatar people have been deprived of the protections offered by a national state, a reality which has stymied the defence, study and development of their own history and culture. This lack of an overarching state structure and of its associated academic institutions has allowed neither for the professional formation of Tatar specialists, nor for substantive research into the process of Tatar ethnogenesis or the formulation of a national thesis in this regard, as has conversely been the foremost priority of all other modern nations and nation states” (p. 17, p. 37).

The large and valuable volume is structured in four thematic chapters: I: *Strămoșii kîpceaci (cumani). Qipchaks Anchestors (Cumans)* (pp. 17-113); II: *Hoarda de Aur (Statul de Aur). The Golden Horde (The Golden State)* (pp. 115-173); III: *Hanatul din Crimeea, tătarii din fostul spațiu sovietic The Crimean Khanate, The Tatars of the Former Soviet Space* (pp. 175-271); IV: *Tătarii din România. Tatars of Romania* (pp. 273-387); he has, of course, *Prefață* (pp. 11-12) / Foreword (pp. 13-14), respectively *Bibliografie* [Bibliography] (pp. 389-410) and *Indice* [Index] (pp. 411-430).

Each chapter is thematically subdivided:

Chap. I – *Problema etnogenezei tătarilor. The Issue of Tatar Ethnogenesis* (pp. 17-36, 37-59); *Osmanlı Öncesi Romanya Topraklarında Türk Varlığı* [Turkic Presence on the Romanian Territory before the Ottomans] (pp. 60-84); *Peste un mileniu de existență a populației turco-tătare pe teritoriul României* [Over a Millennium of Existence of the Turkish-Tatar Population on the Romanian Territory] (pp. 85-95); X–XIV. *Yüzyıllarda Orta ve Doğu Avrupa’da İslâm Varlığına Tatar Katkısı* [The Tatars’ Contribution to the Settlement of Islam in Central and Eastern Europe in the 10th–14th Centuries] (pp. 96-101); *Occident și Orient la început de mileniu. West and East at the Beginning of Millennium* (pp. 102-107; 108-113).

Chap. II – *Altın Orda’nın Umumi Türk Tarihindeki Yeri ve Dünya Uygarlığına Katkısı (Kısa bir bakış)* [The Place of the Golden Horde in the General Turkic History and Its Contribution to the World Civilization. A Brief Perspective] (pp. 115-123); *Cumano-Tătarii și începuturile statelor medievale românești. Cumano-Tatars and Early Medieval Romanian States* (pp. 124-135, 136-149); *Puterea centrală și structura socială din Hoarda de Aur* [The Central Power and the Social Structure of the Golden Horde] (pp. 150-157); *Altın Orda Tarihinde Gereken Önemli Düzeltmeler* [Important and Necessary Corrections to the History of the Golden Horde] (pp. 158-163); *The Tatars in Romanian Historiography* (pp. 164-173).

Chap. III – *Cadrul politico-juridic al raporturilor dintre Hanatul Crimeei și Poarta Otomană* [The Political and Juridical Framework of the Relations Between the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Porte] (pp. 175-196); *Crimeea în politica pontică a Porții Otomane* [Crimea in the Pontic Politics of the Ottoman Porte] (pp. 197-203); *Doă documente tătărești referitoare la campania din 1476 a sultanului Mehmed al II-lea în Moldova* [Two Tatar Documents about the 1476 Campaign of Sultan Mehmet II in Moldavia] (pp. 204-217); *Yarlıg al hanului Crimeei Gazî Gheray-Bora adresat domnului Moldovei Aron Vodă-Tiranul* [Yarlıg of the Crimean Khan Gazi Geray-Bora Addressed to the Moldavian Voivode Aaron the Tyrant] (pp. 218-226); *Yeni Belgelere Göre “Halil Paşa Yurdu” ve “İki Saatlik Arazî”* [“The Country of Halil Pasha” and “The Land of Two-Hour Length” in the Light of New Documents] (pp. 227-233); *Relațiile moldo-otomano-crimeene și problema tătarilor nogai din Bugeac* [The Moldavian-Ottoman-Crimean Relations and the Issue of the Nogay Tatars in Budjak] (pp. 234-252); *L’évolution des limites de l’habitat des tatars nogai au Boudjak* [The Changes in the Borders of the Nogay Tatars’ Habitat in Budjak] (pp. 249-252); *Relații comerciale moldo-tătare în secolul al XVIII-lea* [The Moldavian-Tatar Commercial Relations in the 18th Century] (pp. 253-258); *Kırım Tatarları ve Bütün Türk Dünyası İçin Büyük Bir Şans – İsmail Gaspıralı İslahatı* [A Great Opportunity for Crimean Tatars and the Entire Turkic World – The Reform of Ismail Gasprinski] (pp. 259-264);

O nouă inițiativă tătărească de reformă – Euroislamul [A New Tatar Initiative for Reform – Euroislam] (pp. 265-271).

Chap. IV – *Dobruca ve Bucak Tatarları* [The Tatars of Dobrudja and Budjak] (pp. 273-290); *Probleme identitare actuale la tătarii dobrogeni. Dobruca Tatarlarının Güncel Kimlik Sorunları* [Nowadays Identity Issues of the Dobrudjan Tatars] (pp. 291-300, 301-310); *Însemnătatea deosebită a culturii pentru tătarii dobrogeni* [The Particular Importance of Culture for the Dobrudjan Tatars] (pp. 311-317); *Komünist Döneminde Romanya'da Tatarca Yayınlanan Dergi ve Kitaplar* [Magazines and Books Published in Tatar During the Communist Period in Romania] (pp. 318-325); *Dobruca Tatarlarında Düğün* [Weddings at the Dobrudjan Tatars] (pp. 326-333); *Documente privind înființarea Uniunii Democratice a Tătarilor Turco-Musulmani din România (UDTTMR)* [Documents Concerning the Establishment of the Democratic Union of the Turkish-Muslim Tatars of Romania (UDTTMR)] (pp. 334-387).

The author informs readers from the very beginning – *Prefață* (p. 11) / *Foreword* (p. 13) – that his preoccupations with the history of the Tatar ethnic group date back to the beginning of his scientific research activity: “My first individual scientific research topic included, beginning with 1968, in there search programme of the Romanian Academy’s «A. D. Xenopol» Institute of His-tory and Archaeology in Iași, was titled «Moldavian-Tatar Relations in the 18th Century». The Scientific Council of the above-mentioned Institute approved the topic, viewing it as innovative and important for furthering scientific knowledge on a facet of Romanian history that had been almost entirely overlooked by research. In effect, this was to prove a new beginning in modern Romanian historiography. This topic would later be broadened and expanded upon, opening up a new avenue in scientific research focusing on the Romanians’ relations with the Tatars, a prominent theme long ignored by Romanian historians. Indeed, the very first scientific work I would publish, in 1968, focused on two Tatar documents from the 15th century. These would be the first ever Tatar documents fully published in a Romanian translation, unabridged” (p. 11, p. 13).

Also: “Of course, not everything I wrote on the Tatar issue or everything I have ever presented to audiences could be included herein. I naturally undertook a rigorous selection of the available material, above all in accordance with established scientific criteria. The vast majority of the collected studies in this volume were drafted, presented and published over the past three decades. Given that the history of the Tatars was an almost entirely-unknown subject in Romania – including and especially to the Tatars of Dobrogea themselves – I prioritised the issues of Tatar ethnogenesis, their presence in the regions of Dobrogea and Budjak, the rapport between the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Porte, and the present situation and future perspectives of the Tatar community in Romania. These are the overarching themes guiding the four chapters of the present volume. The complex Tatar issue is unfortunately too broad to be settled in the present pages. I nevertheless believe that this volume constitutes an important step on the long and extremely difficult road towards elaborating a *real history* (our emphasis) of the Tatars. This represents the ultimate objective of my career as a historian, an objective I yet do not know whether I will be able to achieve in the brief time afforded me still”.

The honest author is aware that “The complex Tatar issue is unfortunately too broad to be settled in the present pages. I nevertheless believe that this volume constitutes an important step on the long and extremely difficult road towards

elaborating a real history of the Tatars. This represents the ultimate objective of my career as a historian, an objective I yet do not know whether I will be able to achieve in the brief time afforded me still” (p. 12, p. 14).

We will not insist, it is understood, in this short presentation, on the content of each chapter, some, also thematically subdivided. We mention, however, some of the conclusions of the well-documented Romanian historian and, at the same time, national-cultural militant of the Tartars in Romania. Thus, in *The Issue of Tatar Ethnogenesis* (with explicitly formulated subtopics: *The struggle for the liberation of Tatar, How many Tatars are there?, A complex problem, The confusion between Tatar and Mongol, Tatar as an exonym, The terrible power of the word, Today's Tatars are the Cumans of yesteryear*): “Until recently, Tatar history and culture – including the issue of ethnogenesis – have almost exclusively been a subject of interest for non-Tatar researchers with various degrees of success. As was to be expected, foreign authors tackled the issue of Tatar history from the perspective of the particular culture they themselves were a part of, and according to the respective interests of the country they represented. Such authors can be divided into one of two categories. The first comprises those who embarked on their inquiry with preconceived notions and, at times, even foregone conclusions. For these authors – among them the historical chroniclers of centuries past (including the Romanian mediaeval chroniclers), as well as the vast majority of Russian historians – the Tatars are nothing more than a barbarous breed of plunderers and destroyers.

The second category is comprised of historians that strive to remain as objective as possible, seeking to draw upon several credible historical sources and cast impartial judgement. Fortunately, the number of such scientists is on the rise, particularly in the West but also in the former Soviet space. One of the consequences of the Russian invasion of Crimea in 2014 was an increase in scholarly and research interest in the region and its history. However, the clichés cultivated for centuries by authors of the former category are still proving highly resilient. There are still a great many authors (including in Romania) who, despite their apparent objectivity, are in truth tributary to preconceived notions and long-established clichés regarding the Tatars and their past” (pp. 17, 19, pp. 37, 39).

Also: “Of all the Asian migrant peoples, the Kipceacs, better known as the Cumans and then the Tartars, also played the most important role in the history of the Romanians. The name kipceak (qıbceak, qıfceak) is attested by the Selenga inscription, from 744, which states that «Turkish Kıpceacii dominated fifty deans». There is much more indisputable evidence of the Turkish origin of this nation. At the end of the 1st millennium AD, the Kipcecs broke away from the great union of the Kimek tribes, located between the Irtysh and the Urals (Yayık), and began their journey westward, bringing with them many other elements and entire tribes” (p. 125)

No less important is the last chapter, which reveals the beginning of the organization of the Tatar ethnic group, a process in which the author of this volume had a decisive contribution: “As an active member and leader of the Initiative Group in Bucharest and as the first president (founding president) of the first post-communist organization of the Turkish-Tatar population in Romania, as well as in the first representative of the Tatars in the Romanian Parliament, I have information and documents, which entitle me to make some clarifications, corrections, and nuances to what is known about the establishment and the first year [1990] of existence of the Democratic Union of Turkish-Muslim Tatars

in Romania (UDTTMR) (p. 334) (...). Although we had to deal with many attacks and shortcomings, among which the lack of experience in the political-organizational field was one of the most significant, we managed to come to the surface relatively quickly, with a short program of short-term claims and medium. Among these, it is worth noting that we were the ones who included among our priority objectives, from the beginning, the obtaining of «constitutional guarantees» for the representation of national minorities in Parliament and in the local organs of state power. The initiative was mine and I was also the one who, during the preliminary debates related to the draft of the first democratic electoral law, I first managed to convince the team of eminent lawyers (I. Morar, F. Vasilescu, A. Iorgovan, a.o.), the authors of this draft law, and then a good part of the representatives of the parties and organizations from the multi-party Commission, on the opportunity of admitting the representatives of the national minorities in the Romanian Parliament” (p. 343).

A representative synthesis of the scientific research on the relations of the Tatars with the Ottomans and the Romanians, the volume of the reputed Romanian historian is a valuable contribution of the Romanian historiography to the development and dimensioning of the contemporary Turkology.

Stoica Lascu

Marian Zidaru, *The History of International Relations from Antiquity to Modernity. A Level Course*, Editura Etnologică, București, 2019, 308 pp., ISBN 978-606-8830-78-0

The signatory of this university compendium – born on May 8, 1964, in Craiova; graduate of the History and Archeology Specialization of the Faculty of History and Administrative Sciences (1992-1997) from the “Ovidius” University, PhD in History (*Cum Laudae*), with the thesis *Relații politice și economice româno-britanice 1939-1947* [Romanian-British Political and Economic Relations 1939-1947] (coord.: Professor Viorica Moisuc) at the “Ovidius” University of Constanța (2005) – is a specialist in the history of contemporary international relations (with detailed research in the British archives), the history of Romania in the Twentieth Century in a European context (with a focus on the first half and Bessarabia). Author of 11 books (4 – single author), over 70 studies and specialized articles, published in the country and abroad (Bulgaria, Germany, Republic of Moldova, Turkey), he is also a participant in scientific conferences in the country and abroad (Albania, Bulgaria, the Republic of Moldova, Turkey), respectively organizer and moderator in the country of scientific meetings with international participation.

He is the author of the books: *Relații politice și economice româno-britanice 1939-1947* [Romanian-British Political and Economic Relations 1939-1947] (Constanța, 2009, 388 pp.; Doctoral Thesis), *Conflicte înghețate în spațiul ex-sovietic* [Frozen Conflicts in the Ex-Soviet Space] (Constanța, 2011, 158 pp.), *The effects of the Anatoly Serdiukov's reform on the Russian army federation in prospect of the years 2020-2025* (Saarbrücken, 2015, 60 pp.; co-author), *1918-2008. 90 de ani de la Unirea Basarabiei cu Romania* 1918-2008 [90 Years Since the Union of Bessarabia with Romania] (Constanța, 2008, 308 pp.; coeditor), *Arc peste timp – 23 august 1939 – 23 august 2009, semnificații și consecințe* [Arc Over Time – August 23, 1939-August 23, 2009, Meanings and Consequences] (Constanța, 2009, 182 pp.; co-editor), *20 mai 1990. Despre alegerile din județul Constanța. Duminica Orbului sau Duminica înfricoșătoarei judecăți. Documente* [May 20, 1990. About the Elections in Constanța County. Blind Sunday or Sunday of the Frightful Judgment. Documents] (Constanța, 2012, 6 vols., 4,400 pp.; co-author), *Românii balcanici (aromânii și meglenoromânii) în Arhivele Naționale Britanice (1850-1950)* [Balkan Romanians (Aromanians and Megleno-Romanians) in the British National Archives (1850-1950)], (București, 2016, 296 pp.; co-author).

This substantial compendium, university course notes – held at the “Andrei Șaguna” University of Constanța – is a comprehensive overview of such a generous topic today, important in the intellectual construction of young students in the specializations of Political Science and International Relations. However, it is more thematically extensive, the author not limiting himself to exposing the evolution of international relations as such, but broadening his discourse, providing an extended general framework – taking into account the level of training of students, little familiar with universal history – in which these relations unfolded.

The content of this very useful university textbook is:

Chapter 1. Introduction in International Relations (pp. 7-10) (with the subchapters *The subject and issues of the History of the International Relations course*, *The correlation between the “international system” and the “international political system”*, *Correlation between “History of International Politics” and “History of Diplomacy”*; Chapter 2. Greece and the City-State (pp. 11-16); Chapter 3. The Macedonian Empire (pp. 17-25) – with the subchapters *The campaign in Persia*, *Gaugamela-the final battle*, *Campaign in India*, and *The legacy of Alexander*: “The true realization of Alexander the Great did not stand in the conquest of forming a vast but fragile empire, but in the first attempt to unite mankind, to combine cultural civilizations differently. Greek battle techniques have been taken over by African Carthaginians, not just the Oriental Kingdoms. Greek attic was the first widely spoken European language, being the first universal language” (p. 34); Chapter 4. Roman Empire (pp. 26-33) – with the subchapters *Ab urbe condita*, *Pax Romana (27 BHR–180 en)*, *The division of the Roman Empire*; Chapter 5. Bizantin Empire (pp. 34-51) – with the subchapters *Byzantine Governance*, *Evolution of Byzantine Territories*, *The collapse of the empire*, and *Byzantine Legacy in the Principalities of Romania*: “Throughout the Middle Ages, the Romanian countries have undergone a double influence: both from the West and from the Byzantine Orient. Both directions of influence contributed to the birth and affirmation at European level of an original Romanian culture. The languages in which this culture was developed were Slavonic, Latin and Greek at the beginning, then replaced on a larger scale by the Romanian language. Without being part of the Empire, the Romanian Principalities, indisputably the two outside the Carpathian arch, but to a limited extent, Transylvania, benefited from the influences of this legacy, even symbolically, until the proclamation of Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza in the new state, Romania. A long journey in which Byzantineism accompanied by its formulas from the constitution of the political model of the Romanian states to the time of Tudor Vladimirescu⁴⁰. The medieval Romanian culture developed in close connection with the great European cultures: Western and Byzantine” (p. 45); Chapter 6. Europe and the Muslim World (pp. 51-57) – with the subchapters *The emergence of Islam*, *The Arab conquests*, *Islamic civilization*, “*Europe*” and “*Muslim World*”: *mutual perceptions*, *Islam in Western Europe*; Chapter 7. Early and Cassic Medieval Times in Europe. The Emergence of the Kingdom and the Increase of the Power of the Church (pp. 58-67) – with the subchapters *Competing Political Models in Medieval Europe*, *The emergence and growth of European Kingdoms 1000-1300*; Chapter 8. The Catholic Church Reform. Crusades (pp. 68-72) – with the subchapters *The Cluniac and Papal Reformation Movement*, *Christianity and medieval civilization*, *Crusades*; Chapter 9. The Mongol Empire (pp. 73-78) – with the subchapters *Crusades*, *Mongols and Russia’s Development*; Chapter 10. The Three Types of Europe of the Middle Ages (pp. 79-82) – with the subchapters *Political separation of Western and Eastern Europe*, *Byzantine heirs: the Ottomans and the Russians*, *Oriental new serfdom*, *The Controversial Concept of “Central Europe”*; Chapter 11. The Church between the End of the Middle Ages and the Contra-reform (pp. 83-88) – *Pope Bonifaciu VIII and the Conflict with the State*, *The Great Catholic Schism*, *New Theories of the State-Church Relationship and the Advent of Conciliation*, *John Wycliff and lollard heresy*, *Papacy during the Renaissance*, *Reform, Religion and politics during the reform*; Chapter 12. The Constitution of the Modern International System (pp. 88-101) – with the subchapters *Europe on the way to the modernity*, *Spanish Exploration*, *Discovery of America*, *The Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648)*, *Treaties in Westfalia*, *Resumption of*

the Habsburg expansion to the east; Chapter 13. Fight for Hegemony. Conflict and Treatment (pp. 102-108) – with the subchapters *The main conflicts, The succession to the Austrian throne and the 7-year war; Chapter 14. The Ottoman Empire in the 17th-18th Centuries* (pp. 109-126) – with subchapters *Organization and conflicts, Period of the French revolution and the Napoleonic Wars (1789-1815), The Eastern Question and the spread of the ideas of the French Revolution; Chapter 15. The Period of the Revolutions and the Vienna Congress* (pp. 127-138) – with the subchapters *Territorial revolutions and reconfigurations, The Napoleonic Wars, The Congress of Vienna, Balance of power; Chapter 16. The Balkan Revolutions and the Formation of National States in the Balkans* (pp. 139-174) – with the subchapters *The Balkan Revolutions, Balkan States in the 19th Century, The Oriental Question in the 19th Century; Chapter 17. International Relations on the European Continent in the Period 1871-1914* (175-208) – with the subchapters *Great powers, The main military-political alliances, Relations between the Balkans countries: federalization and the crisis (1878-1914); Chapter 18. First World War* (pp. 209-227) – with the subchapters *The ratio of forces between the great powers before the First World War, The Great War, New forms of war; Chapter 19. International Relations in the Inter-War Period* (pp. 228-242) – with the subchapters *Treaty of Versailles, Romania, the European balance and the involvement in the main conflicts until the First World War, The Great Economic Crisis or the Great Depression, Collective security policy failure (1931-1939); Chapter 20. The Second World War* (pp. 242-253) – with the subchapters *Beginning and causes*: “There are still widely debated, among these causes, in varying degrees: the Treaty of Versailles, the Great Economic Crisis, as well as the emergence and development of nationalism, racism and militarism, Italian fascism, German Nazism and Japanese imperialism. Not to be neglected among the main causes may be the threat of the «World Revolution» triggered by the Communist International, the great powers being understood to take preventive measures. This can be explained by the attitude of England and France towards the preparations and the first part of the «strange war». Basically, all the communist instigating activists in Europe were arrested by the Nazis and killed. After the war, several books appeared that looked at this”; and *Ending and strengthening the alliance between the US, USSR, UK. Chapter 21. International Relations and the Cold War* (pp. 254-286) – with the subchapters *Crises and fall of communism in Eastern Europe, Evolution of conflicts during the Cold War, Military political conflicts in the Cold War, Arms race in the late 1960s, The role of international security organizations in maintaining peace and stability in the world; Chapter 22. The Collapse of the Communist Camp and the New World Order* (pp. 287-299) – with the subchapters *Global Power Balance. Resettlement to a multipolar world; The multipolar world: a world of great powers*: “History cannot be predicted in the long term its course can change radically within twenty years. All that can be done now is to issue some judgments and alternatives regarding the development of the international environment. Since humanity needs security in order to develop humanity, in general the decision making forces in different states try to foresee possible threats against the states they lead. Thus the security of a state is often linked to its power, so the cohesion of the state power center is in some way the guarantor of its security and implicitly of its existence. The current international environment is a risky environment, and it seems that the states as power generators have become attractive for risks.

The United States will lose its influence not so much as a result of its decline, but because states like India or China will quickly establish themselves in the next period.

The system of alliances and the hierarchy of the world resulting from the end of the last world conflagration will disappear. Not only will the new players – Brazil, Russia, India, and China – have a place at the top international decision table, they will bring new stakes and new rules of the game.

The potential for conflict will increase in part due to political turmoil in areas of the Middle East. China will be the world's second economy by 2025 and the first military power. India will follow it closely and Russia will have an upward path where the price of barrels of crude oil will be permanently higher than \$ 50-70. The three countries follow the model of «state capitalism», not the Western liberal model.

In a multipolar world, the fragmentation of interests at international level will also weaken the influence of global actors such as the UN, which will only be able to take coherent action with great difficulty. New members will be added to the existing Security Council, but it will become increasingly inefficient given the lack of a leading nation to standardize views” (p. 299).

A generous *Bibliography* (pp. 300-307), for the level of accessibility proposed by the author, completes a very useful working tool, a significant achievement of the Romanian university historical writing today – from one of the most knowledgeable in the history of international relations.

xxx Dumitru Preda, la 70 de ani. De la istorie la diplomatie în serviciul Neamului Românesc (Centrul European de Studii Covasna – Harghita. [Series] *Profesioniștii noștri*, 31. Coll. *Centenarul Marii Uniri (1918-2021)*. Vols. I-II. Ediție coordonată și argument de Dr. Ioan Lăcătușu și îngrijită de Vasile Stancu și Ciprian Hugianu, Editura Eurocarpatica, Sfântu Gheorghe, 2021, 366+670 pp; ill. ISBN 978-606-8851-44-0; 978-606-8851-45-7

Last year, one of the leading representatives of contemporary Romanian historiography, professor, archivist, and diplomat Dumitru Preda (born in Bucharest, June 17, 1951), a representative number of colleagues and friends dedicated him a substantial book (in two volumes), in recognition of his contribution to researching and writing national history, in a European context, in promoting and defending of national identity values.

As Dr. Ioan Lăcătușu, the publisher of the book, pointed out in the Argument, the one honored – in the prestigious collection *Profesioniștii noștri* [Our Professionals] (No. 31) – “is a well-known and appreciated personality in the Romanian academic, diplomatic, and civic circles, being distinguished throughout his career with numerous awards and diplomas that reward his prestigious scientific work, rich diplomatic and civic activity, as well as beneficial involvement in promoting Romanian history and culture, both in the country and abroad”; and “The appearance of the homage volume dedicated to Dumitru Preda at 70 years old, suggestively subtitled *De la istorie la diplomatie, în serviciul Neamului Românesc* [From History to Diplomacy, in the Service of the Romanian Nation] in our collection from Eurocarpatica Publishing House, honors us at the same time, including the publishing house, thus enriching the gallery of distinguished personalities within the respective collection, the number of members of the Romanian intellectual elite, who with their prestige and experience

support the preservation and affirmation of the identity of the Romanians, the multimillennial inhabitants of the Intra-Carpathian Arc; at the same time, we appreciate that his example, like that of the other Romanian confreres, can contribute to our effort, to the normalization of the climate of interethnic coexistence in this blessed space in the heart of Romania”.

Volume 1 (366 pp.) contains, in addition to the enumeration of the *Principalelor direcții de cercetare și publicații* [Main Research Directions and Publications (1974-2021)] (pp. 25-74), a representative and substantial chapter of *Mesaje, mărturii* [Messages, Testimonials] (pp. 75-223). Their authors (62) – personalities of Romanian Historiography and Diplomacy (including close friends), but also from abroad, are: Alexandru Dan Bartoc, *Domnul Ambasador Dumitru Preda o persoană pe care te poți baza* [Ambassador Dumitru Preda is a Person You Can Count On]; Victor Boștinaru, *Dumitru Preda, istoricul, diplomatul, prietenul* [Dumitru Preda, the Historian, the Diplomat, the Friend]; Alfredo Canavero, *Memorial Dumitru Preda*; Ioan Cărmăzan, *La aniversarea unui Prieten*; Marinela Câmpeanu-Pop, *Cuvânt despre Tache Preda*; Ioan Chiper, *Despre istoria unui istoric: Dumitru Preda* [About the History of a Historian: Dumitru Preda]; Șerban Cionoff, *Dumitru Preda sau despre învățăturile trecutului studiabil* [Dumitru Preda or About the Teachings of the Studyable Past]; Bernard Cook, *Colegul și prietenul Dumitru Preda* [The Colleague and Friend Dumitru Preda]; Jean-Yves Conrad, *Profesorului universitar Dumitru Preda*; Ion Constantin, *Istoricul și diplomatul Dumitru Preda, așa cum eu l-am cunoscut* [The Historian and Diplomat Dumitru Preda, as I Knew Him]; Radu Cosăceanu, *Dumitru Preda, istoricul, diplomatul și prietenul* [Dumitru Preda, The Historian, Diplomat, and Friend]; Sorin Liviu Damean, *Dumitru Preda – istoric dedicat și diplomat* [Dumitru Preda – Dedicated Historian and Diplomat]: “I noticed the seriousness and professionalism of Dumitru (for friends, Tache) Preda. His studies on the relations between Romania and the Entente, on the First World War were very well documented, and the opinions expressed more than convincing. He talked about history with passion, was up to date with the latest publications in the field of specialized literature and successfully represented Romanian historiography at the level of the International Commissions or at the numerous congressional congresses in which he participated”; Sabin Drăgulin, *Câteva cuvinte... prea puține... adresate unui Om* [A Few Words – Too Few – Addressed to a Man]; Mihai D. Drecin, *Istoricul Dumitru Preda la vama celor 70 de ani* [The historian Dumitru Preda at the Age of the 70 Years]: “Through him, the message of Romanian historiography was often taken to the space of international historiography, where he was elected in reputable bodies; he knew how to adopt a dignified and constructive position, in accordance with the historical truth”; Horia Dumitrescu, *Diplomatul, profesorul și omul Dumitru Preda la 70 de ani*; Călin Fabian, *La o aniversare... Dumitru Preda*; Alexandru Ion Giboi, *Despre profesionistul Dumitru Preda*; Ion Giurcă, *Istoric și diplomat*: “The merit of Professor Dumitru Preda is also to take care of the translation and publication in international languages of his works”; Luminița Giurgiu, *La ceas aniversar* [At a Birthday Party]: “Continuous concern for analysis and study of the history of the early twentieth century, completed as training one of the best historians of this period. But we can’t forget that unique professional was and is a devoted husband and father”; Gheorghe Grigorescu, *În calea uitării: din drumurile mele împreună cu Dumitru Preda* [In the

Way to Oblivion: From My Travels with Dumitru Preda]; Radu Homescu, *Un mare profesionist* [A Great Professional: Dumitru Preda]; Vasile Iuga de Săliște, *Dumitru Preda – istoric și diplomat în serviciul țării* [Dumitru Preda – Historian and Diplomat in the Service of the Country]; Stoica Lascu, „Collegam” de promoție ’74, „Durut și tinisit soț” – istoricul și diplomatul Dumitru (Tache) Preda [“Collegam” promotion ’74, “Dear and distinguished” – Historian and Diplomat Dumitru (Tache)]; Cleopatra Lorințiu, *Harul de a spune istorie...* [The Grace to Tell History]; Liviu Maior, *Dumitru Preda și fidelitatea față de profesie* [Dumitru Preda and Fidelity to the Profession]; Dorin Matei, *Istoric și editor*: “Dumitru Preda is a passionate editor of documents and text editions”; Dan Manolache, *Dumitru Preda: o prezență dinamică* [Dumitru Preda: A Dynamic Presence]; Ion Măldărescu, *Cavalerul diplomat al muzei Clio* [The Diplomat Knight of the Clio Muse]; Miodrag Milin, *Crâmpie de aducere-aminte, cu Tache Preda* [Fragments of Reminiscences with Tache Preda]; Paul Moren, „Frânturi” pentru portret de profesionist: *Dumitru Preda* [“Fragments” for the Portrait of a Professional: Dumitru Preda]; Constantin Moșincat, *Ambasador al istoriei* [Ambassador of History]; Liviu Mureșan, *Un istoric erudit, un fin diplomat, un adevărat patriot* [An Erudite Historian, a Fine Diplomat, a True Patriot]; Adrian Năstase, *Dumitru Preda, un istoric-diplomat, un Prieten* [Dumitru Preda, A Historian-Diplomat, a Friend]: “Dumitru Preda made an essential contribution to the development of Romanian historiography, through reference volumes he brought to the public circuit main documents about the historical events to which Romania was a part”; Tudor Nedelcea, *Dumitru Preda – omul, istoricul, diplomatul*: “We met more often at international events organized by the Cultural League for the Unity of Romanians Everywhere; Our friendly relations have been strengthened, finding us on the same wavelength in many respects about Romanian culture and language in the university, about the role of Romanian personalities (including Aromanian and Istro-Romanian) in the fields of culture and science, in diplomatic activity to promote national objectives, some of them left under an undeserved cloak of oblivion or sometimes too little known in the country even after 1989. Since September 2019 he is the executive president of the Cultural League for the Unity of Romanians Everywhere”; Virgil Ștefan Nițulescu, *Dumitru Preda – un prieten printre ambasadori* [Dumitru Preda - a friend among ambassadors]; Anca Opriș, *Gânduri... la o aniversare*; Corneliu Pădurean, *Prima întâlnire cu Dumitru Preda* [The First Meeting with Dumitru Preda]; Anatol Petrencu, *Stimate Domnule Profesor, să trăiești!* [Dear Professor, Long Live!]: “You are an old and faithful friend of the Bessarabians, because you supported us in the most difficult moments, you participated with very useful communications in the various scientific symposia, organized by Your Excellence, you were and are open with us, the historians from the named Republic Moldova, you know what our concerns are and perfectly below the information war, promoted against Romania, a war in which the problems of history have a very large place”; Bruno Pischiutta, *Un prieten magnific!* [A Magnificent Friend!]; Adrian Pop, *Dumitru Preda – profesionistul, patriotul, prietenul*; Stoica Cristinel Popa, *Un gând de apreciere față de profesorul Dumitru Preda*; Alba Popescu, *Laudatio: Profesorului Dumitru Preda la 70 de ani!*; Gavriil Preda, *Gânduri pentru un prieten*; Dan Prisăcaru, *In Honorem – Prof.univ. Dr. Dumitru Preda. Diplomație și Istorie în serviciul Țării*; Mihaela Rusu, *Dumitru Preda*; Marcela Sălăgean, *Profesorul, istoricul și diplomatul Dumitru Preda*; Ion Scumpieru, *Dumitru Preda – istoric și*

diplomat, la 70 de ani de viață; Ioan Scurtu: “Dumitru Preda, conscientiously interested in knowing the «true history», read for the seminar on the contemporary history of Romania, which I was leading, not only the recommended bibliography, but also other works, including collections of documents”; Maria Sibianu, *Exceleței Sale Domnului Dumitru Preda, Ambasador Extraordinar și Plenipotențiar al României în Cuba*; Vasile Simileanu, *Cine este Tache Preda?* [Who is Tache Preda?]; Alin Spânu, *Dumitru Preda, un istoric șarmant și profesionist* [Dumitru Preda, A Charming and Professional Historian]: “Researcher and archivist Dumitru Preda professionalized the archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and renewed it to Western standards]; Gemil Tasin, *Coleg de breaslă și de diplomatie*: “As director of the Diplomatic Archives, Dumitru Preda has contributed substantially to the reorganization and especially to the capitalization of the documents from this precious archive, including the volumes dedicated to the diplomatic relations between Romania and Turkey”; Andrei Tinu, *La mulți ani, domnule profesor Dumitru Preda!*; Mihaela Toader, *Domnului profesor și diplomatului Dumitru Preda, cu recunoștință*; Daria Trifu, *Gânduri despre un prieten*; Valeriu Tudor, *O mărturie la aniversarea unui coleg – Dumitru Preda*; Vasile Tutula, *Dumitru Preda la kilometrul 70. De la istorie la diplomatie, în slujba istoriei* [Dumitru Preda at Kilometer 70. From History to Diplomacy, in the Service of History]; Liviu Țăranu, *Rostul arhivelor și destinul istoricului* [The Purpose of Archives and the Destiny of the Historian]: “Through material, method and style (the three fundamental coordinates of historical writing recorded by Nicolae Iorga), Dr. Dumitru Preda has already entered the gallery of established historians in Romania. And if Romanian historiography is what it is today, in addition to the contribution of the great titans, it must be emphasized that it is also based on Sisyphus’ meticulous work of archive workers, including the distinguished and bright figure of Professor Dumitru Preda. The great syntheses cannot and could not be built except on this solid foundation represented by the document. And His Excellence has proved, through his numerous works, especially on the history of the First World War, the value of such syntheses based on a wide and diverse archival documentation”; Maurice Văisse, *O mărturie foarte amicală: A Dumitru*; Gheorghe Vartic, *Dumitru Preda și „Revista de Istorie Militară”*: “Dumitru Preda has been the same warm, generous man for more than 30 years, always ready to help you when needed”; Vitalie Văratice, *Sub semnul frăției* [Under the Sign of Brotherhood]: “All these his qualities are for me an example for me to follow. I share, admire, support, and try to master the elements of his work and lifestyle”; Corneliu Vlad, *Dumitru Preda: un eminent om al cărții și om de acțiune* [Dumitru Preda: An Eminent Man of the Book and a Man of Action]; Ion Brad, *„Arhive”, poezie dedicată lui Dumitru Preda*.

They are also included appreciations of some High Diplomats at UNESCO and accredited diplomats in Havana – where the homage one was the Romanian Ambassador – regarding the personality and activity of Dr. Dumitru Preda; as well: Titu Georgescu, *Referat la Teza de Doctorat RELAȚIILE POLITICO-MILITARE ALE ROMÂNIEI CU ANTANTA 1914-1918 a candidatului DUMITRU PREDĂ, Cercetător științific principal* [Report to the Doctoral Thesis POLITICAL-MILITARY RELATIONS OF ROMANIA WITH THE ANTANTA 1914-1918 of the candidate DUMITRU PREDĂ, Principal Scientific Researcher].

No less significant for the vision on the research of the past and the role of history in contemporaneity are the interviews, included in chap. III, as well as the appreciations of the late historian Florin Constantiniu. The volume is completed with *Illustrations* (pp. 269-343) – a large and suggestive photo gallery –, with *List of Authors* (89) as well as with *Abstract*.

The extensive volume II (670 pp.) includes the studies of 44 researchers, professors, diplomats, publicists – some of them completely unique, all representing contributions in their respective subjects. Is about: Radu Ștefan Vergatti, *Diplomație și politică în 1701: prima carte din lume tipărită în limba turcă, dialectul osman, la București* [Diplomacy and Politics in 1701: The First Book in the World Printed in Turkish, the Ottoman Dialect, in Bucharest] (pp. 11-16); Georgeta Filitti, *Mărturii inedite de acum 200 de ani* (pp. 17-); Costin Feneșan, *Colonelul Sébastiani – scurte note de drum prin Banat, Transilvania și Țara Românească* [Colonel Sébastiani – Short Notes on the Road Through Banat, Transylvania, and Wallachia] (pp. 25-); Cornel Sigmirean, *Italia, romanitatea și nașterea națiunii moderne la intelectualii ardeleni de la mijlocul secolului al XIX-lea* [Italy, Romanity, and the Birth of the Modern Nation at Transylvanian Intellectuals from the Middle of the 19th Century] (pp. 39-); Alexandru Ghișa, *De la Moscopolé la Budapesta. Problema Fundației Gojdu* [From Moscopole to Budapest. The Problem of the Gojdu Foundation] (pp. 53-); Adina Berciu-Drăghicescu, *Constituirea Societății de Cultură Macedo-Române 1879-2021* [The Establishment of the Macedo-Romanian Culture Society 1879-2021] (pp. 60-); Stoica Lascu, *Documente arhivistice privind aspecte din existența Societății de Cultură Macedo-Române (1939-1950)* [Archival Documents on Aspects of the Existence of the Macedo-Romanian Culture Society (1939-1950)] (pp. 71-); Ioan Vlad, *De la Sarajevo la Făgăraș și pumnalul criminal al lui Tisza. Asasinatul politic – soluția extremă pentru supraviețuirea Austro-Ungariei* [From Sarajevo to Făgăraș and Tisza's Criminal Dagger. Political Assassination – The Extreme Solution for the Survival of Austria-Hungary] (pp. 173-); Petre Otu, *Generalul Dumitru Iliescu – un „Napoleon al României”?* (pp. 185-); Adrian Pandeia, *O oportunitate ratată sau o intoxicare la cel mai înalt nivel? Cum s-a jucat varianta unei ofensive spre sud a armatei române în august 1916* [A Missed Opportunity or a Intoxication at the Highest Level? How the Variant of an Offensive to the South of the Romanian Army Was Played in August 1916] (pp. 202-); Sorin Liviu Damean, *Impactul revoluțiilor ruse din 1917 asupra situației politico-diplomatice și militare a României* [The Impact of the Russian Revolutions of 1917 on the Political-Diplomatic and Military Situation of Romania] (pp. 207-); Vasile Tutula, *Unirea Basarabiei cu Patria-mamă, act profund democratic și de dreptate istorică (27 martie 1918)* [The Union of Bessarabia with the Motherland, a Deeply Democratic and Historical act of Justice (March 27, 1918)] (pp. 212-); Dan Prisăcaru, *Intervenția armatei române în Bucovina – o necesitate strategică pentru restabilirea ordinii interne și apărarea Unirii din 15/28 noiembrie 1918* [The Intervention of the Romanian Army in Bucovina – a Strategic Necessity for the Restoration of the Internal Order and the Defense of the Union from November 15/28, 1918] (pp. 232-); Constantin Moșincat, *Ungaria înviată din mormântul bolșevismului de mântuitorul ei, ostașul român* [Hungary Resurrected from the Grave of Bolshevism by its Savior, the Romanian Soldier] (pp. 267-); Bernard Cook, *The United States and the Creation of Greater Romania* (pp. 298-); Luminița Giurgiu, *Nichifor Crainic relatează despre prima vizită a Suveranilor români în Ardeal* [Nichifor Crainic Reports on the First Visit of the Romanian Sovereigns to Transylvania 1919] (pp. 306-); Laurențiu-Ștefan

Szemikovics, *O sută de ani de la fixarea stemei Regatului României (1921)* (pp. 319-); Radu Homescu, *Moise Nicoară – un destin neîmplinit al diplomației române* [Moise Nicoară – An Unfulfilled Destiny of the Romanian Diplomacy] (pp. 325-); Mihaela Toader, *Diplomați români în exil* (pp. 335-); Vitalie Văratice, *Telemac Dan, un român din sudul Dunării în serviciul diplomatic al României* [Telemac Dan, A Romanian from the South of the Danube in the Romanian Diplomatic Service] (pp. 344-); Ion Scumpieru, *Stabilirea relațiilor diplomatice între România și Japonia* (pp. 351-); Gheorghe Sbârnă, *Premisele formării Micii Înțelegeri* (pp. 359-); Alexandru Oșca, *Dinamica relațiilor interbalcanice între cele două Războaie Mondiale ale secolului trecut* [The Dynamics of Inter-Balkan Relations between the Two World Wars of the Last Century] (pp. 371-); Costică Prodan, *Nicolae Titulescu și destinele diplomației românești între 6 iulie 1927 și 30 iulie 1928* (pp. 379-); Gheorghe E. Cojocaru, *Diplomația română înainte și după acordul de la Munchen, din 29 septembrie 1938* (pp. 390-); Nicolae Mares, *Relațiile României cu Polonia, Ungaria și Cehoslovacia în 1938. „Medierea” Poloniei* (pp. 414-); Florian Bichir, *Horia Agarici și relațiile sale cu mișcarea legionară* [Horia Agarici and His Relations with the Legionary Movement] (pp. 448-); George Lascu, *Nicolae Iorga – Istoric al Dreptului românesc (în tălmăcirea lui Ștefan Gr. Berechet)* [Nicolae Iorga – Historian of Romanian Law (in Ștefan Gr. Berechet’ Interpretation)] (pp. 457-); Vasile Pulcaș, *„Argumentul militar” folosit de ofițerii români (1941) pentru a protesta contra Dictatului de la Viena* [“The Military Argument” Used by Romanian Officers (1941) to Protest Against the Vienna Dictate] (pp. 488-); Anatol Petrencu, *Ivdel – un lagăr al morții în memoria colectivă a basarabenilor* [Ivdel – A Camp of the Death in the Collective Memory of the Bessarabians] (pp. 504-); Ioan Bolovan, Sorina Paula Bolovan, *Valeriu Anania și mișcările studentești de la Cluj din primăvara anului 1946* [Valeriu Anania and the Student Movements in Cluj in the Spring of 1946] (pp. 518-); Constantin Hlihor, Nicolae Melinescu, *Media – rivalitatea pentru hegemonie ideologică și supremație geopolitică în timpul Războiului Rece* [Media – The Rivalry for Ideological Hegemony and Geopolitical Supremacy during the Cold War] (pp. 530-); Ioan Scurtu, *Despre Dumitru Preda și despre o problemă privind relațiile româno-cubaneze* [About Dumitru Preda and About a Problem Regarding the Romanian-Cuban Relations] (pp. 551-); Maurice Văisse, *Picasso dans la Guerre froide* (pp. 556-); Alfredo Canavero, *L’Europa di Papa Wojtyła* (pp. 558-); Constantin Corneanu, *Summit-ul din Malta (2-3 decembrie 1989) și configurarea sistemului de relații internaționale* [The Malta Summit (2-3 December 1989) and the Configuration of the System of International Relations] (pp. 566-); Stelian Mândruț, *Albanezii din România în discursul istoriografic postdecembrist. Studiu de caz: 1989-2013* [The Albanians in Romania in the Post-December Historiographical Discourse. Case Study: 1989-2013] (pp. 595-); Sergiu Iosipescu, Raluca Iosipescu, *Comisiunea Monumentelor Istorice și explorarea arheologică a Basarabiei* [The Commission of Historical Monuments and Archaeological Exploration of Bessarabia] (pp. 599-); Mihail Dobre, *Din politica externă a României în primii ani post-Război Rece. Inițiativele de cooperare în plan subregional* [From Romania’s Foreign Policy in the First Years after the Cold War. Subregional Cooperation Initiatives] (pp. 610-); Adrian Năstase, *Crișa actuală a dreptului internațional* [The Current Crisis of International Law] (pp. 617-); Alexandru Bartoc, *O viață dedicată României – Nicolae Titulescu. Memoria lui în medalistică și în filatelie* [A Life Dedicated to Romania – Nicolae Titulescu. His Memory in Medals and Philately] (pp. 639-649 text; foto 649-662).

Anatol Petrencu, *A fi profesor de istorie în Republica Moldova*. Cu prilejul conferirii înaltului titlu de DOCTOR HONORIS CAUSA de către Universitatea de Stat „Alec Russo” din Bălți [To be a History Teacher in the Republic of Moldova. On the Occasion of Conferred the High Title of DOCTOR HONORIS CAUSA by The State University “Alec Russo” from Bălți] (Academia Oamenilor de Știință din România. Universitatea de Stat din Moldova – Facultatea de Istorie și Filosofie. Centrul de Excelență Institutul de Istorie Socială „ProMemoria”), no publisher, Chișinău, 2021, 236 pp.; ill.; facs. ISBN 978-9975-66-714-2

The scientist from Chisinau (born in Căușeni, on May 22, 1954) is one of the most well-known, prolific and knowledgeable researchers in the field of history in the Republic of Moldova; with a wide scientific activity (is also a PhD supervisor – he has, so far, 12 doctors in History; founding director of the Institute of Social History “ProMemoria”), didactic (Professor at the Faculty of History and Philosophy of the State University of Moldova, dean from 1990-1992), but also public activity (participant in the political life, president, in 2006-2010 and from October 2021, of the Association of Historians “Alexandru Moșanu” from the Republic of Moldova, or publicist activity (hundreds of articles are collected in independent volumes and, no less, is among the few servants of Clio who intensely supports, with their own and original points of view, assumed, a blog of his own, specialized, but also with socio-political issues).

The published books (all in Chisinau, most – all monographs – as unique author, as well as document editor) are: *Învățământul istoric în România (1948-1989)* [The Historical Education in Romania (1948-1989)] (1991, 112 pp.); *Relațiile româno-italiene: de la confruntare la colaborare. 1945-1985* [Romanian-Italian relations: From Confrontation to Collaboration. 1945-1985] (1993, 216 pp.); *Crestomație la Istoria românilor. 1917-1992* [Chrestomation to the History of Romanians. 1917-1992] (1993, 295 pp.) (coeditor); *Basarabia în al Doilea Război Mondial: 1940-1944* [Bessarabia in the Second World War: 1940-1944] (1997, 346 pp.); *România și Basarabia în anii celui de-al Doilea Război Mondial* [Romania and Bessarabia in the Second World War] (1999, 176 pp.); *În serviciul zeiței Clio* [In the Service of the Goddess Clio] (2001, 816 pp.); *În apărarea istoriei și demnității naționale. Culegere de documente* [In defense of National History and Dignity. Collection of Documents] (2003, 96 pp.) (coeditor); *Polonezii în anii celui de-al Doilea Război Mondial. Istoria politică* [The Poles in the Second World War. Political History] (2005, 246 pp.); *Basarabia în timpul celui de-al Doilea Război Mondial: 1939-1945* [Bessarabia During the Second World War: 1939-1945] (2006, 224 pp.); *Varșovia văzută de un istoric basarabean* [Warsaw Seen by a Bessarabian Historian] (2006, 144 pp.); *Mareșalul Ion Antonescu și Basarabia. 1941-1944. Culegere de documente* [Marshal Ion Antonescu and Bessarabia. 1941-1944. Collection of documents] (2008, 350 pp.) (coeditor); *Istoria contemporană. Studii, materiale, atitudini* [Contemporary history. Studies, materials, attitudes] (2011, 580 pp.); *Teroarea stalinistă în Basarabia. Studii, documente, memorii* (2013, 360 pp.) [Stalinist Terror in Bessarabia. Studies, Documents, Memories] (coeditor); *Un scurt popas necesar drumului* [A Short Stoppage Needed for the Road] (2014, 328 pp.); *O istorie a Basarabiei* [A History of Bessarabia] (2015, 424 pp.) (coauthor); *Românii în Gulag: memorii, mărturii, documente* [The Romanians in the Gulag: Memoirs, Testimonies,

Documents] (vol. I, 2014, 352 pp.; vol. II, 2015, 362 pp.) (coeditor); *Rusia, 2019: „Acesta a fost un an greu...”* [“*это был тяжелый год...*”] [Russia, 2019: “This Has Been a Difficult Year”] (2020, 296 pp.).

The present volume contains the balance of the scientific, didactic and publicistic activity carried out in the period 2014-2020.

As the researcher Ion Valer Xenofontov shows, recently, in the scientific journal *Akados* from Chisinau, “It is necessary to know the scientific contribution and the influence of the historian Anatol Petrencu – which owns one of the largest private libraries specialty in the Romanian space, which counts over 50,000 book titles (the equivalent of 10 village public libraries) in the field of history – in the formation of an intellectual elite in order to define the overall evolution of the social realities in the Republic of Moldova. It is easy for the biographers of Professor Anatol Petrencu to study the complexity of scientific, didactic, public activities, because it is presented «in a package» an information rigorously classified by the protagonist himself”.

In *Introduction*, the prolific Moldovan historian explains to the readers the motivations behind this new editorial approach: “In the fall of 2019, the Senate of the State University «Alecă Russo» in Bălți awarded me the high title of Doctor Honoris Causa. Giving this title is an honor for me (...). I thought it would be good to present to the Bălți university community a report on the daily work of a university Professor who has been working in the Republic of Moldova since 1980, a report in which to briefly identify both issues specific to the higher education process as well as the scientific research analysis concerns of the past of the Romanians, and of other peoples (universal history)” (p. 5).

And here too, the “total” historian explains: “From my student years I learned a truth: a historian is obliged to visit the places he writes about in his works (on-site research is called *de visu*. Thus, I always used every opportunity to visit cities, monuments in these cities, museums, memorial houses, places where various events took place (battles, mass murders, if we refer to the totalitarian period, etc.). I have also set out these activities necessary for the fullest possible knowledge of the realities of the past” (p. 6).

The volume is thus structured:

Part I. *Un slujitor al Muzei Clio în apărarea adevărului despre trecut* [A servant of the Clio Muse in Defense of the Truth about the Past] (pp. 9-54), with the subthematic references: *Activitatea didactică* [The Teaching Activity], *Preocupări științifice* [Scientific Concerns], *Popularizarea adevărului despre trecut* [The Popularization of the Truth about the Past], *Participarea la concursul pentru titlul de membru corespondent al ASM* [The Participation in the Competition for the Title of Corresponding Member of the ASM]: “Despite the recommendations of some prestigious personalities – Ion Hădărcă, Ana Blandiana, Valentin Ciorbea, Viorica Moisuc, Ilie Popa, Gheorghe Postică, Mariana Șlapac, Ion I. Solcanu, Valentin Tomuleț –, the candidate, gathering 5 votes for, 4 against, 2 invalid, was not validated as a corresponding member by the voting members of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova: “I want to ask: what was the purpose of filling the vacancies (the other candidate, Professor Ion Șîșcanu, also did not get the required number of votes – our note) and the organization of the competition, for which we prepared files with various documents, we obtained recommendations from distinguished personalities of science and culture, who took us as serious people, so that in the end we, the pretenders, would be in derision [*dați de-a șuia*]. Who did this nauseous show serve?” (p. 54).

Part II. *Cu cărțile pe masă: bibliografia anilor 2013-2020* [With the Books on the Table: The Bibliography of Years 2013-2020] (pp. 55-113), with the references: *Volume publicate (monografii, bibliografii)*, *Articole științifice publicate în monografii colective, culegeri de studii, reviste de specialitate și de cultură, Prefațe. Cuvinte-înainte, Recenzii, Teze, rezumate ale comunicărilor, expuse în formă scrisă la congrese, simpozioane, conferințe științifice (publicate de organizatori), Titluri de comunicări, expuse la conferințe științifice internaționale, naționale, inter-universitare, mese rotunde, manifestări comemorative, Coordonarea activității științifice a studenților și masteranzilor (perfectarea comunicărilor și publicarea rezumatelor), Conducător științific al tezelor de licență, Conducător științific al tezelor de master, Conducător științific al tezelor de doctor. Referent oficial, Președinte și membru al seminarelor științifice de profil.* [Published volumes (monographs, bibliographies) /2/, Scientific articles published in collective monographs, collections of studies, specialized and cultural magazines /73/, Prefaces. Forewords /30/, Reviews /21/, Theses, abstracts of papers, written presentations at congresses, symposia, scientific conferences (published by the organizers) /27/, Communication titles, exhibited at international, national, inter-university scientific conferences, round tables, commemorative events /76/, Coordination of the scientific activity of students and master students (perfecting communications and publishing abstracts) /78/, Scientific supervisor of Bachelor's theses /38/, Scientific supervisor of Master's theses /18/, Scientific supervisor of Doctoral theses. Official reviewer /11/, President, and member of the specialized scientific seminars/9/].

Part III. *Promovarea realizărilor științifice în mass-media. Documentări. Aprecieri* [Promoting Scientific Achievements in the Media. Documentations. Appreciations] (pp. 114-184): *Prelegeri publice* [Public lectures] /48/; *Articole de popularizarea a cunoștințelor istorice publicate în ziare* [Articles to Popularize Historical Knowledge Published in Newspapers] /45/; *Popularizarea cunoștințelor istorice la a) posturile de televiziune* [Popularization of Historical Knowledge on Television Stations] /158/; *b) la posturile de Radio* [on the Radio stations] /122/; *Articole în publicații electronice (blog personal și altele)* [Articles in Electronic Publications (Personal Blog and Others)] /150/; *Luări de cuvânt la lansări sau prezentări de cărți* [Speeches at Book Launches or Presentations] /58/; *Alte activități de popularizare a istoriei* [Other Activities to Popularize History] /50/.

Considerații finale [Final Considerations] (pp. 185-188): "The activity of training, research, and popularization of history in the Republic of Moldova is carried out in very difficult conditions, sometimes even contradictory. On the one hand, indisputably, most of the population shows a clear interest in knowing the truth about the past of our people. On the other hand, sufficient forces are working hard to suppress or diminish the zeal of those interested in true history. Many times, the leaders (decision makers) of the independent Republic of Moldova have vehemently opposed the objective and impartial research of this country's past. This is because the scientific results of Bessarabian historians are often at odds with the current political situation in the Republic of Moldova".

This so articulate bibliographic work and national-historical culture – unique in size and approach, I think, in the trans-Prutean space of Romanian historiography –, that dimensions the personality of the author at the level of an independent institution, ends with: *Anexe* [Annexes] (pp. 189-201), *Indice de nume* [Name Index] (pp. 202—205), *Din fototeca autorului* [From the Author's Photo Library] (pp. 206-216).

Vlad Mischevca, *Între pace și război. Domnii fanarioți în contextul raporturilor internaționale (1774-1812)* (Ministerul Educației și Cercetării, Institutul de Istorie), Cartdidact, Chișinău, 2021, 429 pp.; diagr., facs., fig. ISBN 978-9975-3497-8-9

The author (born on March 14, 1963, in the village of Mingir, in Hâncești district [raion] – former Lăpușna county [județ] –, 6 km from Prut) of the recent volume published in Chisinau is one of the most original, through the polyphony of the topics addressed, and productive researchers in the field of History.

As the dean of Historiography across the Prut, Professor Demir Dragnev, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova, points out in his presentation, “Vlad Mischevca has authored a series of monographs and a booklet of verse, published in Chisinau, Iași, Bucharest, Athens, and Thessaloniki, as a competent researcher with well-defined scientific interests. The main fields of research being the transition from medieval to modern: the history of international relations in Southeast Europe (18th century – early 19th century), genealogy of princes Phanariots, national heraldic vexillology”.

Among the 15 volumes published by this polyvalent specialist and man of culture (he is also a sensitive poet – even this volume opens with significant lyrics; but also a recognized heraldist – was the first president, in 1995, of the National Heraldry Commission) so far (most printed in Chisinau), are: *Pacea de la București (Din istoria diplomatică a încheierii tratatului de pace ruso-turc de la 16 (28) mai 1812* [The Peace of Bucharest (From the Diplomatic History of the Conclusion of the Russian-Turkish Peace Treaty of 16 (28) May 1812] (1992, 200 pp.; coauthor), *Simbolurile Țării Moldovei (Din istoria vexilologiei și sigilografiei heraldice moldovenești din secolele XIV-XIX)* [The Symbols of the Country of Moldova (From the History of Moldovan Heraldic Vexillology and Sigilography from the 14th-19th Centuries)] (1994, 127 pp.; coauthor), *Principele Constantin Ypsilanti, 1760-1816* (1999, 175 pp., coauthor), *Mitropolitul Grigore Irinupoleos (1764-1846). Studii și documente referitoare la egumenul grec al Goliei (Iași: 2010, 132 pp.+XVI pl. color)*, *Ta Πουρανικά έντυπα της βιβλιοθήκης της Ιεράς Μονής Αγίου Παύλου Αγίου Ορους. Cărți românești din biblioteca mănăstirii athonite Sfântul Pavel [Romanian Books from the Library of the Athonite Monastery of St. Paul] (Αθήνα: 2010, 287 pp., incl. pl. color)*, *Anul 1812. Două secole de la anexarea Basarabiei de către Imperiul Rusiei [1812. Two Centuries of the Annexation of Bessarabia by the Russian Empire] (2012, 142 pp.)*, *Prutul în destinul neamului românesc. O antologie istorico-literară a râului [The Prut in the Destiny of the Romanian People. A Historical-Literary Anthology of the River] (2015, 300 pp.)*, *Geneza problemei basarabene – 1812 [Genesis of the Bessarabian problem – 1812] (Brăila: 2016, 368 pp.)*, *Domni fanarioți din Principatele Române – emigranți politici = Phanariotes princes of Romanian Principalities – political emigrants = Phanariotes princes de Principautés Roumaines – émigrés politiques = Господари фанариоты Румынских княжеств – политические эмигранты (Sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea – începutul secolului al XIX-lea): Alexandru Ypsilanti & Emanuel Giani-Rosetti & Alexandru II Mavrocordat (Firaris) & Constantin Ypsilanti (2017, 248 pp.)*.

The volume, so generously presented and also received by other researchers (Florin Marinescu: “the volume is in line with his good results so far”, Alina Felea: “a

book for our times”), is structured according to the rules of academic writing, the author being recognized by the meticulousness with which he conceives his works (the book has no less than 1,263 notes and 376 titles indicated in a “selective” bibliography).

Its composition is: *Introducere* [Introduction] (9-25), then four chapters – **Chapter I: *Politica și diplomația domnilor fanarioți*** [Politics and Diplomacy of the Phanariots Rulers] (27-64) – with subchap. *Fanarioții între pace și război* [The Phanariots Between Peace and War], and *Problema Orientală vs Principatele Române în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVIII-lea – începutul secolului al XIX-lea* [The Oriental Problem vs the Romanian Principalities in the Second Half of the 18th Century – The Beginning of the 19th Century]; **Chapter II: *Activitatea domnilor fanarioți în cadrul rivalității Marilor Puteri (1774-1806)*** [The Activity of the Phanariot Rulers in the Rivalry of the Great Powers (1774-1806)] (65-118) – with subchap. *Anexarea Bucovinei (1775)* [The Annexation of Bukovina (1775)], *Domnia lui Constantin D. Moruzi în Moldova* [The Reign of Constantin D. Moruzi in Moldova], *Considerații privind genealogia familiei fanariote Ypsilanti* [Considerations Regarding the Genealogy of the Ypsilanti Phanariot Family], *Activitatea lui Alexandru Ypsilanti Voievod* [The Activity of Alexandru Ypsilanti Voievode]; **Chapter III: *Domni fanarioți – emigranți politici*** [Phanariot Rulers – Political Emigrants] (119-164) – with subchap. *Alexandru II Mavrocordat (Firaris) – domnul Fugar* [Alexander II Mavrocordat (Firaris) – The Fugitive Ruler], *Șederea de la Brno a lui Alexandru Ypsilanti* [Alexandru Ypsilanti’s stay in Brno], *Emanuel Giani-Rosetti (Manole Ruset)*; **Capitolul IV: *Fanarioții în contextul Războiului ruso-turc din 1806-1812*** [The Phanariots in the Context of the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-1812] (165-347) – with subchap. *Principatele Române în sistemul relațiilor internaționale de la începutul secolului al XIX-lea* [The Romanian Principalities in the System of International Relations from the Beginning of the 19th Century], *Etapale principale ale Războiului ruso-turc din 1806-1812* [The Main Stages of the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-1812], *Rolul familiei Ypsilanti în politica Rusiei (1807-1808)* [The Role of the Ypsilanti Family in Russian Politics (1807-1808)], *Constantin Ypsilanti – încă un emigrant politic* [Constantin Ypsilanti – Another Political Emigrant], *Principatele Române în disputa post Tilsit: Alexandru I vs Napoleon Bonaparte* [Romanian Principalities in Post-Tilsit Dispute: Alexander I vs. Napoleon Bonaparte], *Moruzeștii și anexarea Basarabiei* [Moruzeștii and the Annexation of Bessarabia], *Din culisele diplomației: rolul lui Manuc Bey* [Behind the Scenes of Diplomacy: The Role of Manuc Bey], *Semnarea Tratatului de pace ruso-turc de la 16/28 mai 1812: geopolitică & trafic de influență* [The Signing of the Russian-Turkish Peace Treaty of 16/28 May 1812: Geopolitics & Trafficking in Influence].

The architecture of the volume is complemented by common adjuvants in such scientific enterprises (and the author is recognized as practicing, both in books and in studies – over 150 – an exemplary requirement in the application of academic writing standards) – *Încheiere* [Conclusion] (pp. 349-359), *Material ilustrativ* [Illustrative Material] (pp. 360-384) *Bibliografie selectivă* [Selective Bibliography] (385-408) *Anexe* [Annexes] (pp. 409-421), *Indice de nume* [Index of Names] (pp. 422-426), *Mulțumiri* [Thanks] (p. 427), *Despre autor* [About the Author] (pp. 428-429).

As the signatory of the *Preface* – subtitled *Radiografiind dezmembrarea Principatului Moldovei (1774-1812)* [Radiography the Dismemberment of the Principality of Moldavia (1774-1812)] –, Professor Tudor Dinu (the well-known Hellenist, from young

generation, at the University of Bucharest, of the Phanariot Era) points out, “the researcher manages to shed light on the role played by Phanariot princes in the difficult diplomatic negotiations that doubled the military conflicts at that time. For, let us not forget that, before ascending the thrones of Bucharest or Iasi, they almost always held the position of Great Dragoman or, in other words, de facto Minister of Foreign Affairs of the High Gate, whose role could become decisive. for the Principality when negotiating peace treaties with Austria or Russia. On the other hand, the author does not limit himself to this aspect of the activity of some of the Phanariot rulers who succeeded to the throne of Moldavia in the period 1774-1812 (Alexandru and Constantin Ypsilanti, Constantin Moruzi, Alexandru Mavrocordat Firaris, Manole Giani Ruset), but He investigates their genealogy, studies, career in Constantinople and all aspects of domestic politics promoted not only during the reigns of Moldova, but also in those of Wallachia (administrative and legal measures, construction work, support for education and culture, etc.). Of particular interest are the sections dedicated to their time in exile in the Tsarist Empire, on which the author unexpectedly sheds light by meticulously and thoroughly investigating documents kept in Russian archives and specialized bibliography, usually inaccessible to the Romanian researcher on the right of Prut. We dare say that we are in front of autonomous mini-monographs, which foretell the fulfillment of an old desideratum in our historiography – because we are convinced that in the future Mr. Mischevca will expand with remarkable results the research dedicated to some of the listed characters. (pp. 7-8).

Also, referring, recently (April 27), to this new work of historiography from Chisinau, the well-known researcher from the Institute of History of Moldova Nicolae Enciu, showed: “edited on the 210th anniversary of the signing of the fateful Russian-Turkish Peace Treaty in Bucharest, from 16/28 May 1812, by which the border between the Ottoman and Russian empires became the Prut River – this means the annexation of Moldavia between the Prut and the Dniester to the Romanov imperial court – , the new work of the well-known historian Dr. Vlad Mischevca enjoyed of praiseworthy appreciations from the very moment of launch, an event produced inside the National Library of the Republic of Moldova on March 22.

Starting from the truth that the Bessarabian problem, «the issue of Bessarabia and Bukovina» is «the deepest Romanian national wound», «the most critical of the territorial issues inherited from the present generation by the Oriental Question» and based on information contained in the works published by over the years – 15 monographs and over 150 studies and articles – to which have been added, in the meantime, new historiographical interpretations and original documents investigated in the archives of the Russian Federation, Romania, France, Turkey (some partially published, others unpublished), the historian Vlad Mischevca deals, in his new work, with a wider chronological segment, between 1774 and 1812, representing a decisive period of the politico-diplomatic history of the Romanian Principalities. It is the so-called Phanariot period (1711-1821), rightly appreciated as one of «state decay for Moldova», in which it was mercilessly divided, by transforming the Hotin region into Ottoman raya (1711), by annexing Bukovina to the Habsburgs State (1775) and the occupation of Bessarabia by the Russian Empire (1812).

Undoubtedly, the topics addressed by the author in the presented monograph highlight one of the most important and current scientific issues regarding the political history of Moldova, related to the objective knowledge of the dramatic act of injustice committed in 1812 – a crucial moment in national history that influenced and continues to influence the process of historical development of the Romanians east of the Prut. The author's entire analysis fully confirms the topicality of Prof. Constantin Giurescu's words: «With the abduction of Bessarabia begins the great drama of our contemporary history and the most difficult issue of our foreign policy: relations with Russia»”.

Tasin Gemil, Simona Deleanu (eds.), *Relațiile româno-turce în perioada modernă. Romanian-Turkish Connections in modern times* (Institutul de Studii Avansate pentru Cultura și Civilizația Levantului. Institutul de Turcologie. The Institute for Advanced Studies in Levant Culture and Civilization. The Institut of Turkology), Presa Universitară Clujeană (Coll. *Studii de istorie a Levantului*), Cluj-Napoca, 2022, 432 pp. ISBN 978-606-37-1191-6

This volume is the result of the scientific research of established or aspiring historians from Cluj-Napoca, Bucharest, Botoșani, and Constanța. The papers were presented at the *Research on the Romanian-Turkish Relations between 1878-2018*, Conference organized on the occasion of the 140th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the two states. The conference was held on September 25th, 2018, at the Bucharest offices of the Institute of Advanced Studies for Levant Culture and Civilization (ISACCL), in cooperation with the Institute of Turkology at the Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, with the support of the Turkish Embassy in Romania and the Bucharest branch of the Turkish Agency for Cooperation and Coordination (TIKA).

The book opens with the presentation – in *Preface / Foreword* (pp. 11-18) – by Professor Tasin Gemil (former Ambassador of Romania to Azerbaijan and, respectively, to Turkmenistan, co-editor – the most representative Romanian Turkologist of today, of European reputation –, of a comprehensive synthesis of the history of Romanian-Turkish relations, starting with 1878: “140 years ago [1878], Romania and Turkey established diplomatic relations as two equal sovereign states. This was the result of the victories in Romania's War for Independence of 1877-1878, and of the new, realistic foreign policy of the Ottoman Government. It was the beginning of a new era in the relationship between the two states, both equally driven by desire to become closer and to work together on multiple levels” (p. 15).

The book is opened by presenting the speeches of the officials present – Professor Emil Constantinescu (former President of Romania), *Political and Cultural Diplomacy in the Recent History of Romanian-Turkish Relations* (pp. 31-42) (“I can state with great certainty that the high levels reached by Romanian-Turkish relations in the final four years of the 20th century are a direct result of them having been designed and implemented by personalities that acquired their political acumen on the top of an academic background. In diplomacy, political culture gives you the right communication tools in order to understand your foreign partner, and to be able to convey your own message. Culture, however, in its broadest understanding, affords you the possibility of understanding the world as a whole. Classical diplomacy will ever remain an ephemeral

political exercise if it is not grounded on a relationship of trust between political leaders. Likewise, cultural diplomacy will remain a theoretical concept if it is not grounded on a human relationship that extends to the society. Where these two constructions overlap, visionary projects can come to life in a great leap forward”, pp. 41-42); Professor Ioan-Aurel Pop (President of Romanian Academy), *Two modern states that fulfilled different yet important roles in the history of the European continent* (pp. 45-46) (“We are glad to witness the Institute for Advanced Studies in Levant Culture and Civilization [*Institutul de Studii Avansate pentru Cultura și Civilizația Levantului*] and the Institute of Turkology having such close ties, thanks in no small part to the personality of President Emil Constantinescu, whose wish it is that dialogue and cooperation – including their cultural and scientific dimensions – remain as close as possible throughout this corner of Europe”); Osman Koray Ertaş (Ambassador of the Republic of Turkey to Romania), *Turkey remains a strong ally and friend to Romania* (pp. 51-54); Yasemin Melez Biçer (Representative of the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency /TIKA/ in Bucharest), *The relations between Turkey and Romania are strengthened* (pp. 59-61).

After the presentation of the authors (pp. 71-77), four papers are presented, in Part I (pp. 81-168) – Erem Melike Roman, *Romanian-Turkish Friendship, and the volume dedicated to Nicolae Titulescu* (pp. 85-87); Mustafa A. Mehmed, Nagy Pienaru, *140 Years of Romanian-Turkish Diplomatic Relations. Key Phases* (pp. 103-116); Radu-Ștefan Vergatti, *The Vaqfs of Dobrogea after its Unification with the Romanian Kingdom (1878)* (pp. 133-148): “After Dobrogea’s unification with the Romanian kingdom, all lands that had belonged to the Sublime Porte became the property of the Romanian state. These properties included the *vaqfs*, which had been considered public, state property”); Victor-Claudiu Turcitu, *Ottoman-Turkish Documents in the National Archives of Romania* (pp. 159-168) (as part of the digitization operation of the materials that it holds, “the Ottoman documents preserved in the Romanian archives that were issued before 1600 were digitized and indexed in a database named «Medievalia»; were scanned and indexed a number of 20 Ottoman documents – the oldest, preserved by Romanian archives in the document collections from Brașov and Bucharest”).

Most papers (8) form the substance of Part II (pp. 171-412) – Tasin Gemil, *Collaboration and Friendship between Romania and Turkey (1918-1940)* (pp. 183-195) (In period between the two World War, Romania, and Turkey “had achieved respective historical successes in their national and democratic evolution. In 1918, Romania had completed its Great Unification, while Turkey had successfully preserved its territorial integrity and had proclaimed a secular republic in 1923. These successes laid the groundwork for close ties between the two countries, which were both on the path towards Western progress”); Dan Prodan, *Turkey’s 10th Anniversary and the Participation of the Romanian Muslim Delegation (1933)* (pp. 211-226) (During the visit, members of the delegation – 125 Turks from Durostor County, southern Dobrudja, led by a senator and mufti – were briefed on the realities and living conditions in Turkey, especially in Anatolia, for Muslim families emigrated here from southern of Dobrudja. “In 1933, Turkey did not want to offer vain hopes of benefits for the immigration of Dobrogean Turks to Anatolia, as it lacked the necessary funds and infrastructure to settle them in the semi-arid landscape of Asia Minor. Moreover, joint actions between Romania and Turkey could effectively combat Bulgarian propaganda, which promoted Turkish

emigration from southern Dobrogea to Turkey and the seizure of their lands by the Bulgarians in the Cadrilater”); Melek Fetisleam, *The Fruitful Collaboration between Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Turkish Ambassador to Bucharest and the leader of the National Tatar Movement in Romania, Müstecib Hacı Fazıl* (pp. 245-262) (The leader of the national Tatar movement had several meetings with the Turkish Ambassador, and “Thanks to the Turkish ambassador’s efforts, in the spirit of Kemalist reforms, numerous beneficial transformations were implemented in order to revitalize Turkish language education in Romania by promoting secular education system, as evidenced by the memoirs of Professor Kemal H. Karpat”); Mihail E. Ionescu, *Political Compatibilities and Strategic Servitudes: The case of the Romania-Turkish Military Agreement (1934)* (pp. 277-290); Marian Zidaru, *The SOE in the Balkans during World War II. The Case of Salvet Lijfti Tozan, a.k.a. 'Pants'* (pp. 313-334) (Based on British archives, the author points out that Tozan, a former collaborator of the British Embassy in Ankara, “During World War II was one of the most important Special Operation Executive agent in Balkans”); Călin Felezeu, *Turkey’s Relations with the Black Sea and Caucasus Countries* (pp. 353-372) (After the Cold War, “under the effect of the United States’ and EU’s support for the democracies and market economies of the new countries in the region, Russia and Turkey moved from being historical enemies to potential partners, with intertwining interests”); Valentin Naumescu, *Post-Kemalist Turkey and the New Strategic Relations as the Junction of the West with the Middle East. NATO in the Black Sea Region, and the Implications for Romania* (pp. 383-392) (The post-Kemalism of the current presidential regime, the deviation from the West and the political Islamisation of the Republic of Turkey, the deterioration of the rule of law and impact on the human rights, alongside the unilateral concentration of power, represent obstacles not easy to overcome, even for Turkey’s greatest supporters in the EU and NATO. No-one denies Turkey’s enormous geopolitical, strategic, economic and military relevance, however, the authorities in Ankara and the Turkish people themselves will have to understand that Western organisations are comprised of democratic states and societies, while their leaders, who undergo authentic electoral competitions every four years, will never take any decisions in Turkey’s favour so long as the transformations within the latter are not compatible with what the taxpayers and voter bases of Western countries want”); Adina Fodor, *Establishing and Developing Cooperation between the Babeş-Bolyai University and Similar Institutions in the Turkic World (2009-2018). A brief report of the activity of the Institute of Turkology* (pp. 403-412).

The volume ends with *Rezumat* (in Romanian) (pp. 413-422), respectively *Abstracts* (pp. 423-432).

Stoica Lascu

A.U.C.H. Manuscript Submission

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLICATION IN *ANALELE UNIVERSITĂȚII DIN CRAIOVA. ISTORIE (ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA. HISTORY)*

Email: Manuscripts should be submitted online at history.annals@yahoo.com and analeleucv.istorie@gmail.com with the following settings:

Page Setup: B5 JIS (Margins: Top – 2 cm; Bottom – 2 cm; Left – 2 cm; Right – 2 cm)

Text Font: Garamond 11

Space: Single spaced

Language: Manuscripts are accepted in **English**.

Text of the Article should be between **4000-5500 words** (without abstract, references and key words).

For the title use **Garamond 11 Bold, Center**.

Author(s)

For the Name and Surname of the author(s) use **Garamond 11 Italic, Right**.

About the author(s)

After each name insert a footnote (preceded by the symbol *) containing the author's professional title, didactic position, institutional affiliation, contact information, and email address.

E.g.: Sorin Liviu Damean*, Marusia Cîrstea**

* Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Faculty of Social Sciences, History Specialisation, No. 13, A.I. Cuza Street, Dolj County, Phone: 00407*****, Email: sorin.damean@yahoo.com

(Use **Garamond 10, Justified**)

** Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Faculty of Social Sciences, History Specialisation, No. 13, A.I. Cuza Street, Dolj County, Phone: 00407*****, Email: cirsteamara@yahoo.com

(Use **Garamond 10, Justified**)

Author(s) are fully responsible for the copyright, authenticity and contents of their papers.

Author(s) assume full responsibility that their paper is not under review for any refereed journal or conference proceedings.

Abstract. The abstract must provide the aims, objectives, methodology, results and main conclusions of the paper (please submit the papers by providing all these information in the abstract). It must be submitted in English and the length must not exceed 250 words. Use **Garamond 10, Justify**.

Key words: Submit 4-6 key words representative to the thematic approached in the paper. Use **Garamond 10, Italic**.

References: The references cited in the article are listed at the end of the paper in alphabetical order of authors' names. References of the same author are listed chronologically.

Reference citations

I. Reference-List Entries for Periodicals (APA Style)

a. An Article in a Journal with continuous paging

Harrison, R.L., & Westwood, M.J. (2009). Preventing vicarious traumatization of mental health therapists: Identifying protective practices. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 46, 203-219.

In-text citation (Harrison & Westwood, 2009)

b. An Article in a Journal with separate paging

Damean, S.L. (2013). The Royal Family of Romania and the National Reunification War. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie*, 23(1), 43-50.

In-text citation (Damean, 2013: 50)

c. An article in a monthly magazine

Madu, C. (2010, March-April). A cure for crime. *Psychology Today*, 43(2), 12.

In-text citation (Madu, 2010: 12)

II. Reference-list entries for books and other separately published materials

a. A book by one author

Damean, S.L. (2004). *România și Congresul de Pace de la Berlin (1878)*. București: Mica Valahie.

In-text citation (Damean, 2004: 49)

b. A book by two or more authors

Rosenthal, R., Rosnow, R.L., & Rubin, D.B. (2000). *Contrasts and effect sizes in behavioral research: A correlational approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

First in-text citation (Rosenthal, Rosnow, & Rubin, 2000: 230-231)

Subsequent citations (Rosenthal et al., 2000: 232)

Scafes, C., Șerbănescu, H., Andonie, C., Scafes I. (2002). *Armata română în războiul de independență. 1877-1878*. București: Sigma.

First in-text citation (Scafes, Șerbănescu, & Andonie, 2002: 150)

Subsequent citations (Scafes et al., 2002: 151)

c. A book with no author named

The Blackwell dictionary of cognitive psychology. (1991). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

In-text citation (*The Blackwell dictionary*, 1991: 98)

d. Multiple works by the same author

Sternberg, R.J. (1990). *Metaphors of the mind: Conceptions of the nature of intelligence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (2003). *Psychologists defying the crowd: Stories of those who battled the establishment and won*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sternberg, R.J. (2003). *Why smart people can be so stupid*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (2007). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

In-text citation

The 1990 book: (Sternberg, 1990: 45)

The first 2003 book: (Sternberg, 2003a: 23)

The second 2003 book: (Sternberg, 2003b: 25)

The 2007 book: (Sternberg, 2007: 139)

All four works in the same citation: (Sternberg, 1990, 2003a, 2003b, 2007)

Damean, S.L. (2004). *România și Congresul de Pace de la Berlin (1878)*. București: Mica Valahie.

Damean, S.L. (2008). *Diplomați Englezi în România (1866-1880)*. Craiova: Universitaria.

In-text citation

The 2004 book: (Damean, 2004: 77)

The 2008 book: (Damean, 2008: 55)

e. Reference to a chapter in an edited book

Ghițulescu, M. (2014). Evoluția instituțiilor politice în timpul regimului comunist. În Damean, S.L. (coord.) *Evoluția instituțiilor politice ale statului român din 1859 până astăzi*. Târgoviște: Cetatea de Scaun.

In-text citation (Ghițulescu, 2014: 111)

III. Archival Documents and Collections

a. Collection of letters from an archive

Benomar, Fr.M.C. (March 1875-December 1876). Legación en Berlin. Correspondencia confidencial y reservada con los Ministros de Estado. Cartas a los mismos (Tomo I, Signatura 9-32-7-7401). *Royal Academy of History*, Madrid, Spain.

In-text citation (Benomar, Fr.M.C., 1875-1876, Benomar, Fr.M.C. to F. Calderón Collantes, June 5, 1876)

b. Unpublished papers, lectures from an archive or personal collection

Suțu, C.N. (1863). *Propunerea lui C. Șuțu în numele lui D. Jose de Salamanca*. Fond Ministerul Lucrărilor Publice (dosar 100). National Historical Central Archives Service, Bucarest, Romania.

In-text citation (Suțu, 1863)

Universidad Central (1868). *Espediente Vizanti y Basilio Andrés*. Universidades, Sección Filosofía y Letras (Signatura 6887, expediente 1). National Historical Archive, Madrid, Spain.

In-text citation (Universidad Central, 1868)

Gullón E. Iglesias, P. (1898, April 18). *Memorandum adresat de Guvernul Spaniei Puterilor prietene asupra insurecției cubane*. Fond 71 (Problema 21, Dosar 69). Diplomatic Archives Unit of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Bucarest, Romania.

In-text citation (Gullón E Iglesias, 1898)

IV. Reference to a web source

J.G. (2016, April 11). 7 Deadly Environmental Disasters. Retrieved April 25 2016, from <http://www.history.com/news/history-lists>

In-text citation (<http://www.history.com/news/history-lists>)

