

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

A CONFERENCE ON “THE NEW HUMAN OF EUROPE”

On May 23-24, in Chişinău, in the Conference Room of the Palace of Republic, took place the International Scientific Conference “The New Human of Europe: models, prototypes, ideals”, organized by the Chair of Universal Literature and the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures of the Moldova State University, in partnership with the Moldovan representative of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation and the Romanian Cultural Institute. In the festive opening session of the conference (moderated by Mrs. Tatiana Ciocoi, PhD, Chief of the Chair of Universal Literature, MSU) a word of greeting was sent by Mr. Matthias Meyer, ambassador of Germany in Republic of Moldova, and Mr. Marius Lazurcă, ambassador of Romania in Republic of Moldova. In the second day of conference participants were joined by Mr. Valeriu Matei, academician, director of the “Mihai Eminescu” Romanian Cultural Institute from Chişinău. Words of greeting were uttered by all the guests of honor.

There followed the Session I with an exceptional lecture “The Recent Human” by Mr. Horia-Roman Patapievici, philosopher, writer, scientist from Romania. In his speech he opted for a European civilization returned to Christian values and affirmed that cultural, economic and political development is due to Christianity. (Right to) property, law and morality are those three pylons that resist in any times. However the human of today, the “recent” one, disposes freedom and democratic values as never in the past, he became conformist and indifferent to the intellectual, spiritual and educational values. Redefining relations with values would be the most important lesson that the “recent” human would have to learn. The mental device of the European civilization was born in 325 in Nicaea, and since then there were formed many automatisms of perception, behavioral circuits, associations, different ones from other civilizations. The Romanian philosopher talked also about the transcendence relation of the modern human with the reality, about the redignity of Europe, about coming of nihilism, destruction of values that are not more creditable, about historical fracture produced by the people, about the human eroded from inside etc. The end of the lecture gave the opportunity to return and to redefine: “We all are recent. But we can’t be satisfied with this”.

In the plenary of the Session II communications were held by: Mrs. Ana Selejan, university professor, PhD, “Lucian Blaga” University from Sibiu, referring to the “Destiny of the new human as a compulsory literary character”; Mr. Gheorghe Manolache, university professor, PhD, “Lucian Blaga” University from Sibiu, who spoke about the “Avatars of the new human in Romanian prose of the ’80s”; Mr. Lucian Chişu, professor, Romanian Academy (Bucharest), pointing the temptations, challenges and ripostes of literature in the informational society of knowledge and talking about the new kind of intelligence, artificial one, that becomes more significant in the economy of knowledge. In my communication I referred to the new human of the online space called *homo digitus* / *homo digitalis*, that adds to other features of post-modernity the feature of the virtual human, who presses the keys (charged by an easily decipherable symbolism) ctrl + alt + delete, i.e. the human controls, alternates / chooses and forgets / (be)comes again.

Communications from the Session III were noteworthy by Mr. Vasile Spiridon, professor at “Vasile Alecsandri” University from Bacău (“The new human after *Adio, Europa!* by D. Sârbu”); Mr. Sergiu Pavlicenco, university professor, PhD, vice president of the General and Comparative Literature Association from Moldova, MSU, who outlined an unusual image of the retired human in contemporary literature; Mrs. Viorella Manolache, PhD, Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy (Bucharest), who gave arguments for “the third citizen”. Mrs. Maria Sleahitişchi, PhD, Chief of the Department for Research and Innovation, MSU,

referred to the characters, mentalities and behaviors in the novel of the 80s and noted, citing Eminescu, that *all is old and all is new*.

The second day of the conference, Sessions IV and V, was marked by the Balkan human (Anatol Moraru, PhD, "A. Russo" University from Bălți, "Representations of the Balkan human in Romanian literature"); by the "post" syndrome (Ion Plămădeală, PhD, Institute of Philology, Academy of Sciences of Moldova, "Literature and phantasm of meaning: reflections on the "post" syndrome); by the concept of crisis (Mircea V. Ciobanu, editor-in-chief, "Știința" Publishing House, "Identity crisis in *Prague Cemetery* by Umberto Eco"); by the biblical message (Ioana Scherf, PhD, Humboldt University from Berlin, in a meditation "How new is the *new human*"); by the public reading and show (Alexandru Laszlo, PhD, "G. Barițiu" National College of Cluj-Napoca, "*Lectura Dantis* seen as a literary show"). Mrs. Emilia Taraburca, PhD, MSU, dissociated the image of the human of Enlightenment from that of the contemporary human; Alex Cosmescu, PhD, Institute of Philology of the ASM, spoke in terms of otherness and "self escape" from the perspective of Em. Levinas; Mrs. Natalia Sporiș, PhD, MSU, received a perfect and prompt translation of her communication from Russian in Romanian by the session moderator Ivan Pilchin, relating about amnesia as a syndrome of the contemporary culture, but Ivan Pilchin, lecturer, MSU, revealed to the audience the "new spirit" in literature from the perspective of Guillaume Apollinaire, illustrating his communication with a *calligrammes*-poem "The small car" in the dynamic electronic form.

Session VI was focused on such phenomena as "massiveness" in the modern society, citing *Revolt of the masses* by J. Ortega y Gasset (Raisa Ganea, PhD, MSU); mercantilism of the modern human being is seen by the Bessarabian novelists of the nowadays generation (Iulian Ciocan, PhD, journalist, Radio Free Europe); *Homo sacer* ("the slaughtered human and simultaneously the human excluded from the sacred rite of society") (Maria Pilchin, lecturer, MSU). Dumitru Crudu, writer, director of the "Ștefan cel Mare" Library from Chișinău, brought up the image of the "new Moldovans", the post-Soviet ones, an eloquent case being that of Vasile Ernu. Ioana Petcu, PhD, "George Enescu" University of Arts from Iași, has developed to the audience the image of the new human from the Eastern European film of the '70s and 80s of the '20th century.

In the summary meeting the guests of the conference have reviewed the perspectives of the approaching to such a challenging topic with its endless openings. Mrs. Elena Prus, university professor, PhD, director of the Institute of Philology and Intercultural Researches (Moldova Free International University), spoke about the hypermodern individual and the world where everything becomes hyper. The conference was closed with an impressive speech by the event's moderator Mrs. Tatiana Ciocoi, "Under the sign of *pietas*: *The Red Human's Death* by Svetlana Alexievitch" – a pleading for freedom and equality in the modern world, a communication about the neurosis, crisis and great questions of the humanity, about the ungrateful *second-hand* times, about the technical destiny of the mankind in Heidegger's view, about the author's death and the death of the text, about the kitchen dissent, about books that became a cultural surrogate, about differences and diversity.

All communications that were presented live will be published in a volume of conference materials. The event was held in a collegial atmosphere, overflowing with ideas and proposals. Thanks of the organizers were expressed to the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, to the Romanian Cultural Institute and to all who accepted the invitation to answer the question of the conference title.

Definition of what is European (*homo europeus*), Karl Schmidt as the first mayor of Chișinău, an old new human or a new old human, hyper-citizen, *homo oeconomicus*, discovering the Other and through the Other, *homo digitalis*, digital / technical Humanities, literature as a space that creates identity and includes multiple identities, labyrinth human, cultural marketing, strategies of the vulgarization of high texts, intertextuality as a gift... – all the subjects have had a point of convergence: "the human of Europe is doomed to progress".

ELENA UNGUREANU,

PhD, Institute of Philology of the ASM
Information Society Development Institute
Translation from Romanian to English by

IVAN PILCHIN,

Lecturer, Chair of Universal Literature,
Moldova State University

**BOOKFEST,
INTERNATIONAL BOOK FAIR,
31 May 2014
INSTITUTE OF POLITICAL SCIENCES
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

HAS LAUNCHED THE BOOKS:

REPERE TEORETICE ÎN BIOPOLITICĂ

Author VIORELLA MANOLACHE

and

SISTEMUL POLITIC DIN ROMÂNIA. ACTORI, INSTITUȚII, PROVOCĂRI

Coordinated by ARISTIDE CIOARBĂ and CONSTANTIN NICA

REPERE TEORETICE ÎN BIOPOLITICĂ [Theoretical Landmarks in Biopolitics]

ALLOCUTIONS

"One of a kind", reads one of the critical references to Dr. Viorella Manolache's latest, out of the ten books published along as many years. *Theoretical Landmarks in Biopolitics*, brought out by the Institute of Political Sciences Publishing last year, which is our host at this book fair, is illustrative of a decade's studies in such a complex subject as last century's East Europe, filtered through the conceptual frames of postmodern critical theories. "One of a kind", we would like to add, because, unlike common young researchers, Dr. Manolache does not limit herself to applying some particular theory to the empirical object under consideration, opting instead for a Husserlian phenomenological variation. The doctrine of social hygiene (eugenics) is examined primarily in light of Michel Foucault's concept of "biopolitics", but also of Adornian and Foucaultian social criticism, of Hayden White's deconstruction, of doctrinaire liberalism (an English version of Benthamite utilitarianism), of identity studies, and of the movement of ideas. Disciplinary lore and conceptual rigor are thus enriched by a pluralistic methodology which is extremely beneficial in the post-totalitarian, East-European context. The present *tableau vivant*, with the author having us on either side, i.e., Prof. Ion Goian, a philosopher, and me, a specialist in literary studies, which is integrated nowadays within the broader disciplinary field of the humanities in all major universities, is telling in regard to Dr. Manolache's pluralistic methodology as hermeneutic exercise and discourse of values.

Setting out from the nominal communality between Michel Foucault's biopolitics and the homonymous concept employed by a group of Transylvanian eugenicists in the *Buletin Eugenic și Biopolitic (Eugenic and Biopolitic Newsletter)* of the inter-war period, Dr Manolache goes on to define the terms she is working with, pleading in favor of Dominick LaCapra's historiography or Foucault's critique of reified ideologies rather than the kind of deconstruction of history underwriting Hayden White's "tropes of discourse".

Although I had previously published criticism on modernist literature, I had not heard of the Romanian writings on social medicine dating back to the same time before being offered one by an absent-minded librarian who had mistook the reading desk. I was emerging out of postcolonial studies, with my head full of postmodernist vocabularies teeming with notions of pluralism, de-doxification, alterity, the priority of the other over the self etc., and I was shocked to read now at random about the necessity to eliminate physically and mentally disabled persons in order to ensure the health of the social body. The author's sick mind was ransacking history for similar practices, landing in ... ancient Sparta's custom of smashing handicapped babies against the rocks.

The author, I. Făcăoaru, if I'm not mistaken, had cast his ideas in the form of a social hygiene textbook. No wonder the memory of the race had failed to keep alive a theory looming within the confines of biologized social facts. Searching such counter-ethical anomaly is, however, worthwhile, particularly with peoples who have sometimes been denied an institutional soul (C. Rădulescu-Motru). That is, they are supposed to lack the capacity to rise from the ground to a biped's position, not only physically but also mentally. An evolved human society is not something built within the empire of nature but in contradiction to it (see Niklas Luhmann's concept of "Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft").

The logic of equivalence, the biologizing of the social is likely to trigger human misery, sometimes through a sort of boomerang effect. I remember the sad beginning of our so-called “new world” which proved the new power’s incapacity at the time to go back to lawfulness, meaning the rational search for the truth in a court of law. I watched the “abridged” version of the Ceaușescu trial, which had been rendered possible by ... Nicolae Ceaușescu’s decree of the martial law, followed by a brutal execution. In another TV scene, the dictator’s daughter, a fragile figure, pressing a puppy against her breast, was seen surrounded by armored tanks and soldiers armed to their teeth, one of whom dropped a casual remark to his companions: “Let her have her cigarettes; she won’t be living for much longer, anyhow”. The paranoid mind, inherited from the previous regime, was looking at Zoe Ceaușescu without seeing her; her skin split under her parents’ masks. I, who had been a victim of her mother’s personnel politics, could have said then: “Here is God’s hand: our lives and careers have been smothered by decrees from Cabinet No 2, and look now at her children going down into sickness and death for the ... bad file of having made a wrong choice of parents ...”. There were fourteen criteria for dispossessing people of their rights, none of them being their own responsibility. I was not in a mythical mood, though. I felt contempt for the madcap who stabbed the dictator’s son, whose hand he had probably kissed not long before. I passed then the most difficult test of my ethical being. I was able to thanks to my education at the school of a civilization whose narratives have always counterpointed nature and culture, while the folklore of my own represents the forest as “man’s brother”. The heart of the former has always been a scene of socialization and of nomic practices: the king and the comitatus, domus and curia, the code of laws dating back to 600 A.D., the king’s bank of jurors (12th century), Magna Carta (1215), the Model Parliament of 1295 ... If God punishes by hurting innocents, well then civilized man can do a better job. I’m saying that even if an MP speaking in parliament at a time when such speeches delighted us, previously to the present shortened version of black and white elects or electronic vote, made the following comment on the dictators’ end: “Ceaușescu had lived all his life in contempt of the law, so that, when he finally called out for it, nobody heard him...” *Est modus in rebus* ...

The oldest parley over the nature/culture controversy in English literature is probably a scene in *Fugens and Lucres*, a play written by Henry Medwall, a chaplain of Cardinal Morton’s, the latter being also Thomas More’s patron. Whom shall Roman Lucres choose for a husband: an aristocrat of the blood, or a patriot ennobled by his own virtue and talent? The rights of caste, class, and rank were still being relentlessly defended by ... servants who could even throw down the glove and fight a duel over the issue...

Gathered together in London, a party of humanists including Erasmus, Morus, Juan Luis Vives, and John Colet, diverted the political thought of the age from a militaristic logic to the Horatian ideal of the good life. Aristobios, the good life, was becoming a code rooted in humanistic thought. By the end of the 16th century a system of relief for the poor, managed by knights, had been created. Romantic Wordsworth, the political ally of a conservative lord, glorifies the power of the humble people’s heart to love for love’s sake (“The Idiot Boy”).

Lord Byron defended the machine breakers in Parliament, and wrote a moving passage in *Childe Harold* about a Dacian taken to Rome and slaughtered in the arena of the Colosseum. Is there some Romanian text on this subject? Virginia Woolf, a famous scholar’s daughter, indicts official eugenic politics in *Mrs Dalloway*. Wherefrom all this aristocratic superbia in a land which had but recently got the dignity of a state ruled by an ancient dynasty, a land in which the Romanians had till then suffered from an inferior social status?

Dr. Manolache contextualizes the phenomenon, so as to allow Romanian eugenics to appear as a belated and tamed manifestation of the Galton-founded discipline. The same phenomenon emerging in the late 19th century was pressed down in western countries by parliamentary legislation (the Birkett Report) or politically committed art works (Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*). The cult of the lesser values, such as the biological, natural signified, betrays lack of education, the victimization of the innocents is a sign of primitivism, while retaliation against the blameless for the guilty ones is a symptom of clinical paranoia. The politization or militarization of civil life, of the *Medizinischepolizei* kind, can be explained through the absence of those disciplinary traditions and schools of thought which are only formed around ancient universities. Political changes in Romania are still abrupt, just military rounds of salute. People are on the lookout for changing Orders of the Day Minds unaccustomed to critical exercise work through

totalitarian stereotypes and narratives. Contrariwise, an individual possessed of institutional lore will find more of the Human Rights Charter in the act of an officer who placed the baby of a dissenter against the communist regime in an orphanage without mentioning her ancestry than a presumably democratic minister of justice who refused to rehabilitate the victims of communist repression, including the baby's father.

Reductionist political thinking can be amended, according to the author, with the help of two schools of philosophy: the social criticism of the Frankfurt School meant to awaken people to an understanding of the way they are being manipulated by the power system or by the press, and the ethical awakening to an awareness of "the irreducible face of the other" (E. Levinas).

While defining the concept of biopolitics in Foucault's spirit, as technique of disciplining and repressing the individual body so as to serve the interests of the power system, the author makes room for the only legitimate form of biopolitics which is, according to the late Foucault of *Studies in the History of Sexuality*, the shaping of one's own self, the aesthetic self of the autonomous individual so as to render it apt for a genuinely valuable model of the good life.

ANA MARIA TUPAN

* * *

For me, coming from the Anglo-American analytic tradition in philosophy, reading Dr. Viorella Manolache's work has opened up new ways of thinking about politics and philosophy. She is a synthetic thinker, with an ability to draw together a multiplicity of strands, bringing together ideas from different sources and discovering connections between them in ways which cast a new light on areas of scholarship.

This is one of the great strengths of her writing, and is possible only because of the depth of scholarship that Viorella Manolache has, and the ease with which she is able reach back into the history of philosophy, and to draw upon it. But more than that, she constantly demonstrates how contemporary concerns and ways of analysing society are related to concerns that have a long history within political philosophy, and she utilises contemporary scholarship to throw fresh light on long standing political and philosophical concerns, concerns that reach back into the history of philosophy, and to reconfigure them in ways which reflect this depth of knowledge.

Another of Viorella Manolache's strengths is to demonstrate how concepts are always contested, and how the process of responding to that contestation means they are always changing, that understanding is never final, and that there can never be a last word on the subject. For someone immersed in the analytical tradition, where one hopes to achieve some sort of settled understanding, one of the real benefits of reading Viorella Manolache's work lies in recognising that understanding is never final. And concomitant with that has been learning how to appreciate the way in which her writing offers the reader the opportunity to occupy a multiplicity of perspectives, and to see an issue from every angle.

Her book, *Repere Teoretice în Biopolitică*, has proved a rich source of ideas and approaches for my particular concerns, which are related to neo-liberalism, and in particular the way in which she uses Foucault's concept of biopolitics to illuminate the idea of the natural in politics. Viorella Manolache is particularly good at showing how natural life comes to fall within the scope of state power and how the idea of the natural has been incorporated into neo-liberal conceptions, not just of what 'naturally' man is, but also of what sort of people there should be, one of the abiding questions in biopolitics.

And using terminology resonant with biological import that is very familiar in British political discourse, that of 'the body politic', Viorella Manolache raises important questions about what neo-liberalism takes to be the nature of the body politic, how it conceives the body politic as healthy or unhealthy, identifies certain 'cells' as foreign or diseased, and determines how they are to be 'cured' or 'expelled', to make the body politic whole and healthy again.

So for my part I'm very grateful to Viorella Manolache for opening up new ways of thinking. I'd also like to add that not only is it the basis of a fruitful intellectual relationship, but it is the basis of a warm personal relationship, and for both these reasons I'd like to thank her for her writing and her friendship.

IAN BROWNE

SISTEMUL POLITIC DIN ROMÂNIA. ACTORI, INSTITUȚII, PROVOCĂRI
[Romania's Political System. Actors, Institutions, Challenges]

FINALLY, A TREATY ON THE ROMANIA'S POLITICAL SYSTEM

The launch of the book *Romania's Political System. Actors, Institutions, Challenges* took place under the auspices of the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy, in Institute's Publishing stand, on Saturday, May 31, 2014, at 16.30, in the presence of the special guests Professor Adrian-Paul Iliescu, PhD and Professor Alexandru Radu, PhD, the director of the Institute of Political Science and International Relations (ISPRI) and ISPRI Publishing House, Professor Dan Dungaciu, PhD, a coordinator of the book, Senior Researcher Constantin Nica, PhD, the authors of the book, other specialists, academics, journalists and the public interested in new editorial issues.

Dan Dungaciu, the director of the Institute of Political Science and International Relations (ISPRI), opened the event by considering that the volume *Romania's Political System. Actors, Institutions, Challenges* ranges among the fundamental works of the Institute, illustrating a kind of work which really constitutes the *raison d'être* of the institutes of academic research, that of initiate and develop research programs on topics of major scientific interest and social impact, capitalizing them in research academic exchanges, partial studies, reviews and, finally, in books, representative both for the scientific field and for the authors. The volume, concluded Professor Dan Dungaciu, constitutes an academic success, both in terms of content and in terms of the graphic form.

The prestigious Professor Adrian-Paul Iliescu, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bucharest, confessed that he has the honor and the joy to present a "work-event" that will withstand the test of time and will gradually impose itself on the free market of ideas as a "big book". Professor Adrian-Paul Iliescu considered that the work *Romania's Political System* is a genuine *Treaty* whereas it impresses connoisseurs, given the way it was designed, the methodology it used – a successful fasten of the systematic approach with the structural-functionalist one –, and the way in which the arguments and conclusions were drawn. He praised the work stressing that deserve to be congratulated both those who had the initiative of this important project, who have materialized it and, equally, those who have decided to keep in the Institute's research programs of the project from which the volume has been materialized. Professor Adrian-Paul Iliescu also has drawn attention on the need of the presence of such books and authors in the public space and on the book market, currently monopolized by celebrity-publishers and celebrity-personages that mostly prove superficiality and imposture. He said, among other laudatory assessments that this important project it should have known before the book appeared, in order to be better known, and he expected that the book be recommended as study literature.

Alexandru Radu, Professor at the Faculty of Political Science of the Christian University "Dimitrie Cantemir" from Bucharest, PhD, revealed the interesting conception of the thematic structure of the book, retaining the authors meritorious decision to open the analysis with studies on the actors of political realm and the culture and behavior of the social body constituted in a political body. In this context, he said that the authors have shifted the focus of the observation from the institutions – the traditional perspective that "pushes" the demarche toward a legal vision – to the modern and indispensable agents of representative and pluralistic parliamentary democracy, parties unions, NGOs and other components of civil society. Professor Alexandru Radu wanted to clarify that each chapter is inciting, considering that the proposed views deserve attention, especially from the perspective of a critical debate involving specialists sustaining other positions on an issue or another, the contradictory debates and arguments of each part being those which stimulate the progress in the field of knowledge.

Gabriela Tănăsescu, scientific researcher III, PhD at the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy, co-author of the book and the moderator of the book launch, said that the main initiator and coordinator of the project who made possible this work is Mr. Aristide Cioabă, until recently senior scientific researcher PhD at the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy, head of contemporary

political theories and institutions, which, unfortunately, because of some objective reasons, could not attend the event. He sent to those who attended the event his confidence that the work *Romania's Political System* is a systematic framework necessary in order to understand and analyze the Romanian political phenomenon and that it will constitute a fruitful debate framework and a landmark for future researches.

Dr. Constantin Nica, Senior Researcher I at the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy, the other scientific coordinator of the project, revealed that the book deserves to be read, that it will enter in the public intellectual domain of our country, because it provides a thorough and unified analysis of the problem and proposes innovative points of view and arguments, opening thus new avenues of research in the field. He spoke about how the idea of preparation of this volume was born, about the establishment of the research team – Aristide Cioabă, Constantin Nica, Lorena Stuparu, Gabriela Tănăsescu, Gheorghe Ciascai, Ruxandra Iordache, Bogdan-Mihai Popescu –, about how the team worked and established itself as a true professional scientific community.

Gabriela Tănăsescu considered that the work is a critical approach of the Romanian political system carried out according to the current standards of the Western political science, as language, conceptual framework, methodology and theoretical and empirical analysis. In her appreciation, the work clearly answers to the question: where are we as a political society on a scale of democratic consolidation, especially in the last decade, as well as an answer to the questions: how does the constitutional-extraconstitutional, formal-informal dialectics work in Romania in the current political system, and what kinds of interactions are necessary and desirable in order to avoid the intraexecutive conflicts, failures, political stalemate and political spectacle of poor quality. She thanked the guests and the audience for attending the event and expressed the hope that both the topics which were dealt with “calm” in the book and those which were treated “incisively” will constitute the subject of certain useful and renewing future debates.

LORENA STUPARU

**THE DEBATE
UKRAINE – A PROSPECTIVE ABORDATION
INSTITUTE OF POLITICAL SCIENCES
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
ROMANIAN ACADEMY
and
CONFLICT PREVENTION AND EARLY WARNING CENTRE
25 JUNE 2014**

After the military intervention in Crimea and the annexation of that region of Ukraine to Russia, the speech of Russian President Vladimir Putin on March 18 opened the door to a new reality in the post-soviet space and the Wider Black Sea Region: border at stake, will to rebuild the former Soviet Union, fight for the land of all Russians, to be united with Russia, aggressiveness of politics, military, economic, political pressure, informational war. In that environment, with no guarantees that the first step or steps – together with the 2008 intervention in Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions of Georgia – are the last ones. On the other hand the reaction of Ukraine was quite weak, no shot gun on ceding Crimea, as the Western Countries, US and EU alike, proposed economic targeted sanctions as a reaction to this abominable gesture.

In that particular context, all countries in the region felt under pressure and attack by the Russian Federation under Vladimir Putin, with his new plan to gain by force a part or all of the former Soviet Union in a Russian State. Ukraine, the countries in the Wider Black Sea Region as well as the whole world would like to see where it is this going. That's why the debate proposed to look into the possible multiple futures of the issue. Based on the methodology of the Conflict Prevention and Early Warning Centre created by prof. dr. Iulian Chifu based on the PLATO – Plausible Futures methodology, it tried to find the alternative scenarios and developments within 3/5 years.

COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL “FOUCAULT POST MORTEM”
Laboratory Cultures et Sociétés en Europe, University from Strasbourg,
le Centre «Corps, Conflits et Créativité» (Dynamiques Européennes),
Centre Michel Foucault
Maison Interuniversitaire des Sciences de l’Homme Alsace (MISHA),
Strasbourg,
25-26 JUNE 2014

Scientific Researcher III, PhD, Viorella Manolache (ISPRI) has participated with the study: *Foucaultian Reflexes: The Russian Doll Effect*.

The study proposes a demolition of the impediments which seem to plague a reading of the Foucaultian score within post-1989 Romanian space; the first one perceives itself as the result of a secondary complex signalling the belated contact between Romanians and the Foucaultian discourse, with *act-taking objectified* only in the late 90’s; the second aims to prove a detachment of Foucaultian creation from any *postmodernist extensions or plunging into postmodernism*.

The first answer would involve a recourse to the 5/1967 volume of the *Secolul 20* magazine, dedicated to “an introduction into structuralism”, publishing (with no synchronizing qualms) Sartre’s generational polemic coupled with the “new wave” ideas of Foucault – Lévi Strauss – Lacan, while attempting to bring to light all the effects of “thought before thought.”

Perspectives offered by different comments hurry to report/place/label(ing) Foucault within/in the position of *modernity/Illuminist critic, or of adept/seeker of an alternative modernity* [through the attack launched against the concept of modern rationality – oppressive, reductionist and coercive – or against the idea of progress, in the sense of unmasking impartiality and universality] – of *counter-modern exponent boasting a critical resistance attitude which is characteristic of postmodernism, as an intellectual brand* which is difficult to define, marked by scripted dandyism, suspected of philosophical abuse and/or seen as an *artisan* of a politics of writing [we consider that, in the context of discontinuous knowledge, the myth of Foucault the postmodern is a false one, synthesizing theses and antitheses which are nothing more than simple stylistic expressions in a context acknowledging of the fact that Foucault was never postmodern].

We hold the conviction that Foucault is a poststructuralist (with infrastructural accents) despite all the recycling/borrowings he operated in/within postmodernity. Such a statement is backed by the limit/evidence which shows that Foucault is neither for nor against exposing *the suppressed discourse* of/in modernity, in the sense of a separation from the truth with the aim of connecting to a disciplinary device with nodal points within the abnormal and normalizing alterity. From this point of view a whole feminist, neo-historical and/or post-colonial range of concepts appears, contaminating the Foucaultian endeavour and making it vulnerable to postmodern labelling.

ACADEMIC MEETING BETWEEN THE INSTITUTE
OF POLITICAL SCIENCES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (ISPRI)
and Shanghai Institute for International Relations (SIIS),
ISPRI, BUCHAREST,
1 JULY 2014

The Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations was the host of a delegation of Chinese professors and researchers, led by Yang Jiemian, professor, researcher and vice-president of Shanghai Institute for International Relations (SIIS). The Romanian part was led by Professor and Director of the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, Dan Dungaciu, Ambassadors Ioan Donca and Sergiu Celac, Laurențiu Pachiu, member of Energy Policy Group and other ISPRI researchers.

The discussions have pivoted around the crisis from Ukraine and of the risk of the international political medium to enter accelerated cold political relations between the power centres. The Chinese part has accentuated the idea that another Cold War is not in Beijing interest, whose target is to transform the specific international competition into cooperation, and the transformation of the null game into a game with positive result seems to be the preponderant use of the economic and cultural factors against the military ones. At least, this seems to be the formula adopted by China in order to reformat the actual international medium. Mr. Yang Jiemian has underlined that China wishes another international system, less bellicose and more efficient. We must notice Mr. Yang Jiemian affirmation according to which, referring to the Ukraine crisis, the ex-soviet republics from the Central and Eastern Europe intend to enter the European club. A wish which can be affected by a rapid extension – military and economic – of the United States in the Central Europe and in the East.

During the meeting, the researchers have established common collaboration actions between the two institutes.

**INSTITUTE OF POLITICAL SCIENCES
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
THE COMMISSION OF PROSPECTIVE STUDIES
OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY (CSPAR)
7 JULY, 2014**

Monday, July 7, 2014, at the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy (IPSIR) took place the Prospective Studies Committee meeting of the Romanian Academy (CSPAR) at the initiative of the academician Mircea Malița, inscribed in a tradition of decades of prospective studies in Romania. In front of a packed audience there were presented objectives, projects, membership of this committee – consisting in over 31 members – academicians, diplomats, researchers and university professors.

The opening speech of university professor, PhD, Director ISPRI Dan Dungaciu placed this meeting in the context of concerns related to the shape of the future in Romania and stated that the event follows the first committee meeting, which took place in 2011.

The series of communications hosted by the event began with the presentation of Academician Mircea Malița, based on the argument for the necessity to study scientifically the future (the possible, and the probable one) with and with the care for a construction which should be as accurate as possible of the present. Employing the metaphor of “the arrow that returns from the future into the present” academician Malița explained how prospective studies are essential to the manner in which a country – with the specific example of Romania, in a world of increasingly complex and fluid – builds strategies and policies in at least two of the areas of great significance for the future – on the short term, medium term and especially the long term: in education and diplomacy.

Prof. George Ștefan, correspondent member of the Romanian Academy, spoke of the special and very ambiguous relationship of the current world with the future, placing it into the so-called paradox of prospective, of the acceleration of technological developments and of the manner in which these tools are used in prospective studies, and of the difficulty to include / understand / predict in their evolution the ample emergent effects. Prof. George Ștefan proposed the launching of a master for training future specialists in the use of high technology foresight studies, also in context and ISPRI, a proposal welcomed by Professor Dan Dungaciu.

Academician Lucian Liviu Albu, director of the Economic Forecasting Institute of the Romanian Academy, related the prospective studies to the studies in economic prospective, highlighting the limits of the standard forecasting methods in the study of emergent phenomena

such as the economic crises. He highlighted the role of the economic crisis triggered in 2008 to revive a research and forecasting and challenged established theories and methods. Also, academician Albu has proposed the establishment, also within ISPRI of an Advanced Center for Prospective Studies as a nucleus already formed for expertise in this area.

Mr. Emil Hurezeanu, undertaking the metaphor of the arrow from the future to the present and the past, developed the ambivalent relationship on all three temporal axes. The direction of the flow of time, from past to future, could be reversed by a proper “recycling” and the interpretation of those arrows of future, with direct application via lessons that Romania – the same small state, with medium resources – could extract from past experiences concerning its relations with the great powers.

Mr. Cosmin Dugan, Secretary of CSPAR, made reference to several administrative issues related to establishing a timetable for regular meetings of CSPAR, and a thematic panel regarding the prospective thematic issues to be addressed in the studies of CSPAR. Among the proposals advanced were concerning the affiliation of the Commission to similar international bodies, as well as the attention to access European funds in order to support prospective projects.

These few lines of discussion and the reactions that were generated from the audience are a supplementary argument for the significance of this event and for the many dimensions of development for CSPAR. Under this commission was appointed on behalf of ISPRI, as a member, scientific researcher university professor PhD Darie Cristea.

RUXANDRA IORDACHE

**ISUD INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR UNIVERSAL DIALOGUE
10TH WORLD CONGRESS “THE HUMAN BEING:
ITS NATURE AND ITS FUNCTIONS”
Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, University of Craiova, Craiova, Romania
7 July 2014**

From the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations of the Romanian Academy have participated: Lorena-Valeria Stuparu, Scientific Researcher III PhD: “The Religious Dimension of Aesthetic Experience” and Gabriela Tănăsescu, Scientific Researcher III PhD: “Individualism and Responsibility in the Rationalist Ethics. The Actuality of Spinoza’s Ethics”.

**THE LAUNCHING OF THE BOOK
Cold War Diplomacy, author Academician MIRCEA MALIȚA,
CENTRAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, BUCHAREST,
8 July 2014**

The Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, Romanian Academy, Bucharest, has launched the book *Cold War Diplomacy*, author Academician Mircea Malița, at the Central University Library, Bucharest, in partnership with Club Romania and Digi 24.

In this launching/evoking event, participated as speakers, next to the Academician Mircea Malița, Mugur Isărescu, the Governor of the National Bank, Remus Pricopie, the Minister of the National Education, Emil Hurezeanu, Digi24 TV programmes producer, Member in the Directing Council of the Black Sea Foundation (FUMN), University Professor, PhD, Dan Dungaci, the Director of the Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Romanian Academy.

The Academician Mircea Malița was part of several major events of the Cold War and he has gained the respect of the leaders of the United States, Western Europe and the countries exiting the colonial period, at the international level. His memoirs are the testimony of an eyewitness of the public events and the discussions taking place behind the closed doors, during the most volatile moments of the Cold War, the Cuban missile crisis, the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Romanian media, diplomatic and intelligence games avoiding a similar fate.

“The final idea of this book is that, in fact, *what we believe and know about the Cold War is not true* (...). The missile crisis is not representative for the Cold war. The missile crises, actually, begun quite tumultuously, and at some point normalized, one way or another and, quickly, the collaboration was continued. Why? The explanation is that not the conflict was at the basis of the Cold War. The limit was never crossed (...). Each time the parties paid attention to certain limits which were never crossed, and these limits were never put in writing, but they have functioned each time. (...) During the Cold War, each actor had the consciousness of the fact that the limits were not to be crossed”, commented the director of ISPRI, university professor, PhD, Dan Dungaciu, with reference to the information presented in the volume.

A supplementary argument, to which academician Mircea Malița referred in the book, relates to the role of the secret services from Washington and Moscow.

“The secret services were important during the Cold War, suggested the academician, not because the former spied on the latter, but because these were ultimately the mechanisms maintaining these proto-agreements. If the leaders were wrong, there were ‘valve-institutions’, which met, discussed and stated limits: ‘this far!’ This is the reason why there were never conflicts,” declared also Dan Dungaciu.

At the same time, the latter underlined the fact that even if an atomic conflict emerged during that period, “the two great powers (the USA and the USSR, redactor’s note) found a solution not to initiate the war” (...). “This concerns the so-called *theory of the first strike*. If ever arrives a leader whom the actors cannot control through the instituted mechanisms (those proto-agreements to which were parts the secret services inclusively) and wants to begin war with the other part, and within those proto-agreements each part, Washington and Moscow, should ensure that its first strike would not hit their own territories. So, if you the Soviet people, hit us, do not hit the USA, but another state, from Europe, as well as us are not to hit you, but another allied state of yours, from your block, following that after these hits we sit in negotiations and make peace after things came down”, explained the director ISPRI, underlining that this cynical understanding showed once more that, in fact, the Cold War was rather a question “*regulated to a greater extent*” than suggested by the present day conflict theories.

Even more, Dan Dungaciu stated that “*it is obvious that the theory of the first strike is not written on any document*” and unveiled that “the theory was presented by Mircea Malița himself and it was a determining argument for the President of Finland to reopen the renegotiations for the Helsinki Final Act (1975), because the Europeans were not very interested by their security, stating anyway that ‘nothing will happen to us’”.

Presenting his volume, academician Mircea Malița spoke about the main rules that were found at the basis of what he calls a *tacit agreement between the great superpowers* during that period – the USA and the USSR.

“First – we do not have a real war, no one relates to the nuclear weapon. Two – the military confrontations are avoided (there will not be any conventional wars). Three – none of us gets involved into the affairs of the other space.

Then, the permitted things: the doctrinaire consultations continue, the freedom of the press, each superpower having the permission to establish relationships in the Third World under the circumstance that these do not affect the interests of the other superpower.

These were the guiding rules during the Cold War. Question: Was this document written anywhere? No! Was it known? Probably it was suspected. It can be checked point by point that it was respected? Yes! Then it means that it was a tacit agreement. A diplomat is allowed to write about the tacit agreement deduced from the visible, verifiable experience. A historian is not allowed to do that, a historian is the prisoner of the written, authenticated (etc.) documents. (...) These were the rules, but they were never written. They are verifiable though, and we can consider them real,” argued the former ambassador of Romania in the USA.

"The name of Cold War is not quite suitable for a period that is invisibly led, in a peaceful way. We should call it 'The period of a tacit agreement that lasted forty-some-odd years'", added the Romanian diplomat, referring to the historical period 1947-1989.

For a change, sustains academician Malița, the true 'Cold War' took place during the period 1945-1950, "a period neglected by history, which hosted a terrible European war, although it was nothing written about it", referring to the wars waged in the European space by the USA, "with all the visible and the invisible means," for the "defeat of the communist parties and in order to set in power the other parties."

The Romania diplomat says that "special reserve armies were created in various places in Europe by the Americans" to this end, and the true Cold War ended when the communist party in Italy was replaced through vote by a Christian Democrat party.

"At that point the Cold War ended. America declared 'We won! The power of the political left has gone into thin air (...)' These are disclosures of a researcher who is also a diplomat, neither a political, nor a theoretical and nor a historical type, but who is building his arguments on things that were neither said nor written, on things that were never expressed and constitute the foundation of contemporary history", also asserted academician Mircea Malița.

SUMMER SCHOOL ON THE TOPIC "HISTORY AND CINEMA IN BESSARABIA" WITHIN THE HISTORIC FILM FESTIVAL AT RÂȘNOV, 1-10 August 2014

20 young people from Moldova Republic and Ukraine took part, during 1-10 August 2014, in the Summer School with the topic 'History and Cinema in Bessarabia' organized by the Romanian Cultural Institute, as partner, in the Historical Film Festival at Râșnov. Found at its first edition, the summer school organized by the Romanian Cultural Institute (ICR) through the Direction Romanians Abroad and the Romanian Language addressed especially the students and the Master's students within the space of the historical Bessarabia passionate for history and cinema.

The participants had the opportunity to discuss with personalities of the Romanian cultural world and access to all the events of the Historical Film Festival in Râșnov Fortress. During ten days, the student selected were to participate in debates, conferences, film projections, workshops, thematic trips, benefitting from the presence of reputable specialists (historians, political scientists, sociologists, cineastes, visual artists, etc). The students were invited to expose their ideas concerning the history and culture specific for their native space.

Octavian Bâlea, photo artist resident in Helsinki, presented his album, "Transnistria, the prison of the Romanian language", under press at the ICR Publishing House. Within the fortress took place as well the vernissage of an exhibition with approximately 50 photos realized by the artist in Tiraspol. The section included as well two workshops for the participants in the Summer School.

The first, organized by Virgil Mărgineanu, president of the Documentary Festival CRONOGRAF in Chișinău, presented the state of contemporary Bessarabia cinematography. The second workshop, sustained by Octavian Bâlea, was centered on his experience in Transnistria, which the artist visited repeatedly.

In the opening of the ICR Summer School, the academician Ioan-Aurel Pop delivered the conference "Romanian Spirituality between the Latin West and the Byzantine East". Among speakers there were also the historians Adrian Cioroianu, Petre Otu, Mihai Croitor, Horia Șerbănescu, Georgeta Filitti, Cosmin Budeancă and Liviu Tofan, the ambassador of Slovakia, Jan Gabor, professor Jan Rydel (European Network Remembrance and Solidarity, Poland), Radu Filipescu, anticommunist Dissident, the sociologists Vasile Dâncu and Dan Dungaciu, the artists Ion Caramitru and Ioan Gyuri Pascu, the publicists Sever Voinescu, Bogdan Hrib, the cineaste Laurențiu Damian, the essayist Theodor Paleologu, the ambassadors Sergiu Celac and Sorin Ducaru, Alexandru Grumaz,

diplomat and general in reserve, the economist Ionuț Dumitru, Bogdan Olteanu, vice-governor BNR, the political scientist Iulian Fota, presidential counselor.

The students participated also in the other events of the Historical Film Festival, organized outside the ICR Summer School. The complete programme of the festival included over 40 documentary and fiction films, concerts and special events, and also debated related to the themes of the festival – ‘The Great War’, ‘Year 1989’ and ‘Los Angeles 1984’.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PATRIMONY AND LOCAL IDENTITY, VALEA VERDE, 5-7 SEPTEMBER 2014

The *National Conference on Patrimony and Local Identity*, organised by Valentin Trifescu, Vali Ilyes and François Bréda, and sponsored by Ioan Sicoe and Petru Ursan was held at Valea Verde from 5-7 September 2014. The conference attracted a wide range of academics and researchers from a variety of disciplines, each of whom was able to use their expertise in their particular areas of research to inform the debates. This led to a remarkable degree of cross disciplinary exchange, as academics and researchers from the fields of art history, literature, philosophy, politics, architecture, theater and history, engaged in an exchange of ideas, and it was this which played a key role in the success of the conference. The richness and variety of the papers offered, and the stimulus to intellectual discussion they provided, contributed to the success of the conference, and the discussions, both formal and informal, went on long into the night.

Valentin Trifescu's paper on ‘The spirit of place and literary artistic creation in inter-war Transylvania’ – a richly associative work, deciphered hidden ideatic codes and illuminated new angles of study and thought in the fields of art history and regionalism, analyzing the present day validity of concepts such as minorities, nationalism, comparative history, regionalism, art history - as applied to the political geography of interwar Transylvania.

Viorella Manolache's ‘The effect of editing the local – a technical(ised) demonstration’, provided a characteristically dense study, filled with interesting ideas and utilizing both a critical vocabulary and a complex theoretical framework deriving from post modernist philosophy. It sparked a debate which contributed to the fertile exchange of ideas between all the participants.

Ian Browne's paper on heritage and nostalgia, working very much within the analytic tradition, was a philosophical exploration of the construction of heritage taken as national myth, through processes of the emotional identification with collective memory, and it examined the way in which discursive structures and rhetorical tropes facilitate the transformation of local and particular historical events into the general and the national, constructing the mythic elements of heritage.

Some of the themes of this paper resurfaced in Casian Popa's paper ‘Fluctuations in Romanian identity heritage assumptions of early history’, which looked at changing conceptions of the mythic origins of the Romanian people. He undertook an exercise in demythologizing, drawing attention to the way conceptions of difference and similarity were integral to the various self conceptions offered within scholastic textbooks as ways of creating a Romanian identity and concluded by offering a map of the distribution of DNA in Europe and Romania which provided a stark contrast to some of the mythic conceptions of national and biological identity he had examined.

The ideas of difference and similarity surfaced again, as a key feature of Ștefania Custură's paper on ‘Identity and otherness in medieval Brașov’. She utilised an array of archive material to examine the way in which the ideas of inclusion and exclusion served to regulate medieval life in Brașov, by conferring upon the citizens an identity, as insiders or outsiders, which quite literally marked out the range of possibilities and opportunities that were available to them. Her researches in the archives also served to shed light on the mysteriously fascinating figure of Dr Honigberger who linked Brașov to the fabulous Orient, Tibet and Shamballa through a network of associative discoveries and esoteric secrets positioning him in close proximity to Csoma de Koros and his well-known travel books.

Gina Puică also dealt with the themes of travel, exile and return in her paper on 'The other Romanian exiles, an insufficiently appreciated heritage'. Her focus was on the complexity and ambiguity of the relationships between the literary figures who left Romania for France – such as emblematic dissidents Monica Lovinescu and Virgil Ierunca, as well as less-well known intellectuals and writers – and the communist regime.

George Custură's contributions deserve special mention. Not only did he present a talk on Medieval farce in the seventeenth century, but he showed a short film of a performance of 'The Justice of Michael Weiss', which brought to life in exemplary and entertaining fashion the themes he had identified in his paper.

Vali Ilyes contribution on 'The wooden churches of Bozed, Mureş' brought the discussion of heritage up to date by focusing on contemporary issues and examining some of the political questions that arise concerning the preservation of heritage

The paper given by François Bréda, 'The geography of heaven in the thought of St. John of the Golden Mouth' provided a complete change of focus, by bringing a spiritual dimension to the conference, using the thoughts of St. John Chrysostom to examine the relationship between substance and spirit, and the nature of the relationship between eternal heritage and transcendent local identity in the afterlife.

After this excursion into metaphysical geography, the conference concluded with two papers on geography of a more down to earth kind – the physical and geographical aspects of localism and heritage, focusing on architecture, and on urbanism and ruralism – 'Eclectic versus eclectic, Bucharest between heritage without identity and identity without heritage', read by Monica Mureşanu and 'The local dimension of globalization, rural patrimony between exodus and gentrification' by Florin Mureşanu. Monica Mureşanu's paper illustrated in graphic fashion the changes which have taken place in Bucharest, without any clear regard for a conception of Bucharest's rich architectural heritage, which, as she pointed out, has resulted in an eclecticism which has had a dismal and depressing effect upon the urban environment and has resulted in an irreplaceable loss to Bucharest's heritage. Florin Mureşanu's paper focused more acutely upon recent, and not always happy, hybridizations between traditional rural architecture and its imported counterparts, which create a non-authentic landscape translating prosperity into flamboyancy; continuity and change within the architectural patrimony of Romanian villages were also discussed.

Overall, the most fascinating and most fruitful aspect of the conference proved to be the way in which each of the contributors approached the theme of localism and heritage. Each contributor had an aspect of the subject that they wanted to explore, but the diversity of contributions and the range of disciplines present ensured that no two approaches were the same. However, one of the most positive aspects was the willingness of the participants to find links between the different disciplines.

Both the venue of the conference and the active engagement of all the participants stimulated lively discussions that continued in a relaxed and informal way, long after the formal sessions had closed, and special mention should be made of Ioan Sicoe and George Custură for their ability to produce, spontaneously, an appropriate cultural moment which blended perfectly with the themes of local identity and heritage.

We must also note the pleasant welcome extended to all the participants by the mayor and vice-mayor of Sohodol, whose expertise and generosity made all the participants feel comfortably at ease and ensured a friendly, relaxed atmosphere, filled with true Romanian hospitality and genuine human warmth.

But most praise is due to Valentin Trifescu for the success of the conference, and in large measure this success must be attributed to his efforts to ensure that the atmosphere was so conducive to discussion and engagement with the ideas that were presented. That such a multidisciplinary conference, with each contributor engaging with the themes of localism and heritage in very different ways, engendered such a collective sense of intellectual engagement and a willingness to cross disciplines, is largely down to his efforts.

AM BROWNE

**THE BUCHAREST DEBATE ON EUROPE, 19TH-20TH
OF SEPTEMBER 2014, “1914-2014 WHAT IF EUROPE FAILS?”**

Hundred years ago Europe failed and within a few weeks found itself in a World War nobody could have foreseen in this extent. Is it possible something like this could happen again today? Given the current tension in Eastern Europe writers and scholars from 10 European countries discuss on September 19 and 20 in Bucharest on key issues concerning the project Europe.

The Program has approached: *Dealing with one another in Europe and its neighborhood: diplomacy, sanctions, war* (with interventions of Dan Dungaciu – Sociologist, Romania, Emil Hurezeanu – Political Journalist, Romania, Ivan Krastev – Political Scientist, Bulgaria, Michael Stolleis – Historian, Germany. Moderation: Mihai-Răzvan Ungureanu – Historian, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister and former Director of the Foreign Information Agency, Romania); *Close and remote European “neighbors”: Russia and the United States* (György Dalos – Writer, Hungary; Sonja Margolina – Publicist, Russia; Oksana Sabuschko – Writer, Ukraine; Richard Swartz – Publicist, Sweden. Moderation: Heinrich Detering – Literature Scientist and Writer, Germany); *Ethnicity in Europe. The Renaissance of ethnic nation states?* (Andrei Cornea – Publicist and Philosopher, Romania; Slavenka Drakulić – Writer and Journalist, Croatia; Silvia Marton – Sociologist, Romania; Ilma Rakusa – Writer and Translator, Switzerland. Moderation: Raluca Alexandrescu – Political Scientist, Romania); *The margins of Europe: a hazard zone, a grey zone, or a trading zone?* (Edhem Eldem – Historian, Turkey; Yaroslav Hrytsak – Historian, Ukraine; Jörn Leonhard – Historian, Germany; Karl Schlögel – Historian, Germany. Moderation: Andrei Pleșu – Philosopher, former Minister of Culture and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Romania).

**DEBATE
UKRAINE: THE SECOND FROZEN CONFLICT
AT ROMANIA’S BORDERS
24 SEPTEMBER 2014**

Black Sea University Foundation and *Adevărul* newspaper have organized the debate entitled “Ukraine: the Second Frozen Conflict at Romania’s Borders”, 24 September 2014, at the House of the Scientists, in Bucharest.

The debate had as a starting point the results of an opinion poll conducted by Inscop Research ordered by *Adevărul* newspaper within the project entitled “The Truth about Romania”.

The event was moderated by university professor Dan Dungaciu, PhD, Director of the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, President of the Black Sea University Foundation and Ion M. Ioniță, Senior Editor of *Adevărul* newspaper and transmitted live on www.privesc.eu.

Speakers: Ambassador Liviu Bota, President of the Director Council, Black Sea University Foundation (FUMN), Ambassador Sergiu Celac, member in the Director Council, Black Sea University Foundation (FUMN), Bogdan Aurescu, State Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – *TBC*, Emil Hurezeanu, member in the Director Council, Black Sea University Foundation (FUMN), George Scarlat, Black Sea University Foundation (FUMN), Darie Cristea, Scientific Director of the Black Sea University Foundation (FUMN), university professor at Bucharest University, and the representative of the Embassy of Ukraine in Romania – *TBC*.

**SCIENTIFIC MANIFESTATION
ROMANIAN ANTROPOLOGY DAYS
21th Edition
IMAGE ADVENTURE. IMAGE, IMAGINATION, IMAGINARY
25-29 SEPTEMBER 2014, SIBIU**

At the international scientific event (organized by the “Lucian Blaga” University from Sibiu, Faculty of Socio-Human Sciences, Sibiu County Council, Astra Library, Astra National Museum Complex, County Center for Preservation and Promotion of Traditional Culture “Cindrelul – Junii” Sibiu and gathering more than 80 de professors and researchers from Romania and from USA, France, Taiwan and Turkey), with interdisciplinary accents and approaching anthropology, history, letters and arts, have participated with scientific communications, ISPRI researchers:

CARMEN BURCEA, *The Hispano-American Continent Image in Gabriel García Márquez Representation*;

VIORELLA MANOLACHE, *The Third Order Instructions of the Image: Representation – Proximity–Identity*;

HENRIETA ANIȘOARA ȘERBAN, *Democracy as Freak Show Adventure*;

ENACHE TUȘA, *Constanța at 1914 in an Epoch Film* and

The Propaganda Romanian Movie and its effects in Dobrogea 1950-1980

**THE DEBATE – UKRAINE A NEW PANDORA’S BOX
Casa Titulescu, 14 October 2014**

The European Foundation Titulescu – Centre of Strategic Studies has organized on 14 October, Casa Titulescu, the debate – *Ukraine a New Pandora’s Box*, having as special guests: Mr. Adrian Severin, vice-president of the Foundation of the Social-Democrat “Ovidiu șincai” Institute, Dan Dungaci, Director of the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, Romanian Academy and Armand Goșu, Professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest. The debate was moderated by the FET President, Adrian Năstase.

**THE 7TH EDITION OF THE CONFERENCE *RELIGIOUS TEXT
AND DISCOURSE*,
7-8 NOVEMBER 2014,
SIBIU**

The conference “Religious Text and Discourse”, organized by the Centre of Intercultural and Philological Researches, “Lucian Blaga” University, Cultural Association “Religious Text and Discourse” and “Andrei Șaguna” Faculty of Theology, has continued the spirit of the language theology.

Placed among the literary resuscitate theological perspective, in its formula certified in the interwar period in Sibiu through Dumitru Stăniloae’s *Philokalia* and amplified by Nichifor Crainic, the present conference closes the circle appealing to Wittgenstein perspective on religious discourse.

The conference has gathered a valuable and voluminous presence – more than 60 participants, professors, researchers, PhDs, theologians and philologists.

Scientific Researcher III, PhD., ISPRI, Viorella Manolache has moderated *atelier 2* and has presented the scientific communication: *Radical Orthodoxy Politics*.

**INTERNATIONAL BOOK FAIR,
GAUDEAMUS,
ROMEXPO, Bucharest
20-22 November 2014**

Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations, Romanian Academy, Bucharest has launched the following books:

Teorii ale legitimității puterii [Theories of Legitimizing Power], authors: Constantin Nica, Gabriela Tănăsescu, Lorena Stuparu, Adela Deliu, with the participation of Professors CARMEN DIACONESCU, ALEXANDRU FLORIAN and DUMITRU BORTUN;

Spațiul public european. Idei, instituții, politici [European Public Space. Ideas, Institutions, Policies], authors: Alexandru Ștefănescu, Viorella Manolache, Gabriela Tănăsescu, Lorena Stuparu, Cristian Popa, Anișoara Șerban, with the participation of Professors LILIANA POPESCU and DANIELA BLEBEA NICOLAE;

Protecția infrastructurilor critice în cadrul relațiilor internaționale [The Protection of the Critic Infrastructures in International Relations], authors: Victor Matei and Dana Dumitru;

Uniunea Europeană după 25 de ani [European Union after 25 Years], coord. Dan Dungaciu;

Filosofie politică republicană [Political Republican Philosophy], authors: Anișoara Șerban, Cristian Popa, Ion Goian, Viorella Manolache, Enache Tușa, Sari Florescu, with the participation of Professors VASILE MORAR, DUMITRU BORTUN and IAN BROWNE;

Între geopolitică și utopie [Between Geopolitics and Utopia], author: Ion Goian, with the participation of Professors VASILE MORAR, DUMITRU BORTUN and MIHAI MILCA;

Romanian-Moroccan Forms of Manifestation in the European Space, coord. Viorella Manolache, with the participation of the journalist, essayist, diplomat and correspondent for Romania at "Observatoire d'études Géopolitiques", Paris, CLEOPATRA LORINȚIU and scientific researcher LUCIAN JORA.

* * *

Istoria prin ochii diplomatului [History through the Diplomat's Eye], Mircea Malița, Dan Dungaciu, Rao Publishing House, with presentations of: Ambassador IOAN DONCA, Prof. ELENA MALIȚA and DAN DUNGACIU;

Thomas Kuhn despre revoluție și paradigmă în dezvoltarea științei [Thomas Kuhn on Revolution and Paradigm in Developing Science], coord. Angela Botez, Henrieta Anișoara Șerban, Oana Vasilescu, Marius Augustin Drăghici, Gabriel Nagăț, Pro Universitaria Publishing House, with presentations of: Researcher ANGELA BOTEZ, IAN BROWNE, HENRIETA ANIȘOARA ȘERBAN and VIORELLA MANOLACHE.

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
After 25 Years. Histories and Memories of Communism,
20-21 November 2014,
National School of Political and Administrative Studies (SNSPA), Bucharest**

At the international conference organized by the *Memoria Cultural Foundation and the Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile* and focused on Historiography of Communism, Everyday life, Memory and history of the repression, Memory trends and Postmemory generation, scientific assistant ISPRI, NICOLAE ȚIBRIGAN, has participated with the presentation: "The Soviet Regime Repressive on the Population from Bessarabia and North Bukovina (1940-1941)".