

BOOK REVIEWS

Christopher Hill and Michael Smith (edited by)

International Relations and the European Union, Oxford University Press, 2005, 469 p.

Intellectual Background and Social Context

In the recent years the EU has increasingly been studied as a particular kind of international actor with a focus on the ways in which its international policies are made and pursued. Such scholarly endeavors reflect both empirical importance and analytical challenge regarding the EU's status as a global actor. Empirically, the EU carries importance in global economy, international diplomacy, soft security, and the broader world order. Analytically, it poses major challenge by virtue of its status as a something more than an intergovernmental organization but less than a fully-fledged European state. Therefore a tendency has prevailed that the EU's external behavior can be understood through a combination of understanding the EU's *sui generis* qualities, and a reliance on the tools of comparative politics. Consequently, the subject of international relations of the European Union' is a neglected one. This volume/book widens the perspective from 'the EU as a global actor' to 'international relations and the EU'. This focus does not rule out consideration of the EU's credentials as an international/global actor, rather it connects this issue to the broader study of IR and of international policy-making. Thus 'International Relations and the European Union' is about both the place of Europe in the world and the way the world contributes to the shaping of Europe. At the same time, it is about the place, actual and appropriate, of the EU in the academic subjects International Relations.

Previous Stages of Knowledge

In general, the EU has drawn an extensive attention of the scholarly writings on its historical evolution, the process of integration, and the particular roles and functions of its institutions. But in terms of an international actor, the EU too often in the past has been dependent on some major event or policy, such as the 1973 oil crisis, or single market initiative, to attract wider intellectual attention. But in the recent past particularly during the 1990s and 2000s there has been a considerable level of attention on European foreign policy, or on the EU as a global actor. As mentioned above, the EU as a global actor has not been studied with an integrated focus. On the one hand, the EU's external relations have been studied by emphasizing the role of the institutions of European foreign policy-making, and by highlighting its distinctive nature/*sui generis* status. On the other hand, the literature of IR has not found it easy to accommodate the EU fully in its study of the international system, its process, and its evolution. Although, there have been efforts to study the EU in the context of foreign policy analysis, regionalism, and identity. But so far, the EU has not been approached as having power to shape processes and outcomes in the IR sense within the new Europe. It has also not been comprehended in the sense that how the EU produces international action, and how the international dimension enters into EU policy-making. This book attempts to fill these gaps.

Subject

This book is an attempt to locate the European Union in the context of International Relations, both in theory and practice. The main argument that the EU has international presence and impact is analyzed through three lenses/perspectives. These lenses see the EU as a sub-system of international relations, as a participant in wider international processes, and as a power. The EU as a sub-system of international relations embodies three distinct ways. The first is the way in which the EU has dealt with its own international relations by developing the level of interest and the range of instruments for regulative and effective dealings with each other. Second is the way in which the EU provides a platform for coordinating the interests and preferences of member states for the purpose of collective action in world politics. Third way is related to the ideas that bind the EU member states together and, more broadly, it refers to the ideational quality of the EU's evolving approach to IR. The EU as a participant in wider international processes, it has been intimately related to the processes of international relations. During the cold war, European integration performed a role in the stabilization of the west, and formed the basis for a 'Europe between the superpowers'. From the mid-1980s, it became an emerging 'economic superpower' and thus having implications for global political economy. EU's commitments to free trade, enlargement, civilian power, and democratization make it interpenetrated with the wider processes of international relations. The third perspective, EU as a power is related to both its capability and impact on the international arena. In some policy arenas, the EU has considerable capacity to achieve its ends. It is an economic superpower because of its weight in world trade, common currency, and its size and wealth. But in terms of 'hard power', it is just a beginner. In this case, the EU's participation and effectiveness are uneven and patchy, and so is the impact.

Pol. Sc. Int. Rel., X, 1, p. 175–182, Bucharest, 2013.

From the three perspectives on 'International Relations and the European Union', authors of this volume conclude (1) that the EU can no longer be treated as a peculiar side-issue in international relations, and must now be fully integrated into the academic study of the subject; (2) that the EU has both significant powers and presence in the international system.

Hypotheses

This volume entails three hypotheses related to the factors affecting the development and the impact of the EU's international relations.

First, the EU matters in the world and the world matters to it.

Second, EU positions, decisions and actions in the world are produced as the result of often complex interactions in a multi-level system.

Third, the process of EU action and reflection internationally is dynamic, if not always progressive/cumulative.

Conclusion

'International Relations and the European Union' is a serious, scholarly, and comparatively new academic attempt to bringing the discussion of the EU's world roles into a conversation with mainstream IR debates. Its importance and innovation lies in the authors' endeavor of connecting the EU's distinctive credentials to the broader study of IR and of international policy-making. This book is a progressive continuity of other works on the EU's external relations, as it attempts to broaden the methodological, theoretical, and empirical canvasses of the EU's international relations. Given the broader theme covered in this book, authors argue that a theoretical and methodological pluralism is required to explain and understand the EU's international relations. The writers have successfully related diverse methods and theories to each other within the context of subject of this volume. This book is a very useful reading to comprehend not only the place of the EU in international system, but also its relations with other international actors.

Muhammad Riaz Shad

Iulian Chifu, Oana Popescu, Bogdan Nedea (coord.)

Religion and Conflict. Radicalisation and violence in the wider Black Sea Region (Région et conflit. Radicalisation et violence dans la région élargie de la Mer Noire), Editions de l'Institut de Sciences Politiques et Relations Internationales, Bucarest, 2012, 424 p.

Le livre *Religion and Conflict. Radicalisation and violence in the wider Black Sea Region (Région et conflit. Radicalisation et violence dans la région élargie de la Mer Noire)* est paru en 2012 aux Editions de l'Institut de Sciences Politiques et Relations Internationales, sous la coordination d'une équipe constituée de trois spécialistes du domaine *Relations Internationales* — Iulian Chifu, Oana Popescu, Bogdan Nedea. Le livre fait partie d'un programme de recherche déroulé par le Centre de Prévention des Conflits et d'Alerte Précoce de Bucarest.

Le collectif nombreux d'auteurs a contribué à une architecture élaborée et ample du contenu du livre, chacun d'eux essayant de recouvrir la section qu'il maîtrise le mieux, ce qui se reflète dans la qualité de l'ensemble. En plus, c'est un livre profondément centré sur l'actualité, ce qui est important parce qu'il essaye de construire un point de référence pour des événements trop actuels ou qui pourraient avoir lieu dans l'instant même ou dans le futur immédiat.

La structure du livre comporte trois grandes directions — *Théorie, Politiques, le Caucase du Nord* — parties qui à leur tour sont divisées en chapitres proprement-dits, de façon à fournir aux lecteurs les instruments théoriques et les exemples nécessaires pour comprendre un phénomène complexe et profond — à savoir le *conflit* — dans ses ressorts les plus intimes.

La partie *Théorie* est composée de trois chapitres théoriques, signés par Iulian Chifu, et qui visent à dessiner le tableau le plus complète possible de l'environnement théorique du *conflit*. De la sorte, dans le premier chapitre — *Conflicts, Conflicts of Identity. Religious Conflicts. Characteristics and Specificities (Conflits. Conflits de l'identité. Conflits religieux. Caractéristiques et spécificités)* — on retrouve définitions, typologies, courants de pensée, concepts connexes (tels: identité, religion, agression, violence, individu, groupe, émotions, besoins de l'individu, Etat, nation, nationalisme etc.). Ce premier chapitre, particulièrement dense en explications théoriques, est voué nous à attirer l'attention sur la dimension multidisciplinaire de l'approche, absolument nécessaire pour arriver aux origines et aux causes les plus profondes et cachées des conflits. Car une question se pose dès le début: comment se fait-il qu'un individu ou un groupe arrivent à commettre et à s'approprier un acte de violence, au nom d'une croyance qui les a fait sortir d'un état de violence latente et les a poussés à l'acte concrète, avec tous ses conséquences?

Le deuxième chapitre du livre est intitulé *Radicalization and Violence in Islam. A Classification of Radicalization Mechanisms* (*Radicalisation et Violence dans l'Islam. Classification des mécanismes de radicalisation*). Sans entrer dans le cœur du sujet, on se borne juste à évoquer la précision qu'il n'y a pas de dépendance obligatoire entre les éléments du triangle *radicalisation — violence — Islam*, qu'il faut donc opérer avec des nuances à cet égard. Ensuite, l'auteur montre que derrière tout mécanisme de radicalisation qui transforme l'individu en auteur d'un acte de violence — au nom de la foi, de l'idéologie ou d'une cause politique — se trouvent les perturbations ou les inquiétudes identitaires, facilement manipulables notamment par le biais de la religion.

Le troisième chapitre théorique, intitulé *Religion and Conflict: Radicalism and Violence in the North Caucasus* (*Religion et conflit: radicalisme et violence au Caucase du Nord*), se propose d'explorer les causes de l'ascension de la violence et des radicalisations fondées sur la religion dans le Caucase du Nord. De la sorte, l'objectif de cette étude est de fournir une base d'informations, idées, théories relatives à la situation dans la région et à ses évolutions possibles.

La deuxième section du livre — *Politiques* — est consacrée à certaines politiques relatives à la région du Caucase du Nord, avec la préoccupation des auteurs qui y ont contribué à mettre en lumière: le rapport avec la Russie — héritière de l'ex-Union Soviétique; le phénomène du terrorisme international; l'histoire et les courants-clé expliquant l'ascension de la violence dans la région nommée; les acteurs de l'insurgence dans le Caucase du Nord.

La troisième section, le *Caucase du Nord*, comprend une série de quatorze études qui viennent éclaircir certains aspects caractérisant les territoires de la région analysée: Tchétchénie, Ingushetsia, Dagestan, Kabardino — Balkarie, Karachay-Cherkessia, Krasnodar Krai, Adygea, la région Urales — Volga, Azerbaïdjan, Géorgie, Ukraine. Ce tour de la région vient illustrer les parties antérieures et fournissent un volume substantiel d'informations, ce qui fait que la lecture soit au même temps dynamique et profonde.

Ruxandra Iordache

Ion Bulei

O POYMANIKS KOS MOS TO 1900 (translated from Romanian by Ciprian-Lucrăţiu Suciu), Eklozeis melpomeni dioti Publishing House, Athena, 2011.

For those interested in the “modern alternative”, historian Ion Bulei book stands, primarily through the insolent method, the researcher seriously “seeking” the Romanian historicity depths, “tempting” the vastness of the surrounding landscapes. Romanian researcher prepares each incursion, historically vertically or horizontally, with an evident security of crossing the turmoil of the early 20th century atmosphere, advancing dynamically into the Romanian modernity, each “step” being under the control of the information provided by / through “acceleration forces” acting as “axes” of the event.

We cannot elude the fact that the “canonical and historical” perspective will be systematically subjected to a dynamically (re) contextualization, profitable from a hermeneutical point of view, Ion Bulei allowing himself the luxury of (re) evaluating, with the same unit of measurement, both the organics canon as well as the relativist one. But above all, one could notice Ion Bulei's performance of reviewing, organizing and decoding the mechanisms, through which history develops, increasing as a “big narration”. The hypostasis of this approach — that of approximating the Romanian historical azimuths of accession to modernity — is equally a culturologic one, in the sense that, the exegete envisages “potentialities”, insufficiently exploited, and as such, unjustly ignored by the historians — the autochthon realities subordinated to the secondary culture. Philosophers used to call it wise attitudes that of unsealing the gentle god [Chronos], by double reporting to some relativist “gaps”: *January 1, 1900. The first day of a New Year, but the first day of the 20th century.*

The “soft” coincidence between / among “endo” and / or “exo” pneumatical perspectives — (πνεύμα, “breath”) — has in mind the fact that the 1900 Romanian world has its own rules, translated into / through the “penultimate versions of reality” nostalgia — *time as depth* — as well as the imperative of repositioning the chronograph's “languages” / “pages” “to the start”. Because, *Historia* is defined, as interpreted by the professor and researcher Ion Bulei, as the “veil of Penelope” with all that entails from doing, and (often) undoing it, as a feeling of an irreversible “flow”, *Πάντα ρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει*.

Fascinated by the irresistible attraction that of the (i) mediated exercised life, Ion Bulei is involved in decoding the “cuts” of a possible “historical narrative model”, focusing on events or patterns, on the role and the way they play in the “dressing” historical clothes, be it casual or “full dressed”. The effort resulted from a spirally circumscription of the ‘points of view’, leads eventually, to a semiotics of the event, seen as a historical sign with all its components / powers, accredited by an already modern Europe.

Ion Bulei's belief is that, "ab initio", Romanian modernity has not betrayed its original invariants creditable under the historical development signs and the European destiny of *The Romanian sense of being*, as Noica stated. We adhere to the idea (be it sometimes vaguely suggested) according to which, "great history" of modern Romania (through events, characters, imaginations, accidents, personalities, etc.) continues to be the "story" of some "histories" more or less in conflict with the scientific legitimacy. According to Ion Bulei, *Historia* cannot remain only an autotelic and self-sufficient territory, concerned only with the investigation of causes and effects. Because, in Ion Bulei's approach, Romanian modernity requires to be undertaken not as a dated "historical epoch", but more like a "modus".

In Ion Bulei's point of view, "Romanians *Historia*" begins as a "fractal structure" (*confusion, chance, adventure, mishap, trick*), in order to become "history" (*narration*), governed by the "idea of emancipation". The hypothesis argues on "philosophy of history" bases, knowing that (also) J.-Fr. Lyotard insists on the attempts to sort the many events under the sign of the "great narrations" focused on a specific idea in the sense of Kant; hence the tension maintained by the fact that these narrations are "subject of litigation" and / or "dispute".

The nodal point of the book is easily recognizable in developing a movement with the adequacy angle of historical investigation, as a *dynamics of accession to modernity on a political path from Titu Maiorescu inspre P. P. Carp*. In 1900, the Romanian world was "sitting" (economic, political, cultural) in line with modern European world (*even if for some the new century began without seeming to start!*), entering a new century — one of collective energies — producing "political changes".

Involuntarily, Ion Bulei displaces the "tabular" model of the "second modernity", when he builds, through imitation or on his own, a semiotic character of the Romanian historical character, through fashionable — dress, physiognomy, living environment — as a immediate contact with the natural systems and, in particular, clarifying the status of *historical culture* as a way through which actors are enrolled in natural systems.

The feeling that remains after reading this book is one of resistance to "modern weakness" as a "plurivoice relations" between history-culture-anthropology-philosophy — sociology, embodied in a "historic chain sui generis, in which "the local event, rooted in the Western or Eastern cultural paradigm becomes the spiritual coordinate" of a new era. With or without permission, we are prisoners of this "subtle alchemy", whose artisan-historian Ion Bulei — celebrates the unity between "language games", practiced in the "limit rule".

Viorella Manolache

Laurențiu Ștefan

Who governs Romania? Profiles of Romanian Political Elites before and after 1989, Editions de l'Institut de Sciences Politiques et Relations Internationales, Bucarest, 2012, 257 p.

Le livre de Laurențiu Ștefan *Who governs Romania? Profiles of Romanian Political Elites before and after 1989* (*Qui gouverne la Roumanie? Profile des élites politiques avant et après 1989*), paru aux Editions de l'Institut de Sciences Politiques et Relations Internationales, regroupe, tel que l'auteur même l'explique, une série d'articles et études reflétant son intérêt vis-à-vis d'un thème de recherche moins investigué en Roumanie: les élites politiques. L'auteur précise dès le début que ce volume reflète le trajet de sa propre évolution et de son propre développement dans la recherche du sujet, et que, dans son désir de préserver la spécificité et les atouts de chaque "étape" il a résisté à la tentation de les réécrire et d'y rajouter les accumulations postérieures, théoriques et d'expérience en tant que chercheur.

Il y a quelques interrogations qui ont guidé l'auteur dans cette démarche de connaître les élites politiques, tant dans leur envergure personnelle, comme dans leur ensemble, constituant une catégorie sociale proprement dite, avec ses règles et ses subtilités. De la sorte, explique-t-il qu'il a essayé de donner des réponses aux questions suivantes: quel est le profil politique et non-politique des élites politiques de Roumanie?; quel âge ont ceux qui en font partie?; quelle est leur éducation?; quel est leur occupation d'origine?; depuis combien de temps font-ils partie d'un parti politique et dans quelle mesure ont-ils un rôle important à jouer dans les actions de celui-ci?; quelles sont des élites locales et respectivement, des élites nationales?; quelles positions publiques avaient-ils occupé et depuis combien de temps?; quelles ont été les règles qui ont mené à leur sélection?; comment savent-ils exploiter le statut qui va de pair avec leur leur position?; quelle est la carrière typique des homes politiques roumains?

Avec ce squelette de questions à prendre en compte, l'auteur déroule son discours, en précisant en plus que même s'il préfère opérer avec une méthodologie qui peut sembler trop simple ou élémentaire, il arrive à des conclusions intéressantes et substantielles sur le sujet investigué.

Le contenu du livre est structuré en six chapitres. Le premier — *From one Stalinism to Another. A Study in Romanian Governing Elites from 1952-1974* — est construit sur une comparaison entre les gouvernements Gheorghiu-Dej et les gouvernements de Ceausescu, en ce qui concerne leur dimension technocratique. Dans le

deuxième, sous le titre *The Impact of Recruitment for Public Office on Party Organization: Theory Development and a Case Study from Post-communist Romania*, l'auteur fait une étude sur les critères de recrutement et de performance du Parti National Paysan Chrétien-Démocrate, en expliquant les raisons pour lesquelles il a choisi d'étudier ce parti, non pas un autre. Le troisième chapitre — *The Waiting Room* — fait une analyse du Parlement roumain, tel qu'il a existé après le moment de rupture de 1989. Le chapitre suivant — *Political Careers of Romanian MPs: Paths to and from Parliament* — traite des carrières des parlementaires roumains, en partant de la constatation du fait que maintes fois les caractéristiques du système politique sont reflétées dans celles des carrières politiques. Le cinquième chapitre se tourne vers le profil des ministères, après la chute du communisme — *Pathways to Cabinet: Selecting Ministers in Post-communist Romania*. En fin, un dernier chapitre nous propose un panorama des recherches sur les élites, déroulées en Roumanie, dans la période postcommuniste.

Ce livre nous procure une lecture intéressante et alerte. Les discours théoriques et les informations prélevées de la vie politique roumaine se combinent naturellement et sont organisés en segments de texte bien délimités, de façon à atteindre le plus de précision des idées transmises.

Ruxandra Iordache

Dan Dungaciu, Cristina Arvatu Vohn

Uniunea Europeană după Tratatul de la Lisabona. Evoluții și tendințe, Bucharest, ISPRI Press, 2012, 315 p.

European Union is nowadays a project improved in terms of precision after Lisbon Treaty, but a project that triggers numerous discussions and controversies.

The volume emphasizes the directions and orientations marked by the Lisbon Treaty, the evolutions and tendencies, as well as the characteristics and a part of its consequences. Considered a better manner to manage the European idea, Lisbon Treaty cannot gain much distance from the contestations and critiques that made it famous, concerning the impossibility of the Treaty to overcome the remnant weaknesses related to the crises of the European integration project, and implicitly by the financial and economic crisis, eventually evaluated as a delay and even as a problem in terms of answering the inner European difficulties.

The volume is structured in four parts and an introduction entitled "A Treaty already in its 'post' phase?" (signed by Dan Dungaciu who is one of the coordinators of the volume). The first part approaches the theme "European institutions after Lisbon", the second the subject "Foreign Affairs and Security Policies", the third aspects concerning "Culture and multilingualism" and the fourth the topic of "Populism and the European project".

This tension senses in the current voices and discourses recommend the introductory chapter signed by Dan Dungaciu where we encounter an interesting appeal to a medical-metaphoric formula, placing the Treaty in perspective, as a failed form even since its ratification, a version "born by a C-section" and already arrived in its 'post' phase, far from representing though a finality of the political European project, with plenty of issues still on the agenda and deprived of revolutionary reformation, with visible lacks emphasized by the following observation: "Especially this inter-governmental armature of this document is now under attack" (p. 13), by the recurrence of a handful of concepts such as "federalism", "the united states of Europe", "federal state" or "federation of states".

Maintaining the distance from the aspects that seem to worn out this Lisbon Treaty from its inner structure outward, Cristina Arvatu Vohn, also coordinator of this volume, shows that although the Treaty could be appreciated as a compromise accomplished by the EU leaders after the failure of the attempt to adopt the Constitutional Treaty, Lisbon Treaty presents a reforming aspect. The author investigates this aspect thoroughly from different perspectives. The domains considered are the European institutions, the adoption of a more efficient decision making algorithm and the simplification of the relationships among the member states and the community institutions.

Ruxandra Iordache highlights several aspects related to the consolidation of the European Parliament, with attention for the effects registered in various domains, such as agriculture, examined in its potentially benefic and challenging characteristics with great impact for the European Union, with accent on the most important aspects describing the activity of the Romanian Euro deputies in the field, examining also the reports of the specialists for the Agriculture and Rural Development Commission of the European Parliament. The timeframe of the study is January 2007 – January 2012. The evaluation insists on the idea of proportional political contribution and takes into consideration the influence of the phases of "listening and passivity" (p. 68), as well as aspects of efficiency of the capital with which the states entered the European Union.

Studying the reform of the EU security and defense system, Sanda Cincă follows these evolutions of reform in the light of the specifications of the Lisbon Treaty. From the perspective of the manifestation of the European Union as an actor on the international scene in the 21st century, the chapter analyzes the extent in which the European states are enhanced by the stipulations of the Treaty to act efficiently together on the international scene as an agent that promotes security and global defense and as a coherent and efficient provider of international security, too. The purpose of The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the European Union is precisely to transform the Union in a provider of security of this type. "According to the Treaty, the entire process of decision making with military implications is governed by the principle of unanimity and can be subjected to the veto right of each member state" (p. 79). The study assesses the existence of a process of institutionalization of the common policy within the sphere of security and defense, with a definite role in forming a European community of security and defense, and even of a European governance of security under the reserve of allowing for a opening in what concerns the necessary juridical frame in The Treaty to push this domain forward, toward an integrative approach (p. 89). The adversaries of The Treaty sustain that it undermines national sovereignty and that, lacking the capacity to define a clear mandate in matters of international security; thus, European Union is also deprived of the status of unitary and coherent political entity and an autonomous European defense.

Beyond these disputed aspects, Lucian Jora identifies in the European service of external action several functional dimensions that overcome the rhetorical political declarations and provide equilibrium between the declarative principles and political reality on the field. The functional aspects are therefore described by a reflex of coordination, and cooperation at embassy level, offering mostly in the field of public cultural diplomacy recommendations related to the desired increased capacity of interaction of the personnel of the European Commission delegations with the local community, creating data bases with the relevant actions for cultural diplomacy, facilitating communication, cooperation and the exchange of information and procedures. Thus, the investigation of the capacity of communication of the communities from Diaspora will be as well stimulated (pp. 136-137).

Oana Simion reinvestigates the fact that Lisbon Treaty is not a factor of change for the dynamics of the European Union — Russia relations, opting, beyond the views of the Moscow analysts, for the predominant conception: that The Treaty could be an obstacle in front of the Russian strategy to entertain separate relations with the member states of the European Union, in promoting best of Russian interests (p. 143). The chapter identifies as well the successes of the "cooperation" with Moscow to the extent in which the partnership for modernization European Union — Russia could generate hopes for an extended collaboration in domains such as industry, trade, energy or infrastructure.

Evaluating the specific history of these issues of cooperation in the perspective of international relations, Rodica Iamandi and Alexandra Vasile propose novel perspectives for the study of the most important aspects in the investigation of European policy of vicinity in general, emphasizing the active role of EU in a wide range of policy areas, with accent on the relations between European Union and the "Western Balkans". Ileana Stănculescu evaluates the eastern partnership issued after the signing of The Lisbon Treaty, integrant part of the EU vicinity policy, emphasizing its place and meaning in the Swedish sources and interpreting the assistance funds provided by the Swedish government for Moldova Republic.

Analyzing concepts such as culture and multilingualism, the third part of this collective volume reunites the studies signed by Carmen Burcea, Rudolf Dinu and Flavia Jerca, articulating the profile of the European "multiculturalism" as an intrusive term, reinterpreted in relation to subtexts and perspectives of "globalization", which is a much more often used term, although it is not quite a synonym. The interpretation involves other terms and phrases such as "unity in diversity", "multi-/plurilinguism", "inter-/cultureness", "integration and identity", "intercultureness" employed also with the meaning of concrete policy, a policy sensitive to the concept of "motivation" (Carmen Burcea, p. 225). The conclusion drawn by Rudolf Dinu and Flavia Jerca takes into consideration the fact that one can identify a innovative modality of action within the field of culture, through the consideration of cultural clusters and that Lisbon Treaty can sustain, coordinate and complete the inter-relations of the member states within the cultural sphere, although it does not confer legislative power in the field of culture to the European Union (pp. 237-238).

Understood even from the introduction of the coordinator of the volume, Dan Dungaciu, as a reaction to the unpredictable rhythm and direction of the European construction (p. 13), the studies, reunited in the fourth part entitled "The populism and the European project", bring again to the fore the discussion around the democratic roots of populism, the notes of historical sociology, meant to guide the interpretations from less familiar perspectives: the medieval hierarchy perspective, modern populism perspective, resentment populism perspective, as well as that evaluating the aspects concerning biopolitics (Cristi Pantelimon).

Considering nowadays populism a *soft form* of the secular socialism, recuperating explicit and also certain implicit philosophical ideas from the prose of the politicians, Cristian-Ion Popa reinterprets these philosophical ideas that are constitutive to political discourses as related ideas or rival ones, legitimating the public policies in contemporary society, offering novel interpretations and exemplification to the affirmation of Philip Pettit,

who considered contemporary political dialogue a code with which operates a more dogmatic Babel Tower of the present times.

Aside the temptation of definitive conclusions concerning this evolutionary process and maintaining a scientific distance, beyond the exacerbated optimism and pessimism surrounding this topic, the volume ends with a possible answer to the question whether the European post-Lisbon populism is rather a media myth than a reality (Răzvan Victor Pantelimon), thus underlining the ideas expressed in the introductory chapter, emphasizing that Lisbon Treaty remains an open project, an important part of the continental political adventure.

Henrieta Anișoara Șerban

Mircea Malița, Dinu C. Giurescu

Zid de pace, turnuri de frăție. Deceniul deschiderii: 1962-1972, Bucharest, Compania, 2011, 248 p.

Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej's epoch is the most controversial period in Romanian contemporary history. It was presented by some authors only in its negative aspects but it can not be analyzed outside the context that generated it, Romania entering at the end of the Second World War under the Soviet domination, which has imposed its own political, economical system. There are many necessary parts still missing from a complete picture of this period, hampered by the difficult access to many documents from archives, especially those concerning the Romanian foreign policy after 1948.

The present book, that treats a part of the Dej's epoch, is a unique book because of the remarkable idea that generated it, envisioned by two academicians Mircea Malița și Dinu C. Giurescu. *Zid de pace, turnuri de frăție. Deceniul deschiderii: 1962-1972* presents two perspectives on the history of the 1962-1972 period, on the Romanian foreign policy actions and on the political leaders involved in these actions.

The first part of the book presents the opinion of the diplomat Mircea Malița on the 1962-1972 decade. Mircea Malița named this period *the open decade* that has its own profile (p. 11), which is different by the previous ones through the foreign policy actions initiated by Romania from the inner of the socialist camp. The diplomat accounts the unprecedented events which he witnessed or was related by the most important leaders at the moment. We discover new information about *Cuban missile crisis* or *The Prague Spring* and reactions of Romanian political leaders in the light of these major international events; the preparations and actions to begin new relations with Middle East countries; we see Petru Groza, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej sau Nicolae Ceaușescu through Mircea Malița eyes, a man who met them, face to face.

But the most important aspect which Mircea Malița reveals is the existence of a strategy for Romania's foreign policy that was planned at high levels of the state, which permitted the Romanian state to build a better international image. It was a strategy of *survival*, as noted the author of *Survival strategy in Romanian people's history*, who sustains Mircea's Malița theory about "*history's stain*". We had "silence" and obedience to Soviet Union, which troops stationed in Romania and sometimes they imposed their regime by brute force. After 1958, when Soviet troops were retreating, it was possible to create a diplomatic strategy for foreign policy.

In the second part of the book, Dinu C. Giurescu analyzed through the historian point of view, Mircea's Malița new information. In Dinu C. Giurescu's view, for biographical accounts to be valid, they must be confirmed with documents. The positive aspects of Gheorghiu Dej's regime was put in perspective by Dinu C. Giurescu, in what concerns the amnesty of a large number of politically held positions or changes in educational area with abandonment the Soviet educational system. But he hadn't forgotten the mass detentions and penitentiary system. That events happened under Soviet occupation and Dinu C. Giurescu's question comes very naturally: if some of the arrested, deported or house arrest people were not Soviet "suggestions"? (p. 173). In other words, Romanian communists leaders were not implied in that facts which led to the death of many Romanian people? The answers to these questions can be found researching the archives.

Remarkably is the capacity of Dinu C. Giurescu to analyze communist era's enigma from an objective point of view, without resentments of negative personal experience and especially considering the situation of his father, the well known historian Constantin C. Giurescu, who was imprisoned in Dej's regime and who, after his liberation, was still in house arrest.

The book is a history of foreign policy and diplomacy of Romania, from 1962 to 1972, addressed by two professionals. Mircea Malița wrote as an eye witness and a man who was in middle of the events, emotionally involved. Dinu C. Giurescu wrote from a historian's perspective, a man who view the events from outside. There are two faces of the same reality, faces of a quest for truth, a truth about an unclear and unsettled period from Romania's history.

Cristina Vohn

Diana Didă

Școala geopolitică românească. Proiectul sociologic al geopoliticii interbelice, Bucharest, ISPRI Publishing House, 2012, 148 p.

The present book is a work of history, sociological and geopolitical ideas and by this character is noteworthy. Few are, in these latter days, in Romanian sociology, the approaches of this type, generally called to recover old theories (not very old, though) of the sociological domain. The approach of Diana Didă is especially important as it is about a quite controversial issue, namely the geopolitical approaches. As it is well known, born in the German space, geopolitics is born in the twentieth century, the century of two World Wars. After the Second World War, it is actually quasi-prohibited academically. Only in the 70s it appears again, quite dimly, in the French academic area (where was fought against from the beginning), while in Romania obviously it cannot occur again until 1989.

Romanian geopolitics has a special feature: it is closely linked to the monograph school of Dimitrie Gusti. This is the “discovery” and most important focus of the work of Diana Didă. The author states, even boldly, that “the Gustian system of knowledge of the nation, which had to be built as a monograph of monographs, with the practical purpose to affirm and strengthen the State, is made in the spirit of the time and represents actually an approach based on a geopolitical pattern.”

These fairly trenchant statements pose a problem of critical importance for the fate of Romanian sociology and geopolitics. If the Gustian monographic system, initiated from purely scientific reasons of interest, was actually a geopolitical approach, have we the right to suspect that system of some interests foreign to the corpus of science? Was Gusti a geopolitician, i.e. a kind of propagandist, above scientific approaches, of his nation, which has “served” with the instrument of geopolitics/monograph school? These questions are particularly urgent and serious because, as I said already, classical geopolitics, by German pattern, was often suspected of fatal influences in the international relations before the two World Wars.

Diana Didă, by her approach of re-reading the contribution of the Gustian monographic school and, indirectly, of interwar Romanian geopolitical school, gives implicitly a convincing and at the same time, calming response to these important questions. Romanian geopolitics approach was not a focus of potentially bellicose ideas, as was the case with German geopolitics. Romanian geopolitical approach was formed on Gustian pattern and remained an honest monographic approach, of course, with natural patriotic accents, but beyond any contamination with that sort of conquering spirit of German geopolitics and geostrategic (in the sense of Haushofer). Rooted in the Gustian spirit, this geopolitical school remained faithful to Versailles ideology, to the League of Nations type of pacifism that dominated Europe until mid thirties. Is a national spirit, but not nationalist, a rational scientific approach and a net option for cultural diplomacy and not for a kind of militaristic pressures.

Diana Didă’s exposure is consistent and carefully built. It starts from the main expressions of axial geopolitics, i.e., of the German school of geopolitics, then reveals critical contributions of the French school of geopolitics, headed by Jacques Ancel, but does not hesitate to remember the less known today contributions of the English geopolitician, Ernest H. Short and of the Italian Ernesto Massi at that time, to complete her approach with an incursion into the geopolitical ideas of Nicolae Iorga. This is the first chapter of the book. Next, the author enters in the core of Romanian geopolitics, represented by John Conea, Anton Golopenția and Mihai Popa-Vereș. Chapter III of the book, most consistently, focuses on the monograph school of Dimitrie Gusti. Very useful seems the case study of *Romanian Geopolitics* magazine, where the reader is acquainted with the most important arena of interwar Romanian geopolitics. It is also useful to note that, from the point of view of the author, the most important exponents of Gustian “geopolitics” (if we can call it that) are Anton Golopenția and Mircea Vulcănescu.

Diana Didă’s book is a useful tool, a sample of careful analysis of currents of ideas in Romanian sociology and geopolitics. Originally a doctoral thesis, it is less a work of original nature, but rather an attempt to monograph of a cultural phenomenon still discussed today. A successful attempt, we believe, and a evidence that social sciences can resist to the harsh test of the time, and their cultivation in national spirit, as happens in Romania during the interwar period, has nothing irrational, quite the contrary. It is indirectly an invitation to return to the spirit that ensured Romanian sociology (and our geopolitics) a safe status in the Pantheon of humanities.

Cristi Pantelimon