

LBRIS

We know  
books

Vasile Pușcaș

*MAGNA  
CIVITAS*

THE WORLDS OF OUR WORLD

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS



Cluj-Napoca  
2025

## Contents

Abbreviations | 9

Foreword | 13

*In memoriam Keith Hitchins:*  
Honesty and the writing of history | 19

### I. The International System

- I.1. 1914: Central Europe and the reconfiguration of the international system | 39
- I.2. World War II and the reconfiguration of the international system | 54
- I.3. Global developments and the role of the EU | 77
- I.4. The Transatlantic partnership: A Euro-American debate | 93
- I.5. Management of the global crisis in the 20th century | 107
- I.6. Management of post-crisis global interdependencies | 119

### II. The New Regionalism

- II.1. “The historic complex” in Central Europe and the chances of political pluralism | 165
- II.2. The Treaty of Trianon: History and politics | 175
- II.3. Romania and Slovakia (1944-1948) | 197
- II.4. The new political geography of post-Madrid Central Europe | 213
- II.5. The new Europe and the Mediterranean area. Geo-economics, geo-culture and social communication | 225
- II.6. Globalization and regionalism: The “strategic regions” (Central Asia) | 240

### III. International/European Negotiations

- III.1. Romania and the American Most-Favored Nation status  
(1990-1993) | 263
- III.2. 1993: How did an American epistemic community regard  
the regranting of the Most-Favored Nation status  
to Romania | 279
- III.3. Negotiation as a method for making Europe | 298
- III.4. Accession negotiations with the European Union | 317
- III.5. EU accession negotiations: The case of Romania | 334

About the Author | 353

Index | 355

## Abbreviations

- APEC Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
- ASEAN Association of Southeast Asian Nations
- BCBS Basel Committee on Banking Supervision
- CAP Common Agricultural Policy
- CCP Czech Communist Party
- CEPR Centre for Economic Policy Research
- CFSP Common Foreign and Security Policy
- COE Centre of Excellence
- COMECON Council for Mutual Economic Assistance
- CRS Congressional Research Center
- CSCE Conference on Security and Co-operation  
in Europe
- CSTO Collective Security Treaty Organization
- DUHR Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania
- EC European Commission
- ECOSOC Economic and Social Council
- ECU European Currency Unit
- EEA European Economic Area
- EFTA European Free Trade Association
- EIPA European Institute of Public Administration
- EMU Economic and Monetary Union

maintained and reinvented. Nation-states have proposed revising traditional attributes, emphasized the external framework, and agreed to involve non-governmental actors in internal and international decision-making processes. For economic, financial, and managerial reasons, they have also preferred the regional associative dimension. Based on this vision of international relations, we can predict that the future international system will feature a **multipolar world** comprised of **several worlds**. In this system, the balance of power and complex interdependencies will require a functional framework. In other words, we will live in a **world of worlds!**

The texts in this volume are the result of the many questions I have asked myself over the past three and a half decades while transitioning to a post-Cold War international system. Therefore, these studies contain traces of the years and historical stages in which they were published, which is what this collection aims to demonstrate. Additionally, many of the aforementioned questions continue to be relevant today, which is one reason for revisiting these texts. We have tried to present them in the most unified form possible. All texts were revised to achieve greater readability and concision of style. Since the author intended to contribute to European and international debates on these topics, we decided to keep the volume in English. I believe it is crucial for us to remain active participants in the dialogue of ideas and options on the continent and around the world. I would like to thank my young colleagues, Tudor Salanțiu and Vasile Andreica, for their support in identifying, selecting, and organizing the reissued texts. Their suggestions were most welcome, as they were the first readers of the volume. As always, I express my sincere appreciation to the editors and director of the Școala Ardeleană Publishing House for their efforts to deliver a high-quality editorial product.

Vasile Pușcăș

Cluj-Napoca, July 26, 2025

IN MEMORIAM  
KEITH HITCHINS:

HONESTY AND THE WRITING OF HISTORY\*

The first book published by Keith Hitchins, *The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1780-1849* (1969), has the following description of the topic approached by the author on the front cover: “Long before Romania existed as a sovereign state, the Romanians struggled for national identity in Transylvania, an area of Eastern Europe of great ethnic and cultural diversity.”<sup>\*</sup> To paraphrase the introduction to the book, I met Professor Hitchins a few years before I saw him in person. This occurred in the fall of 1974, when I began my third year of studies at Babeș-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca. After a lecture on modern Romanian history taught by a professor who seemed more interested in dogmatic clichés than actual science, I started a historiographical dispute with him concerning the Romanian national movement in Transylvania in the late 19th century. I then asked Professor Pompiliu Teodor to be our “referee.” Professor Teodor told me to demonstrate my opinions only after I had convinced myself of their validity. To better argue my case, he recommended a book by an American historian, which I was to assess from the perspective of our historians’ value system. The book in question was *Cultură și naționalitate în Transilvania* [Culture and Nationality in

\* *Transylvanian Review*, 2011, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 88-100.

*Transylvania*] (1972) by Keith Hitchins. I appreciated the clarity and style of the arguments in the three studies included in the volume, especially their logic and rationality. I was particularly fascinated by the chapter on the Congress of Nationalities (1895)<sup>2</sup>, which presented a clear overview of the complex ethnic situation of the Habsburg Empire in a broader European and international context. At the time, this book helped me with our seminar “disputations” and made me focus on Central Europe and international relations in the 20th century.

I met Professor Hitchins in person in 1981 in Cluj-Napoca. I had recently become an assistant professor of contemporary Romanian history at Babeş-Bolyai University when Professor Pompiliu Teodor introduced me to our American guest, saying, “Keith, this lad is our assistant professor of contemporary history. He has read everything on contemporary history that he could find in Cluj, Bucharest and Jassy, and he keeps pestering me about the theory and the methodology of this discipline. How do you think we could help him?” This conversation marked the beginning of my professional relationship with Professor Hitchins, who became a valued mentor in American, European, and Romanian academic circles. He taught me the discipline governed by the muse *Clio* and guided me in terms of research methods. He also told me that I should not force a topic of study into an existing theory. Rather, I should start by reading everything I can find on the subject, understand it in full complexity and the broadest possible context, critically evaluate the sources, and then formulate my own point of view. This point of view should include interpretations that consider the social theories of the studied period and the time of my readership.

Keith Hitchins has been a prominent figure in Romanian historiography for over five decades. After studying at Harvard University, in Paris, and in Vienna in the 1950s, he was in Bucharest (with Academician Andrei Oşetea) and Cluj

(with Academician David Prodan) from 1960 to 1962 as the first Fulbright Fellow in Romania. During this time, he also worked with Petru Comarnescu, from whom he learned to analyze culture and literature, as well as the Euro-Atlantic Integrative imprint of scientific and cultural dialogue.<sup>3</sup> As he recently confessed, his time in Romania helped him not only complete his doctoral thesis on Bishop Andrei Şaguna<sup>4</sup> but also understand the essence of the “Europeanization” process in Romanian society, politics, culture, and mentalities.<sup>5</sup> It was in this context that he approached the interwar period, attempting to understand the development of the national idea after Romania’s political and statal unification in 1918.

Despite being one of the leading specialists in Romanian studies, little has been written about Professor Keith Hitchins, and few interviews with him exist in the media. In 1997, the *Transylvanian Review* published an article about the life and work of this historian of Central and Southeastern Europe.<sup>6</sup> In 2001 and 2006, Editura Enciclopedică (Bucharest), where Hitchins published most of his Romanian books, compiled a bibliography of all his works.<sup>7</sup> For his 75th birthday, *Vatra* magazine (Târgu Mureş) (33, 424, July 2006) compiled data on Hitchins’s historiographical activity and a number of opinions and interviews with cultural and scientific figures from Romania, as well as academics from several European and American universities. Similarly, the *Colloquia* journal (Cluj-Napoca, 2008) published a presentation on the historian. The Romanian university and academic environment often praised his qualities as a professor and scholar, particularly after 1990. Universities in Cluj, Sibiu, Alba Iulia, Târgu Mureş, Timişoara, Iaşi, and Constanţa awarded him an honorary doctorate, and the Institutes of History in Cluj and Bucharest (the Institute of Southeast European Studies) made him an honorary member. He has been an honorary member of the Romanian Academy since 1991.

His work in Romanian studies has received high praise, as evidenced by the numerous reviews of his writings published in prestigious journals from nearly every continent. He was also invited to oversee Romanian studies projects undertaken by various historical research centers. His contribution to *Romanian Studies* (Leiden, 1970-1986) is quite remarkable, both as an editor and as an author of studies, articles, and reviews. As a member of the editorial board of the *Slavic Review* from 1980 to 1991, he was one of the most active American researchers to ensure that topics related to Romanian history were included in area studies in the US.<sup>8</sup> Keith Hitchins has also been a respected consultant for prestigious American institutions that promote area studies, particularly those focusing on Central and Eastern Europe. These institutions include the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (1970-1979), the International Research and Exchanges Board (1972-1975), the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council (1982-1989), and the East European Selection Committee of the American Council of Learned Societies (2008-2011). In the late 1980s, he directed a project on the interwar history of Eastern Europe, which was established by the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe from 1987 to 1989. Thus, during the Cold War, the American historian helped facilitate scientific exchanges with limited ideological bias and encouraged dialogue among researchers, universities, and historical institutes interested in Romanian studies. After 1990, Hitchins served on the scientific and editorial boards of numerous Romanian historiographical institutions and publications. He has attended numerous conferences and historiographical events organized by Romanian academic centers almost annually since the mid-1990s.<sup>9</sup>

In the 1950s, when Keith Hitchins was a student, Harvard University was one of the most prestigious American centers of area studies. This field experienced spectacular growth

after World War II. Since the primary research topic regarding Eastern Europe was Russia/the USSR, Hitchins initially focused on this area as well. However, his professor, Robert Lee Wolff, suggested that he focus on Romanian history instead. With the support of the Ford Foundation, Hitchins studied in Paris and Vienna from 1955 to 1956, becoming familiar with European history and Central Europe. In Paris, he met Professor Emil Turdeanu, who introduced him to the study of Romanian language and literature. His systematic study of Romanian history began in 1960-1962, when he was a Fulbright Fellow and investigated Romanian archives and libraries. This research familiarized him with the national movement of the Romanians in Transylvania and the cultural and political figures of the 18th and 19th centuries who led it. Since then, Hitchins has demonstrated an extensive and dedicated interest in this historical topic. Furthermore, he has produced the most thorough and systematic approaches to the subject. For more than five decades, the American historian has carried out an in-depth investigation of events, personalities, institutions, and trends of short, medium, and long chronological periods. He has extended and compared his main topic to the immediate geographic area, as well as to the European and international context. He has also analyzed the cultural and political phenomenon within the greater socioeconomic process of societal evolution. In short, Hitchins has researched a comprehensive history integrated with world history.

When a few young Cluj historians asked Professor Hitchins why he had chosen to specialize in history, he listed “interest and pleasure” as his main reasons.<sup>10</sup> By “interest,” he meant understanding a society in all its aspects: cultural, economic, social, political, and so on. Those familiar with Hitchins know of his veneration and love for humankind. In a world divided by the Cold War and affected by the turmoil following 1989, Professor Hitchins’s humanism was and remains an oasis

in the desert. This humanism undoubtedly stems from his personality, the education he received from his family, and the cultural and intellectual experiences he had after World War II. His thirst for knowledge about the social manifestations of human individuals is boundless. Even today, discovering older books and documents that describe the actions and behaviors of individuals and communities, especially outstanding individuals, stimulates him to embark on new research projects and expand the horizon of human knowledge even further. We are tempted to say that Hitchins is aristocratic in his intellectual approach to his chosen research topics, dedicating himself to them thoroughly and completely without sparing any effort. As an outstanding intellectual, Hitchins has always enjoyed the company of intellectuals from various historical periods, seeing them as the most dynamic agents of societal change. In the opening sentence of his first book on the Romanian national movement in Transylvania (1969), he attributes this movement to Romanian intellectuals. Using historical and linguistic treatises, schools, and churches as “weapons,” these intellectuals laid the foundation for a national conscience and identity that supported certain Western-inspired political actions and programs.<sup>11</sup> Convincingly demonstrated and disseminated through studies published at Harvard, Oxford, etc., Professor Hitchins’s opinions contrasted sharply with those who saw only evidence of “Eastern behavior” in the Romanian space during the Cold War era. Extending his cultural, intellectual, and political research to the first half of the 20th century, Hitchins alludes to the resistance put up by pro-European (pro-Western) Romanian intellectuals confronted with rising imperial claims to the region by various pan-Eastern and totalitarian ideologies.<sup>12</sup> Hitchins’s investigation of the “Romanian intellectual phenomenon,” not only in Transylvania but also throughout Romania, is one of the most important contributions to Romanian studies in the

Anglo-Saxon world from the second half of the 20th century to the present day.

In his “Preface” to *Mit și realitate în istoriografia românească [Myth and Reality in Romanian Historiography]* (1997), Keith Hitchins confessed: “The modern history of Romania stirred my interest because of three elements: the evolution of the idea of nation in the 18th and 19th centuries, especially in Transylvania; the rise of the organized workers’ movement in the last decades of the 19th century and its evolution under socialist and communist auspices in the first half of the 20th century; and the great controversy regarding national identity and the road to progress among Romanian intellectuals and politicians during the interwar period.”<sup>13</sup> We must also note that Professor Hitchins has significantly contributed to Romanian historiography’s participation in the European and international historiographical dialogue and to the modernization and development of historical writing in Romania. Before 1989, Professor Hitchins was a role model for young Romanian historians alongside Academician David Prodan and a few other historians. In various universities, research institutes, and publications, they supported the professionalization of history in opposition to politically manufactured historians and tendencies toward ideological bias in historiography. After 1990, Hitchins dynamically supported Romanian historiography’s attempts to regain credibility and become part of world historiography. By stating that “Today, Romanian historiography is on a par with Western historiography, in terms of both methods and subjects,”<sup>14</sup> the Urbana-Champaign historian indicated that the Europeanization of Romanian historiography fulfilled a geocultural desire and that Romania had demonstrated its potential for integration into contemporary world historiography, of which Hitchins himself was an outstanding representative.

Romanian historiographical criticism often states that *The Rumanians 1774-1866* and *Romania 1866-1947*, published

by Professor Hitchens in 1994 and 1996 respectively, are the best contemporary syntheses of modern Romanian history and a crowning achievement of his research in the field. The two books brought an essential contribution to understanding the main directions in the development of Romanian society over nearly two centuries. Similarly, his studies on the development of the Romanian national movement are essential reading for anyone seeking to understand Romanian identity and the efforts devoted to modernizing and Europeanizing this cultural and historical space. In our opinion, the role of Professor Hitchens's historiographical work in stimulating interest in area studies has not been sufficiently recognized. This field originally led him to investigate Romanian history when he was a student at Harvard. Brilliantly and skillfully, Hitchens assimilated the histories of Central and Southeast Europe, including Transylvania, Wallachia, Moldavia, and modern Romania. Aware of the interdisciplinary nature of area studies, the American historian cultivated a comparative approach and turned toward the geopolitics and geoculture of these two regions of Europe in an organic association legitimized by history itself. This historical reality is evident not only in studies devoted to these two regions but also in pieces about Romanian history. The most recent reference to this topic can be found in Hitchens's book about I.I.C. Brătianu (2011). In it, the author logically and cogently describes how the geopolitics and geoculture of the two regions shaped Romania's foreign and domestic policies in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Building on these area studies, Professor Hitchens expanded his research to include other regions, such as Central Asia, the Middle East, and the Caucasus. He conducted comparative studies of their national and identity movements, as well as their cultural and intellectual structures. Thus, he found himself just one step away from investigations pertaining to international relations and

remarkable pieces explaining the evolution of the modern international system and the role of the Great Powers.

For Keith Hitchens, Romanian studies mean systematically considering the European dimension. After devoting more than fifty years to investigating the last three centuries of Romanian history, the historian is convinced that Romania's modernity lies at the "crossroads between East and West."<sup>15</sup> Therefore, Romania has constantly vacillated between the two geopolitical and geocultural spaces socially, economically, culturally, politically, etc., with manifest efforts by the "pro-Europeans" who advocated the Western model of development. Hitchens believed this category included Romanian intellectuals in Transylvania starting in the 18th century and local entrepreneurs from the Romanian principalities and Romania proper who favored expanding markets, industrialization, and urbanization. In 1969, Hitchens wrote that Romanian Orthodoxy was essentially an expression of the Romanian spirit, not a set of dogmas that separated them from Catholics and Protestants in the West. It posed no obstacle to the assimilation of Western ideas and favored defining the national identity in relation to a Western heritage in order to highlight differences with the East.<sup>16</sup> In several studies and volumes, Keith Hitchens emphasized the intellectual, social, and political debates in Romania between the "pro-Europeans" and the "traditionalists." He approached the process of Romanian modernization systematically, viewing it as driven by Western models and grounded in the adoption of Western cultural values. In his latest book, devoted to the Brătianus and particularly to Ion C. Brătianu, Hitchens suggestively presents the attitude of Romanian political leaders regarding the structural changes demanded by the process of Europeanization. According to Hitchens, this national epic was abruptly ended after World War II when the country became subordinate to Soviet Russia and was forced to adopt a different development model. When Romania joined

the European Union in 2007, Hitchens once again argued that the communist period could be seen as an “aberration that diverted Romania from the path of Europeanization, which it had been following since the beginning of the nineteenth century.”<sup>17</sup> On that occasion, referring to the behavior of Romanian historians after 1989, Hitchens argued that “the manner in which they understood their job” demonstrated that “European integration is the best way to ensure the advancement of their discipline and a better understanding of national history.”<sup>18</sup>

Keith Hitchens is a professional historian, as defined by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre. Like Paul Veyne, Hitchens views the writing of history as an intellectual activity.<sup>19</sup> He does not constantly ask himself whether historians are objective or subjective; rather, he seeks to be accurate and honest.<sup>20</sup> What does this mean? First, it means presenting all societal aspects in an unbiased way. It also means explaining the meaning of the past so contemporary readers can understand it. He began researching the history of the Romanian national movement in Transylvania, a subject pertaining to cultural and political history. However, in the course of his work, he specialized in multiple areas. Thus, he developed an interest in social, economic, institutional, and biographic history, among others, while expanding the topic to include national identity and the history of Romania. Consequently, he published landmark studies devoted to the modernization and Europeanization of Romanians in the 18th-20th centuries. Keith Hitchens shows that the role of the professional historian is to rewrite history, not because of changing circumstances, but to show the ongoing development of human society as a process of constant change and transformation. According to Hitchens, historians should study human thought and actions, identify and analyze the processes they generate, and offer them to the present and future human community. In doing so, they outline the evolution of humankind and

help people understand “what they are, where they come from, and where they are going.”<sup>21</sup>

In *Le Temps de l'Histoire* (1986), Philippe Ariès argued that contemporary humans have been “invaded by history” and criticized professional historians, especially those in academic environments, for writing only for specialists and not for general readers. Ariès described professional historians as “technicians” who structure their discourse around “historical facts,” which involves “identifying the facts, the continuity of the identified facts, and explaining the facts in their succession.”<sup>22</sup> The French author demanded that historians “respond to the concerns of their contemporaries,” stop relying solely on a “specialist technique,” and embrace a “manner of living in time.”<sup>23</sup> We will not comment on Ariès’s statements here, but we must note that professional historians do not appropriate the fields of political science or sociology; rather, they draw on these disciplines, as well as others, within an interdisciplinary approach. As demonstrated by Keith Hitchens himself, this approach is useful to historians.<sup>24</sup> Conversely, the studies and conclusions of professional historians can provide readers, including specialists in political science, economics, and sociology, with the certainty that they are operating with data unaffected by transient interests. Thus, they can consolidate the factual-empirical foundation of social studies. Anyone familiar with historian Keith Hitchens’s “research lab” knows he doesn’t live in an “ivory tower” at his university. He is constantly interested in observing and learning more about current issues and remains in dialogue with students, public opinion, colleagues, and friends around the world. The American professor is interested in history as a field of human experience at the individual and community levels. He has brilliantly cultivated historical biography from his doctoral thesis on Bishop Andrei Șaguna to his latest book on I.I.C. Brătianu. Furthermore, Hitchens’s presentation of his research in books, studies, reviews, and conferences has