

BOOK REVIEW

Constantin HLIHOR: ISTORIE ȘI GEOPOLITICĂ ÎN EUROPA SECOLULUI XX - *Considerații teoretice și metodologice (Geschichte und Geopolitik in das Europa des XX. Jahrhundert - Theoretische und Methodologische Erwägungen)*, Editura Academiei de Înalte Studii Militare, Bukarest, 1999, 209 S. 13 Skizzen.

Westliche Experten in Sachen geopolitische Strategie, die mit den wissenschaftlichen Leistungen und Erkenntnisse osteuropäischer Kollegen wenig vertraut sind, dürften über die formalen ebenso wie inhaltlichen Qualitäten der vorliegenden Arbeit erstaunt sein; vermutet man doch „im Westen“ vielfach, dass das vom Kommunismus verursachte „tabula rasa“ in wirtschaftlicher Hinsicht auch das Denkvermögen und die Urteilskraft der Menschen „im Osten“ beeinträchtigt haben könnte. Gegenteilige Beispiele gäbe es freilich in Hülle und Fülle, bloß liebgewonnene Vorbehalte und Stereotypen lassen sich schwer überwinden, zumal die von den Medien und vermeintlichen Kennern ein fachheitshalber gerne, in Schüben, verbreitet werden. So kommt es leider allzu oft vor, dass eine vortreffliche Leistung, wie das vorliegende, unter den Tisch fällt, zumal es noch nicht in mehreren gängigen Sprachen übersetzt wurde. Dem sollte schleunigst nachgegangen werden.

Dabei ist der Verfasser im kleinen aber feinen Kreis der echten Sachkenner durch seinen zahlreichen einschlägigen Arbeiten über geostrategische Themen bekannt und auch als Professor an der Akademie für Hohe Militärstudien zu Bukarest ist er oft auf internationalen Veranstaltungen im In- und Ausland durch bemerkenswerte Untersuchungen und Diskussionsbeiträge nachhaltig aufgefallen. Hlihor ist darüber hinaus Mitherausgeber, Mitautor und Spiritus Hektor von zwei renomierten Fachmagazinen, „Strategie XXI“ und „Euro-Atlantic-Studies“, letzteres mit Beiträgen in westlichen Sprachen. Das erste ist eine Publikation der oben angeführten Militätakademie, das zweite ist von der Universität Bukarest ediert. Beide haben viel Anerkennung in Expertenkreisen gewonnen.

*

* *

Hlihor geht in seiner vorliegenden eingehenden Untersuchung davon aus, dass das Ende der geostrategischen Bipolarität infolge der in der UdSSR erfolgten Implosion zu Beginn der neunziger Jahre wohl oder übel dem „Weltkommunismus“ den Garaus (vielleicht bloß vorübergehend - u.A.) gemacht hat, wodurch sich eine multipolare Landschaft teils untereinander zerstrittener oder rivalisierender möchte-gern-hegemonialer Mächte herausgebildet hat, die wiederum neue Unsicherheitsfaktoren beinhaltet. Man sei gegenwärtig mit einem Konglomerat von schwer zu lenkender Großmächte mittleren Zuschnitts konfrontiert, welches unter anderen dabei ist, die atomare Pattsituation des „Kalten Krieges“ durch unberechenbares „Säbelrasseln“ zu ersetzen, das im allgemeinen schwer zu kontrollieren ist. Ein Unsicherheitsfaktor erster „Güte“ ist und bleibt China, das von einer erstaunlichen Eigendynamik getrieben ist und derzeit nicht mehr von Moskau in Zaun gehalten wird. Unschlüssig wirkt sich auch die mögliche Destabilisierung der ASEAN-Region durch die scheinbar fortschreitende Auflösung Indonesiens negativ auf die Asienszene aus: Lauter sich neu formierende Ungleichgewichte, die offensichtlich nichts Gutes verheißen.

Der Vorsatz des Verfassers, den vorkommenden „Mutationen“ innerhalb der neuen, noch nicht stabilisierten Kräftekonstellationen auf Weltebene auf die Spur zu kommen, führte zu manchen denkwürdigen Ergebnissen und sie offenbarten zugleich neue, originelle Denkansätze methodischer Art, welche die gewohnten Paradigmen sprengen, zumindest jedoch zur Diskussion stellen. Hlibor gelang es eine gewisse Ordnung in den unterschiedlichen Forschungsansätzen und erzielten Werten der bekanntesten geopolitischen, sehr widersprüchlichen Richtungen, zu bringen, die zwar alle um die Erkenntnis roeieren, daß die Geopolitik eng mit der Hegemonieforschung verbunden ist, hedoch zu den untersch edlichsten Solutissen gelangen. Er verstand es, die bislang verwendeten, liebgewonnenen Paradigmen unter sorgfältiger Abwägung ihrer Vor - und Nachteile unter einen Nenner zu bringen und eigene, wohldurchdachte und - so meine ich - angemessene Schlüsse zu ziehen. Der Vorzug des vorliegenden Bandes ist nicht zuletzt die überzeugende Einordnung der bestehenden Forschungskriterien - und Methoden nach ihrer Brauchbarkein bei der Analyse der Istzustände und laufenden Entwicklungen unter vorsichtiger und genauen Brücksichtigung der historischen „Er-blasten“ und Tendenzen.

*

* * *

Dieses Buch ist in allen Teilen klar und ungeachtet der komplizierten un komplexen Materie leicht lesbar. Sie öffnet für die Geopolitik neue Wege und erleichtert zugleich dem Leser die Aufgabe, sich selber aus dem sich laufend veränderten politischen Geschehen eine richtige Meinung zu machen. Schade blos, daß es bislang keine Übersetzungen in den gängigen Weltsprachen gibt, ein Manko dem hoffentlich recht bald ein Ende gesetzt wird. Der Kreis der potentiel Interessenten ist sehr groß: als Leser kommen in Frage neben den Historikern und Politikwissenschaftlern Medienleute, Hochschullehrer, Politiker usw. Das Buch würde sich auch in Privatbibliotheken von Zeitgenossengutmachen, die Wert darauf legen, Entwicklungen auf Weltebene leichter zu verfolgen und Ereignissen die richtige Deutung zu geben.

Prof. univ. dr. Dionisie Ghermani

INCOMPATIBLE ALLIES NEOREALISM AND SMALL STATE ALLIANCE BEHAVIOR IN WARTIME - Larry L. Watts

Larry L. Watts' work "Incompatible Allies: Neorealism and Small State Alliance Behaviour in Wartime" is an important study situated at the border between geopolitics an history, that approaches the complex subject of small state alliance behaviour during World War II, proceeding from the analysis of relations between Hungary, Romania and Finland on the one hand and Germany on the other hand.

Using key concepts, such as neorealism, behaviour within alliances, war, small states, incompatibility and dependency, World War II, the Eastern Campaign, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Finland, the author focuses his attention on the analysis of decisions and policies adopted by those states perceived to be great powers - states having or assuming to have the capacity to change the balance of power, the ratio of forces within alliances - and on the analysis of motives which induce small states to ally with those great powers.

The central hypothesis of the study is the fact that, in general, the motive of joining an alliance by a state affects the nature of its policy within the alliance, in other words it affects the behaviour of that state within the alliance. Considering that neorealism (in its classical form) - the predominant theory of the international politics in the last 25 years - does not offer the expected answer regarding the small states' behaviour within alliances, Larry L. Watts intends to reinterpret and redimension this theory using the analysis of the behaviour of Romania, Finland and Hungary within their alliance with Germany.

Larry L. Watts defines the circumstances that make an alliance possible and presents the basic tendencies of the evolution of the states composing this alliance.

The author substantiates his study on three paradigms: Kenneth Waltz's balance of power, Stephen Walt's balance of threat and Randall Schweller's balance of interest. The work presents the compatibility/incompatibility degree related to short/long term goals between the three small states - Romania, Hungary and Finland (establishing their motivations for joining the alliance), and between each of them and the great power - Germany. Considering neorealism as methodologically definitive, when analyzing the alliances, Larry L. Watts proposes a new view and demonstrates that the relation regarding compatibility between small states in the ratio of forces within the alliance is reverse to that one between the alliance and the great powers, because the small states have a remarkable ability to defend their own interests and policies within the alliance, often succeeding in imposing their points of view.

The author believes that small states' evolution within the alliance has distinct phases: the moment and causes of joining the alliance, their behaviour within the alliance under the pressure of the great powers, and their ability to defend and pursue their own interests.

In order to illustrate the first phase, Larry L. Watts uses the case study method and presents the historical context in which alliances between Hungary, Romania, Finland and Germany appeared as a consequence of their existent or non-existent cooperation relations between these states. Thus, if the relation between Hungary and Germany was favoured-supported by the existence of a tradition in their foreign relations as far back as in 1918, in Romania's or Finland's relation with Germany, the participation in the alliance was perceived as being rather a necessity to stop the Soviet's offensive and to recover their territories invaded and annexed by the Soviet forces at the beginning of the war. But once the territories had been regained and USSR pushed back to their own borders, these states were able to reestimate their position within the alliance.

The proper phase of states' evolution within an alliance is analyzed through a case study too, either by presenting the forms of Germany's, as a great intervention power, in the internal and foreign policies of each member state of the alliance, by the agency of the existent structure in these states, or by creating radical military organizations with the purpose of imposing their own policies and objectives within the alliance. At the same time the author analyzes the symmetry of the military and economic (financial, agricultural, and in mineral resources) effort made within the alliance by each of the three states (Hungary, Romania, Finland) at wartime, in comparison with the degree of attaining or non-attaining the alliance's short-term and long-term objectives, as well as the extent to which each of these states succeeded or failed in achieving the objectives for which they joined the alliance.

The author noticed, when referring to similarity, the continuity in the internal and foreign policy of the three states during 1920-1941. He comes to the conclusions that while Hungary's situation is characterized by continuity in its political regime, system of government and foreign policy, and Finland is characterized by continuity in its political regime and system of government, and by discontinuity in its foreign policy, Romania is characterized by discontinuity in all three aspects.

Though Hungary, Finland and Romania have different political systems and traditions, there are similarities between them as well. Thus, Hungary and Romania have the same characteristics in terms of imperfect democracies with dictatorial governments. In terms of stability and continuity in foreign policy, Hungary and Finland have the strongest similarities, maintaining the same type of regime and government during both the inter-war period and the Eastern Campaign. On the other side, Romania experienced a series of radical regimes and changes of leaders during both the period before war and shortly before the Eastern Campaign. Of all three states, only Hungary showed continuity in its foreign and cooperation and security policy, extending itself further as it planned as far back as the inter-war period. Both in Finland and Romania, the dramatic changes in foreign and cooperation and security policy occurred after USSR had attacked them.

In terms of compatibility within the alliance, we can consider that Hungary had the highest degree in this respect, because it had been politically allied with Germany and Axis Powers since 1933, the formal political alliance having been set up in 1939. Neither Finland nor Romania concluded such an alliance before 1940, but they did it in 1940 - Romania, and only in 1941 - Finland.

As regards security and cooperation, Hungary began its cooperation and security policy with Germany in the early 1918's, giving to the latter an important support after Hitler's rise in 1933-1934. But the military alliance and cooperation began in 1938.

Finland began its military cooperation a little earlier than Romania, in the spring of 1940, but in fact the military alliance with Germany was formed by the two states only in the autumn of 1940, both of them having as objective stopping the Soviets' advance.

In all cases, due to the compatibility between Germany and Hungary, established under the ratio of forces and the objective of their foreign and security policy, Hungary joined the alliance earlier than Romania and Finland, and therefore it had a privileged position. Romania and Finland, having diametrically opposed objectives to those of Germany, succeeded with more difficulty to impose themselves within the alliance. It can be said that Hungary, having the highest degree of compatibility with Germany, had more opportunities to pursue its own objectives in its foreign and internal policy than Finland and Romania.

Emphasizing the concepts of compatibility and incompatibility, Larry L. Watts' study is intended to be a pertinent analysis of the behaviour of small states (Hungary, Finland and Romania) within alliances, at wartime, with a great power (Germany).

*Constantin Hlihor
Adriana Valentina Pitic-Tran*

The Archives of Totalitarianism

Nowadays Romania is applying for membership in the European Union and a successful adhesion became for it a guarantee to prosperity and security. Essential to this activity are the economic statistics, the various political strategies, the assimilation of the European legislation, the emergence of the civil society. Without denying the primacy of these criteria, we believe that an eventual adhesion should also mean a better mutual understanding and during this difficult process the historian should play a significant part. The historians from both Western and Eastern Europe must fulfil the task of recovering and evaluating the history of Eastern Europe as a part of the European civilization.

We subscribe to this effort by introducing to the western specialized public an well-known Romanian review: *The Archives of Totalitarianism*, review which managed to avoid the trap of political partisanship and of vulgarizing popularization.

The review began its work in 1993 as part of the activity of the National Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism (N.I.S.T.) and since then it was an efficient presence in the Romanian academic world by the twenty numbers published and by numerous volumes of documents edited by now.

The Archives of Totalitarianism is aiming, as Mrs. Radu Ciuceanu, its director, said, at a "restitutio in integrum" of the tragic life of postwar Romania¹. Its main target is represented by the tackling of both right and left extremism through bringing in the field of research new documents and unpublished testimonies, through formulating new study themes². Obviously, N.I.S.T. will insist on the study of the communist era, another target being the "creation of a documentary museum of the bolshevik holocaust in Romania"³. Studying the numbers already published we could notice the primacy of a few themes (the communization of Romania, the "systemic" repression, the anticommunist resistance, the communist propaganda, aspects less known from the history of the Iron Guard) and the presence of some articles which analyse the totalitarian phenomenon from sociological and politological points of view. The review is overlapping on a huge historiographical gap which covers almost the entire communist era and especially the institutional, economic, social and cultural history. This situation was noticed by Octavian Roske who emphasised the lack of a profound institutional analysis, even in the case of the "Securitate"⁴. Given this lack of synthesis materials the review intends to identify and publish, if possible, diverse direct sources and to create a data base using different research tools such as microbiographies, a dictionary of laws and institutions, review of books published in Romania and abroad⁵.

To illustrate those mentioned above we shall present⁵ one of the last numbers of "The Archives of Totalitarianism" (no. 1(18)/1998)). We shall select the articles we believe to be more representative.

Alesandru Dutu: The Disorganization of the Romanian Army by the Allied Control Commission (Soviet) during the first Postwar Years.

The article underlines the importance of the Romanian Army as an opposition center during the process communization. Without an independent army the Romanian Government couldn't hope to counterbalance the Soviet actions and that is why the Soviets did their best to subordinate the army they fought with for more than three years. The demobilization of the Romanian Army was made simultaneously with an increase in the Soviet military presence and with the communization of the Romanian military elite.

Constantin Buchet: The National Churches and the Process of Communization in Eastern Europe (1944-1947).

The author emphasises the violent interference between the communist "social engineering" and the theological dogmas which determined the tough opposition to the Soviet - imposed policies towards religion. The author tries to prove the existence of a strong opposition coming from the Orthodox Church (at the individual and institutional level) and he asserts the opinion that the Church remained the core of the civil society during the "childhood of Communism".

Gheorghe Onisoru: National Liberal Party-Bratianu during the First Postwar Years (1944-1947).

Mrs. Onisoru describes the eclipse years of the greatest Romanian political party. The decline was caused, according to his opinion, by the hostile political environment, by the inadequacy of the political formulas which could not counterbalance the communist propaganda, by the lack of unity of the liberal force and also by the weak penetration in the rural world.

Dan Catanus: America at the Time of Communist Subversion (1945-1954)⁶.

The article tries to identify the main events and trends which took the American society from postwar euphoria to McCarthyism. Scandals connected to the Soviet espionage, the loss of China and finally, the Korean War brought the tension to a climax. The author believes that the terror of a global conflict offered the best environment for the violent McCarthyism which could give simple answers to highly complex questions. Dan Catanus also analyses the social background of McCarthyism, the official attitudes, the totalitarian temptation of the movement and the role of Eisenhower in finding a new equilibrium for the American society of the cold war.

Oliver Velescu: The Ideology of Urban Reorganization (1944-1972).

The author stresses the ideological background of townplanning reorganization. The socialist town had to be completely different from its capitalist equivalent and according to the new theories of "socialist townplanning" everything old had to be destroyed. This reconstruction had to be based on the Soviet experience which considered the town as a place for "quartering the labor force". The article also emphasizes the importance of the block of flats which was the right answer for two problems: how to solve the problems of an increasing urban population and how to increase and facilitate the degree of control which the state had upon the people.

The Archives of Totalitarianism has become during the last six years an essential tool for those interested in Romania of the XXth century. Its numerous study themes and the diverse methods of approaching these themes has made it indispensable.

Alin Matei

NOTES

¹ Radu Ciuceanu: *N.I.S.T...* "A Materialized Project", in *The Archives of Totalitarianism*, no. 1/1993, p. 8.

² *Ibidem*, p. 9.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

⁴ O. Roske: "The Anxiety of Reading", in *idem*, p. 12-13.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 15.

⁶ The article has two parts: *The Archives of Totalitarianism*, no. 1(18)/1998, pp. 45-58 and *idem*, no. 2-3 (19-20)/1998, pp. 56-71.

THE MILITARY HISTORY REVIEW – A LANDMARK IN THE ROMANIAN MILITARY HISTORIOGRAPHY

Created 16 years ago, "The Military History Review" (R.I.M.), initially appeared as "The Romanian Military History Review – The Fight of the Entire People", a supplement to the "Military Life" review. Its aim was to publish studies and articles based on the military doctrine of the period, which evoked "the struggle of previous generations for unity, freedom and independence, the bravery of our army of every single person living on these lands for defending the material and spiritual civilisation set up here along centuries and millenia".

Even if at that time it had sought to "constantly guide itself by the principle according to which the value of any historical scientific work is the objective, true, real presentation of facts and events", the proposed wish was difficult to accomplish under the pressure of the existent political factor, mainly the cult of personality.

Still, in the pages of the review one could find sound, lasting studies on the autochtony and anteriority of our nation on these lands, as compared to various allogeous ethnical groups; the continuity and stability of our forefathers in their everlasting hearth; their constant struggle to preserve their national being and the territory they were born on. The combativity in analysing and criticising the distortions, denigrations, omissions, exaggerations, even the fakes referring to the history of Romania, from the ancient age to the 20th century, was really remarkable. The articles and studies were signed by notable personalities of the Romanian historiography, such as: academicians Emil Condurachi, Alexandru Rosetti and tefan Pascu; historians Florin Constantiniu, Dumitru Berciu, Șerban Rădulescu-Zoner, Paul Cernovodeanu, tefan Gorovei, Gheorghe Platon, Mihai Maxim, Camil Mure[an, Liviu Maior, Mircea Popa, Ioan Scurtu, Valeriu Fl. Dobrinescu, Constantin Botoran and so on; as well as by well-known military historians Vasile Mocanu, Vasile Alexandrescu, Gh. Romanescu, Constantin Toderășcu, Mihail E. Ionescu, Ioan Talpeș, Constantin Căzănișteanu, Nicolae Ciobanu, Alesandru Duju, Mircea Dogaru, Costică Prodan, Mihai Retegan, Dumitru Preda, Ilie Schipor, Ștefan Pâslaru, Sergiu Iosipescu, Adrian Pandeia, Maria Georgescu, Dorina N. Rusu etc.

After 1989, the publication changed its name to "The Military History Review", with a periodicity of six issues a year, in Romanian. The editorial staff has also succeeded in editing three issues in English. The last ten years have been extremely fruitful and we have never gone astray from our commitment assumed in the article-programme "To the Reader", published in the first issue of the new series: "To write and read clearly, calmly and reasonably, professionally but without passion, revenge, inertia, abuse or obstacles and obstructions, without fearing the Truth, even if that meant to make some people uncomfortable".

On the battlefield of the post-revolution "Brownian movement", of resettling and re-arrangement, but also of reversed values, of unleashed political passion, of distrust and suspicion, The Military History Review has the merit of having gathered and maintained around it a core of politically unbiased collaborators, both military and academic historians, consecrated through their works.

The series of ideology based editions was replaced by editions of historical science which put back in the written media circuit items of great interest, including for their presentation. In the 60 issues published in the last ten years, the significant events which marked the evolution of our people in its ancestral hearth, as well as the traditions of our army, the Army-National Church relationship were accurately presented.

A main concern was to fructify the archives sources disclosed in the recent years, which allowed for unveiling and restitution of lives and actions of Romanian military commanders

who resisted foreign occupation regimes, enfeoff and communisation of the country and its army. One of the first issues of the review showed Marshal Ion Antonescu on its cover and later many studies meant to cast a new light on the Leader of the country in the dramatic 1940-1944 were published, presenting the way he really was, the way he was characterised by his actions. We avoided the dangerous trap of political passion which could ostentatiously place the Marshal on the other side of the barricade, as opposed to the Sovereign of that epoch; instead, we let the documents talk.

The new headings of the review - "Romanian Hearths", "Restitutions", "History as It Was", "Disclosures", "Pages of Archives", "Veterans' Memoirs" - were supported by valuable articles which highlighted the truth about how Romanian territories (Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina, the Herza County) were lost following the Soviet ultimatums in the summer of 1940; they also presented the Romanian army's operations during the 1941-1944 campaign carried out up to the Dniester, as well as to the Don Bent and the Caucasus; they evoked figures of famous commanders, diplomats and military personalities; they analysed the military occupation regime enforced by the Red Army in Romania after August 23, 1944, and especially the baleful outcomes of introducing communism in the country, which resulted in the destructuring of the Romanian armed forces; they evoked the martyrdom of some Romanian commanders in communist prisons (generals Nicolae Macici, Nicolae Dăscălescu, Gh. Jienescu, Rear Admiral Horia Macellariu etc.); they recorded veterans or war prisoners' memoirs; they pinpointed the traditional relations between the armed forces and the Church. The old prestigious collaborators were supplemented by scholars, diplomats, historians, political analysts, teachers, officers, war veterans. They had significant contributions in diversifying and deepening the approaches; in the multidisciplinary study of the military phenomena and their interference with the other components of the society; in explaining and interpreting certain periods which, up to that moment, had been dealt with in a propagandistic or tendentious way. In the pages of the Military History Review, articles signed by illustrious names were published in these last years: academicians Dan Berindei, Vladimir Trebici and Ștefan Pascu; high officials of the Orthodox Church: His Holiness Antonie, Metropolitan of Transylvania, His Holiness Daniel, Metropolitan of Moldavia and Bukovina, His Holiness Bartolomeu, Archbishop of Vadul Feleacului and Cluj, PSS Gherasim, the Bishop of Rădăuți; researches such as Dr. Gh. Buzatu, Dr. Florin Constantiniu, Dr. Valeriu Fl. Dobrinescu, Dr. Ion Agrigoroaie, Dr. Ion Calafeteanu, Dr. Viorica Moisuc; but also consecrated military historians: gl. bg. Dr. Nicolae Ciobanu, Col. Dr. Petre Otu, Col. Dr. Jipa Rotaru, Col. Dr. Alesandru Dușu, Lt. Col. Dr. Mircea Dogaru, Col. Dr. Aurel Pentelescu, Col. Dr. Costică Prodan, Col. Al. Oșca, Col. Cezar Ardeleanu, Lt. Col. Mircea Chirițoiu, Col. Vasile Pricop, Lt. Col. Marin Valentin, Maj. Mihai Macuc; scientific researchers such as: Maria Georgescu, Maria Sinescu, Florica Dobre; war veterans known for their already published volumes: Army General (Ret.) Vasile Bărboi, Division General (Ret.) Gh. I. Ioniță, Col. Dr. (Ret.) Nicolae Micu etc.

A very good initiative was to get contributions from our historian brothers from across the Prut - Dr. Ion Șișcanu, Dr. Ion Țurcanu, Dr. Vitalie Văratec - which proved that the matrix of the Romanian spirit and truth is one.

Through the value of its collaborators and through the quality of its articles, The Military History Review is well-anchored in the scientific life of our country and it is often quoted among the reference works of the national historiography patrimony.

The editorial staff has close relationship with the Romanian Academy's Section of History and Archaeology; the European History and Civilisation Center of Iassy; history departments of the Universities of Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Iassy and Craiova; the Romanian Military Archives, the Foreign Affairs Ministry Archives; the National History Museum, the National Military Museum, the Romanian Navy Museum, the Air Force Museum etc. The

review is spread abroad, in over 40 countries, as its contents translated in the main foreign languages and its summaries in English allow for a quick reception of the published ideas and news. It is a great pleasure to us to mention the names of some of the distinguished foreign collaborators who sent their valuable studies to our review: Roger Gheysens (Belgium), General Jean Delmas (France); Donald Cameron Watt, David Walker, James McDonald, Gregor Burns (Great Britain); Boris Slavinski (Russian Federation); General Ermei Kanninen (Finland); José Antonio Santos Cachon (Spain); Lars Ericson (Sweden); Lt.Col. Klaus Schönherr (Germany); James Beane and Robin Higham (USA); Col. Cemalettin Tashkiran (Turkey); Vladimir Seges (Slovakia); Marion Normand (Canada); Nikolai Yanakiev and Dr. Jeco Kioseu (Bulgaria); Col. Enrico Pino (Italy); General Dimitris Gedeon and Prof. Ioannis Loukas (Greece).

A genuine way in which The Military History Review made itself known to the Romanian public was the organisation of a number of scientific activities in various garrisons, with the participation of prestigious military and civilian historians from the capital of the country and important researchers or history lovers from the local communities. The debates have always been good opportunities of elegant duels resulting on one single winner> the science of history. Between 1992-2000, The Military History Review editorial staff successfully organised a number of 40 scientific meetings (symposia, conferences, panels), with wide national and international participation and the generous and useful support of the "Hans Seidel" Foundation. Among them> The International Symposium - "South-Eastern Europe in the 19th - 20th Centuries. Unity and Diversity" (Bucharest, 1992); a series of scientific activities under the name "Society and the Armed Forces in the 20th Century Europe" (1992); the symposia "Factors of Risk in the 20th Century Europe" (Sinaia, 1994), "The Role of the Pontic and Danube Space in the Political and Military Evolution of Europe in the 20th Century" (Mangalia, 1995), "The Armed Forces and the Church, Basic Institutions of the Romanian Unity and Continuity" (Iassy, 1996); the Romanian-German panel - "The European Security Today - Romanian and German View" (Bucharest, 1997); the international conference - "Interferences Geopolitics-History. Historia Quo Vadis ?" (Bucharest, 1998); the International Symposium - "Military Historiography at the End and Beginning of a Millenium" (Bucharest, 1999); the scientific reports session - "60 Years Since the Outbreak of the World War II" (Cluj-Napoca, 1999); the International Conference - "On Both Sides of the Iron Curtain" (Bucharest, 2000).

Every spring since 1993, The Military History Review awards prizes and charters (220 prizes and several hundred charters bearing the stamp of The Military History Review have already been awarded), an activity which spurred the researches in the field of military history, mainly through the publishing of a number of valuable studies which have highlighted the Romanian military historiography in the recent years.

The staff have initiated and worked out a number of volumes as the "R.I.M. Collection", out of which six have already been published: "Society and the Armed Forces in the 20th Century Europe", "The Force of Cynicism and the Cynicism of Force" (1996); "The Red Army in Romania" (collection of documents), 1996; Knights of the Michael the Brave Order" (1997); "The Armed Forces and the Church" (1997); "Interferences Geopolitics-History. Historia Quo Vadis" (1998).

The great number of expressions of appreciation and congratulations received by the editorial staff or written down by the participants in the R.I.M. scientific activities, especially the appreciation from foreign personalities, stand as vivid proof to the idea that The Military History Review has won its place as a landmark in the national military historiography.

By Cdor (A.F.) *Gheorghe VARTIC*

A SYNTHESIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Iron Curtain from Europe have considerably enlarged the interest of historians, political analysts and sociologists to make out the cause of this phenomenon that appeared in the 20th century's history. These people and other specialists in international relations field were also interested in getting true information about the regional and global evolutions that marked the life of states and nations in this period. The famous Italian professor, Sergio Romano, was actuated by such an interest. He himself confesses about this in the foreword to the work: "Cinquant'anni di storia mondiale", published in 1955, in Milano, by the publishing house Longaresi & C., and translated in Romanian by Mina Vasilescu, at the publishing house of Romanian Cultural Foundation.

"The stage of the international relations looks like a battlefield", where the analyst can be wandering among the events like Pierre at Borodins in September 1812. He can also discover the sense of the events or the evolution tendencies. Having been aware of all these, Sergio Romano intends to find out that element which makes possible the existence of the international relations in a "permanent mixture of order and chance". The author believes that the element can be "the always present and invisible factor which destroys commanders' plans and blows up the best strategic projects". Carl von Clausewitz associated that element with the phenomenon of war. This factor is identified by Sergio Romano with "the friction". This means, in fact, the permanent rubbing of things and people with other things that appear unexpectedly in front of them. "Friction is neither predictable, nor quantifiable" as the author says, ... this does not prevent us from making out the logics of the battles for interests in the international relations.

In this book's prologue the author concisely presents his opinion regarding the context where the Cold War appeared and the moments or the event which gave history an imprevisible evolution after the World War II had finished. Very interesting is the fact that Sergio Romano places the beginning of the Cold War before the end of the World War II: "when the appearance of the atomic bomb modified the relations between the Great Powers" and "when the Western and the Soviet people began to draw on the field, with their troops, the Europe's new map". The first reaction to his new map came from Europe, which began the action of integration and unification.

The analysis of the fifty years of history in the 20th century is made seemingly by respecting the classic rules of historiography. The chronology was just a frame where the political or diplomatic action happened. Sergio Romano is primarily interested in understanding the power rapports and the "frictions" of interests in different areas of competition that have become real geopolitical fields.

The author of the work: "50 years of world history" says that, in Asia, the support of the "frictions" between the states has been the end of the decolonization process. In this context, USA eliminates the traditional colonial powers in the area, but also sets-up (establishes) his own imperial policy, that had been named long ago «the policy of open doors». The perfection of the state conscience in this geopolitical area has been made by importing two kinds of ideologies the nationalism and the fight of the social classes. This will generate two types of states: national and communist. After the success of the communist forces in China, USA considered that they should interfere to stop the communism's expansion in other directions. The Korean war, finished in an apparent "draw", had an enormous influence regarding the battle between the Great Powers in Asia.

In the geopolitical area formed by the Middle East and the North of Africa, the function that marked the confrontations had as a support, like in Asia too, the battle for liberation from the colonial domination. Unlike the Asian area, inside this battle appeared the antagonisms between: "moderate and radical nationalism, between laic and religious one, between the Arabs and the Heros Jews from Palestina, between the European colonists and the native society", that complicated the evolution in the area.

Little by little, Africa becomes the African's continent but, unfortunately, there are special established relations between the young (new) independent states and the old masters. The African states way of (to) independence was accompanied, in Sergio Romano's opinion, by a big and profound crisis that emphasized the contradiction between the western models of political organization and the traditions, the cultural and spiritual features of those communities".

The end of the decolonization process in Africa and Asia made possible the appearance at a certain moment of "an actor of pretensions", the states that formed "the nonalignment moment". Sergio Romano states that: "the big nations were conditioned by the third world": they had to tolerate their blackmails, they were made to protect some governments which were phylooccidental or phylosovietic, depending on the circumstances. In fact, "the nonalignment movement" has never wanted to express itself in a unitary and coherently, in order to become a first class actor in the international world. Indeed it always moved beside one power or another.

The work's densest part consists of the analysis of the confrontation between the two superpowers that have dominated with authority the mondial policy. "The friction" between the two superpowers appeared because of the leaders that ruled USSR and USA. If during Stalin's period, between Washington and Moscow, the probability of a "hot war" was big enough, after his death, the leaders in Kremlin were receptive to the "signals" sent from the White House, especially by president D. Eisenhower and J. F. Kennedy, who made proposals to come "to the stage of condominium instead of conflicts". The confrontation will become external and the wars will be carried "by proxy".

Each Great Power will administer its interest sphere without the existence of a real danger that one of them should involve into the other's area. The Soviet citizens (people) will administer the crisis at Praga in the summer of 1968. Their intervention had "modest repercussions on the international echilibrium and on the East-West rapports. In Latin America, USA sustained the fall of Allende regim in Chile with lots of millions dollars, because, as Sergio Romano says: "there is an American Commonwealth, from Alaska to Horn Head, where the Canadian vicereign and the ones of Spanish or Portuguesse language have a limited sovereignty in the big international problems. "Although it was exploited propagandistically by USSR, Allende's fall, had a modest influence on the East-West rapports".

The conclusions that author draws regarding the end of the Cold War and also regarding the conventions after the Cold War are very interesting and also pertinent. The leaders from the White House, R. Reagan and G. Bush saw in M. Gorbaciov's diplomacy "the possibility of a different mondial order, where the Unites States, who had won the Cold War, could have governed the international society with the help of some regional powers: The Soviet Union, The European Community, China and Japan". This fact had been considered in diplomacy by elaborating "The Charter (?) in Paris" (1990). The Soviet Union implosion and the desintegration of the federal states in Europe made possible for the international order established in Paris to become true. After that there has begun "a recomposition and restructuration stage of the geopolitical areas very much affected by the collapse of communism and by the bankrupcy of decolonisation process. This stage will probably ble long and marked by local conflicts".

*Cătălina Răpan
Mădălina Constantin*