The soundly based questions I intent to state are the following: why was a revolution necessary to overthrow the communist dictatorship? What did the 1989 revolution mean for the Romanian society? To what degree have the political changes of December 1989 brought about the Romania’s democratization and the adapting of the state to the demands of Western Europe and the USA? How does one explain Romania’s being accepted as a fully fledged member of NATO and the European Union? What are Romanian citizens’ difficulties during the process of European integration and how are those explained?

The dictatorial communist regime of Romania stretched over a period of four decades and proved to be a failure from all points of view: political, economic a social as well as cultural. The populations’ discontent accumulated over time, spontaneous uprisings of some segments being visible from the regimes first decade in power. The gap between Nicolae Ceausescu’s personality cult and the daily life of the average citizen led to the build up of a humongous popular discontent.

The late outbreak of a revolution, spawned by the idea of overthrowing the dictatorship can be explained through the force of the regimes political police that had inoculated fear for decades among the citizens through arrests on ideological grounds, suppressing of personal liberties, personal surveillance and murders. Secondly, the party spread among the masses the idea that the regime was eternal, that it had all the necessary resources to solve “all” of Romania’s socio-economical problems. This was an illusion, but one that made many victims among the poorly educated persons of underprivileged background. There was also a mass of gullible persons, able to heath the propaganda carried out by an impressing number of activists that dominated the political scene, relating the impression of commanding everything.

Human suffering, unbearable in a free world, had spread in the health and educational systems. Thus, possible forms of resistance were weakened, ending in the acceptance of humiliating living conditions. There is also the explanation according to which the society was uniformed and unprepared for revolt, lacking sufficient political revolutionary traditions. Finally, the civic code that had made the organizing and expressing of dissent in states such as Hungary, Poland and Czeckslovakia was almost invisible in the Romanian social media. Resignation was a
tray of character that marked a large part of Romania’s population in the communist years, hence the delay in starting a movement against the regime.

The revolution outbreak taking place in Timișoara is to be explained by the fact that this city is located in the Western part of the country, by the situation that it benefited in the times preceding communism from cultural influences of Central and Western European origin and having preserved a way of life motivated by the old civic code. Even in the years of the dictatorial regime, Timișoara society did encourage vanguard cultural experiments, suggesting alternatives towards the official culture. The example of the Phoenix rock band, of the artists group Sigma, of the Eduard Pamfil bionics circle, of the German writers circle self styled Aktionsgruppe Banat, proves the existence of some attempts in this aspect. In the musical, technical and sports clubs an ideological perspective had appeared that ignored the orders of the communist regime. Cross border trade had flourished in Timișoara as nowhere else in between war Romania, reaching a point that could no longer be controlled by the authorities. In 1956, in Timișoara there had been the first anticommunist revolt from Romania, as an echo of the revolution in Hungary.

Despite the hardship signaled by the population of several Romanian cities (Timișoara, București, and Brașov) and of the Valea Jiului miners’ discontent and in spite of several individual protests, political changes were to delay until 1989. The lack of alternatives in political thought, the lack of an ample dissent movement, but above all the lack of initiatives and of Romanian intellectual solidarity (element that set apart Romania from the neighboring states) made the overthrowing of the dictatorial communist regime a bloody episode. In a study dedicated to revolutionary Timișoara, Professor Victor Neumann stated that “during the ‘60-’80 years, the Ceausescu regime created an unbearable state of spirit. In Timișoara the politics of the dictatorial regime challenged the inhabitants in several ways. The food shortage, the financial servitudes, the military control over the institutions, the fear for a private life, the persecution on professional grounds, were all general features of the communism in Romania. In the case of Timișoara, as well as other town from the Banat the suspicion towards the average citizen who lived near the border and who might try to illegally emigrate was added. A constant tension was artificially and permanently nourished concerning the relations between the majority and the minorities. This was quite visible in the case of the Hungarians, who whenever they tried to draw
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attention towards various injustices were reproached with the intention of claiming Transylvania and dividing the country”

Besides, as Victor Neumann noticed, „the spark that ignited the great demonstration of December 1989 in Timișoara is connected to the city’s multicultural and multilingual physiognomy. There was a political idea shaped against the destruction of Transylvania’s villages, idea that rapidly became known in the international media. This idea was to play a major role in starting the anticomunist demonstrations of Timișoara. The protest of the Hungarian Reverend László Tőkés against the destruction of the Transylvanian villages initiated and enacted by Nicolae Ceausescu has been positively accepted by the parishioners of the Reformatted Church, by the international political media, by the press from Germany and Hungary, but especially by the local population.”

The protest of the Reformatted parishioners was appropriated and taken up by a large segment of the city’s population who had understood that the suffering of the minority group was the same with the one of the Romanian majority. Among the calls shouted on December 16th was those that had marked the ideology of the revolt: „Down with Ceausescu“, “Down with the tyrant“

After December ‘89, Ivan Evseev, one of the most famous professors at Timișoara’s University, admits to have been shocked by the mental change that had occurred. He found it hard to recall the route of the passed events. He had witnessed the terrible battle of the crowd with the tanks and water cannons, the open clash with the oppression forces. The remembrance is also emblematic for the social category in question. “Starting on the evening of December 16th and until December 22nd perhaps for the first and last time in my life, I had the chance to live the experience of another time and another reality, different from the average, common, able to
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be rationally modeled space\textsuperscript{4}. The professor tried to explain the rupture in his own perception of the world through “the deep gap between the time experienced before and after the events”. However he did not grasp the absence of the intellectuals from those events. Then, in 1989, the cultural elites played a minor role in the course of the events. The revolts were due to the society of Timișoara and above all to the workers of the city (who paid the heaviest blood price), one who inherited or adopted the old civic model of the community. Melted into the understanding level of the people and kept alive through the actions of small vanguard groups (mentioned above for their courage), this recalled model guided the crowd in December 1989.

In Bucharest, the popular movement started a few days later than the one in Timișoara. It was triggered by Nicolae Ceausescu’s speech from December 21st 1989. Ceausescu’s speech did not take into account either the dead from Timișoara, shot on his order by the army, or the state of spirit of Bucharest. That speech was booed, being followed by a popular demonstration. Countless discontents, expressed later, started from the overlapping of actions: 1. the spontaneous movement of the masses with on the spot found leaders; 2. Ceausescu’s arrest by top of line military after a previous agreement with the group of the communist reformers. The example of cooperation between army General Victor Atanasie Stănculescu, on the one hand and Ion Iliescu and Silviu Brucan, on the other hand, have become notorious.

In the later interpretation of events both the authenticity of a popular revolt and a coup d’etat were discussed. It is certain that the flight of the Ceausescu’s from the balcony of the Central Committee organized by General Victor Atanasie Stănculescu (a top military of the communist regime) with a helicopter was followed by the arrest, trial and execution of the couple by the group of the communist reformers who drew up the jury as well as the trial. All was possible in the situation in which many of the former communist leaders had switched sides. Things became blurred, most of Romania’s population being misinformed as to the clashes taking place in Timișoara, Arad, Lugoj, Sibiu, etc. The population had not benefited from enough information to define an own political option- except Timișoara – there was no experience and no program useful to a revolutionary action. Bucharest’s population accepted the officials intervention who had renounced the regime almost a week after the revolt in Timișoara. A number of confusions were born, many understandable in the context of the radical political removal of a dictatorial regime. Thus can be explained that the former communist leaders will dispute for the first years the primogenity of decisions concerning the country’s democratization.

---

While the new leaders adopted the term revolution a large part of the crowd in the streets had doubts about the word. The two ideological interpretations, the myth of the spontaneous revolution and the myth of the stolen revolution contain a political reductionism. The most famous one of all was the one of the National Salvation Front (FSN), the group of former communists lead by Ion Iliescu who took power in December 1989: „... leadership was imposed by popular acclamation when he emerged from the ashes of the Ceausescu regime just as the Phoenix bird. This statement was so hollow that it could be challenged on several sides. Still, his opponents did not attack the inconsistence of the Fronts version; they narrated on its subject and on many questions remained unanswered about the event, in order to create their own myths about the revolution“5. The interpretation criteria were for a long time ideological for both camps that had clashed in 1989, what made the critical-rational understanding of the main events difficult.

The sincere mentioning of Andrei Pleșu, one of the most prestigious Romanian intellectuals from before and after 1989 is worth quoting: “Many of the indigenous transitions difficulties result from- the absence of a richer brother from the West- from the incapacity of our intellectual class of anticipating and preparing the change even from the time of the dictatorship. A certain excess of accommodation, a form of vaguely senile wisdom, as well as the self serving rhetoric of a “resistance through culture” (idea cherished by the philospher Constantin Noica, n.m.) made us face the changes of 1989 empty handed. We have lived under a laughable decision pressure and are compelled now to bear the consequences“6. Undoubtedly, things have been like this. One, single observation sets us apart from the late, but rich in common sense interpretation offered by A. Pleșu: no matter how many wealthy brothers Romania might have had in the West, the solution to its problems had to be based on an internal engine.

* * *

After 1989 the democratization process was slow, but it has led to the formation of a multi party system, to the discovery of the role and functions of the civic organization, the appearance of the market economy. The evolution of the Romanian society from a totalitarian to a democratic system can be surprised through the analysis of the domestic and foreign policy in the

---

last 17 years. Internally one has to admit that the road from totalitarianism to democracy has been often slow and winding. The new political system went through a long process of maturing. The majority of the political elite were of communist origin, fact which caused ample anticommmunist demonstrations in Timișoara and Bucharest. The initiators represented, then and many more years afterwards, an obvious minority of Romania’s population.

The opposition was mainly set against the new political leaders which came from the former apparatus of the Communist Party, renamed the National Salvation Front. In this case, Ion Iliescu, who was to become Romania’s first elected president after 1989, caused the greatest indignation. The civil society together with the historical Romanian parties, the National Liberal Party and the National Peasantry Party, started ample and vivid protests. The proved the existence of alternative thought patterns. The Proclamation of Timișoara (March 1990), the first document motivated by a genuine revolutionary thinking- its main author was Professor George Şerban -, as well as the demonstrations from April- June in the University Square of Bucharest, proved the will for a definite break up with the communist past.

The conflict between the existing political options became radical, degenerating in a true street fight in June 1990. The protesting segment of the civil society clashed with gangs of miners armed with clubs, mobilized by the authorities of the time. The greater mass of the voters did not take the oppositions side, fact which delayed once more the assertion of the civil society and of democratic pluralism. The forceful intervention of the miners caused the putting down of the demonstration in the University Square of Bucharest and showed the dangers to Romanian society. The miners would show the same totalitarian tendencies in the following years. In September 1991, the miners stormed the seat of the government and forced its removal together with the removal of PM Petre Roman. In 1999, encouraged by the extremist political leader Corneliu Vadim Tudor, the miners acted as a paramilitary organization trying to restore the old totalitarian regime. In spite of such sad episodes, the process for the reform of the states institutions continued, and had notable results.

A democratic constitution was voted by the Parliament on November 21st 1991, the citizens giving their approval in the referendum of December 8th 1991. It has remained unchanged until 2003, when a few amendments were added to facilitate the process of Romania’s integration into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and into the European Union (EU). The elections of May 20th 1990, September 28th 1992 and December 6th-7th 2000 were won by Ion Iliescu, a politician coming from the old rosters of the Communist Party. The elections of November 17th 1996 designated as president Emil Constantinescu, a Geology Professor at the University of Bucharest, former Dean, a centre- rightist politician. On
November 28 Th 2004, the Romanians elected Traian Băsescu, a centre-rightist politician, with many populist tendencies.

Accession to NATO and the EU structures has brought about an ample process of democratization in the political system. The right wing politics, one with tradition in Romania is represented by the National Liberal Party (PNL). In March 1999, the National Liberal Party has been admitted to the International Confederation of Liberal Parties and its president became the vice-president of this international organism. The PNL has been and is an organization supporting the conservatory liberal politics. Opposed to other liberal ideas the PNL rejects liberal-progressive policies, but supports economical globalization, the US foreign policy and the security agenda issued by NATO. This party has a conservative standpoint towards the church, the liberal politicians opposing the removal of Christian Orthodox icons from schools.

After 1989, the Christian-democratic groups appeared at the centre of the Romanian political scene. Based on the tradition of agrarian parties from the first half of the XX Th century, the National Peasantry Party combined the tradition of its founding interbelica members with the centrist Christian-democratic doctrine. In 1990 a group of agrarian leaders headed by Corneliu Coposu and Ion Diaconescu reinstated the party under a new title, the National Peasantry Christian Democratic Party (PNȚCD), thus making possible the accession to the International Confederation of Christian Democratic Parties. The PNȚCD has been a key factor of the Romanian political scenery during its time in opposition: 1992-1996, as well as during its time in office: 1996-2000. At the elections of November 2000 it did not accede to Parliament, the party diminishing its area of recruitment and concentrating on the Banat region, in the West of Romania. After the elective failure of 2004, the PNȚCD began a process of ideological and aesthetic renewal. The changes reflected in the voting of a new statute and in changing the name to the Peoples Christian Democratic Party. On September 10 Th 2006 its new leaders decided to readopt the initial name of National Peasantry Christian Democratic Party.

The political left in the Romanian society is based on a tradition of labor union activity among the industrial workers, especially in the centre and West of the country, namely in Transylvania and the Banat. From a chronological, the first social democratic party that appeared on the political Romanian scenery was the Romanian Social Democratic Party (PSDR), January 17 Th 1990. The PSDR declared itself the heir to Romania’s social democratic interbelica transition. The Social Democratic Party, formed in June 2001, through the union of the Social Democracy Party of Romania with the Romanian Social Democratic Party, claims a direct
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relation with the European contemporary social democracy\(^9\). Its credibility has been often affected by the action of the leaders, mainly those coming from the old Communist Party. The process of modernizing and uniting the Romanian left wing has favored the contacts between the PSD and the international structures of the social democracy as the group has joined the International Confederation of the Socialist Parties and the Socialists European Party. PSD has developed close cooperation relations with like minded European parties.

Any period of transition brings along certain malfunctions at the level of the economic and political system. The appearance and development of extremist political parties is one of those symptoms. After 1990, on the country’s political scene the Greater Romanian Party (PRM) appeared. This is an organization of national-communist orientation. The PRM promotes xenophobic and anti-Semitic tendencies and is a party that engages in a sort of opposition with profound undemocratic features\(^10\). The PRM considers itself a Christian-democratic organization. With its entire Star Chamber Justice message, in spite of its excessive national-xenophobic attitude, the PRM has had voters that helped it enter the Parliament for over a decade and a half. At the general elections of 2004, the PRM landed on the third place in Parliament according to the number of votes. As Romania acceded to the European Union, the PRM’s 5 euro-observers became European MPs. The euro parliamentary group Identity, Tradition, Sovereignty was made up by the association of the PMR with other radical or extremist parties from Europe. This organization is considered by the European press as an extreme rightist group. This parliamentary group encloses representatives of the National Front from France, from the Liga Nord, Forza Italia, as well as from other parties in Belgium and the Netherlands.

\* \* \*

At first with hesitating steps, than more and more decided, the Romanian authorities have begun to transform the Romanian economy from a state governed one to one guided by the laws of the free exchange, of competition, of demand and offer. The privatizing of the industries, of the banking system and of the agriculture has not been without problems, but it has been carried out to its greater part\(^11\). As the Accession to the European Union approached, the government initiated a radical program of financial reform. The RON or “hard Leu” as the new currency is named, came into power on July 1st 2006 with the purpose of leveling the differences between the Romanian currency and the Euro. The activity of the countless ONGs has drawn the
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citizens’ attention on the miss happenings in the political and judicial system, on the corruption and malfunctions in administration and legislation, thus contributing to the assertion of the civic spirit.

On the level of the foreign policy Romania has cooperated well with its neighbors. Romania has supported Turkeys and Croatia’s efforts in achieving a more cooperative attitude with their neighbors in order to accede to the European Union (the Turkish-Romanian economic relations enjoy a privileged status). Romania has been actively involved in regional political programs, such as: The South-East European Cooperation Initiative (February 2001) and the Stability Pact for South-East Europe (1999). Romania has been a positive force in keeping the stability and promoting the cooperation in the region. Romania has developed diplomatic relations with Israel and has supported its negotiations for peace in the Middle East, after the Gulf War of 1991. Also, our country is a founding member in the Organization for Cooperation of the Black Sea.

In all these years after the revolution, the Hungarian-Romanian relations have bettered, Hungary supporting Romania’s accession to the European Union. From 1996 up till today, through its political organization, the Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania (UDMR), the largest minority group in our country has been part in all the governing coalitions. Romanian and Hungary have sealed and signed at Timișoara in 1996 a treaty solving a few older disagreements and putting the basis for a mutual beneficial relation of cooperation.

The present day Romanian leaders work for the strengthening of the relations with the neighboring countries trying to help them politically in their process of euro-Atlantic integration. For instance, this is the case of Moldavia, the Ukraine and Georgia. Still, the problems with the Ukraine, concerning the Serpents Island, the continental platform of the Black Sea have pressed on the development of reciprocal relations. Another problem between the two countries is the construction of the Bistroie Channel by the authorities in Kiev, this project crossing Romania’s interests in the area. Never the less, in the context of a treaty being signed between Romania and the Ukraine in 1997, it is hoped that some of the minority and territorial related issues will be resolved.

Matters are similar in respect to the relations with Moldavia, which became tensed after 1994. After a brief period, 1990-1991, in which a union of the two countries seemed likely, the Romanian-Moldavian relations have cooled down. Although linguists agree that the so called Moldavian language is similar or identical with the Romanian one, in Moldavia theories are
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being drawn up according to which this language is being spoken by ethnic Moldavians, a different people from the Romanians. In spite of these tendencies, Romania has remained interested by the problems concerning the Moldavian republic, especially by the conflict with the separatist region of Transnistria.

*          *          *

Romania’s foreign policy has been ample and coordinated to secure the integration into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Romania was the first country to join the Program Peace Partnership (January 26th 1994), which opened the way to accession to NATO. On March 29th 2004, Romanian became a member of NATO. Romania has thus the possibility to promote its national interests in a collective defense system, based on democratic values and benefiting from the most solid security guarantees in its history. The Romanian state is involved in developing the NATO partnership with the Balkan states, with Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, encouraging the stability of the mentioned areas and asserting democracy. Romania considers that the border of the euro-Atlantic community should not stop on the River Prut. As part of Europe and bridge towards Central Asia, the Black Sea region is important for the euro- Atlantic stability, fact clearly stated in the Final Communicate of Istanbul, June 30th 2004. Integrating Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina in the Peace Partnership (January 26th 1994) ought to represent an important step towards a new policy in the Western Balkans.

The level of involvement in the policy of maintaining international peace has grown as a direct consequence of acceding to the euro-Atlantic alliance. Romania takes part in the Alliances missions, including those outside the euro-Atlantic region. The weather and terrain conditions of Afghanistan proved that the new type of operations NATO has to manage are extremely demanding and very different from those the international organization had been preparing for in the past. Romanian involvement is notable with over 540 troops in the corps of the International Force of Assistance and Stabilization in Afghanistan, in the operation Enduring Freedom and in the process of training the National Afghan Army is notable. In the process of stabilizing Iraq Romania participates together with American troops in assisting the Iraqi security forces.

Romania became an active allied of the USA in fighting terrorism even before joining NATO. It was involved in many actions undertaken by the Alliance, cooperating in the common
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effort against this plague. The set of measures against terrorism adopted at the *Summit of Istanbul*, June 28th- June 30th 2004, states the development of capacities for the defense of both military and civilian personnel against terrorist attacks. These include: *defense against weapons of mass destruction; defense of aircraft against missiles; protection of helicopters against ground treats; protection of the harbors, of the merchant fleet and navy; detection of mines, bombs and torpedoes*. The newly taken measures come from the accumulated experience in recent operations, including patrolling the Mediterranean as well as from operations against terrorist groups in the Balkans affiliated to the Al-Qaeda network.

Romania has had an important part in the operations a *UNAVEM II* from Angola, *IFOR/SFOR* from Bosnia, as well as in the operations from Albania, Afghanistan and Iraq (in Iraq, for instance it has a detachments of over 800 troops). During the war in Yugoslavia, in 1999, the Romanian authorities strictly respected NATO’s sanctions. In spite of pro-Serbian sympathies manifested by the population and by some political parties, Romania supported NATO’s campaign in Kosovo and allowed allied aircraft to cross Romanian air space. In December 2005, the Romanian President Traian Băsescu and the US State Secretary Condoleezza Rice signed an accord permitting the setting up of an American military base in Romania16. The program was set in motion during the summer of 2007.

*  *

As to the accession process to the EU, it was started on February 1st 1993, when *Romania’s Association Accord to the European Union* had been signed. The request to join the Union has been officially made in June 1995 and in December 1999 the European Council decided to open accession negotiation with Romania and six other states. Negotiations began on February 15th 2000, being technically closed during the Accession Conference at Ministry Level, December 14th 2004. The decision was confirmed by the European Council in Brussels on December 16th-17th 2004. The European Council reaffirmed the accession agenda: April 2005: signing of the Accession Treaty, January 1st 2007 effective accession.

In the time span 1998-2006, the European Commission has presented annual documents regarding Romania’s progress, these documents being of two types: reports on stage of preparation for the accession and, after signing the Accession Treaty, monitoring reports in which the level of completion for Romania’s commitments is presented. After signing the

Accession Treaty, Romania passed from the status of candidate state to the one of a state acceding into the EU, gaining the quality of an active observer in the Unions activities. It has been technically and politically associated to all the communitarian institutions: the EU Council and its sectorial formations, the Councils work groups, the Councils reunions, the European Commissions committees and work groups, the Economic and Social Committee. On January 1st 2007, Romania joined the Unions states. As a direct consequence Romanian politicians and civil servants entered the service of the European communitarian institutions. Their number is proportional to the number of Romanian citizens.

The Council of the European Union adopted on January 1st 2007 a set of decisions regarding the appointment of Romanians to the European institutions, regarding the renewal of the population numbers of the Union and of the presidential terms in office in the EU Council (Romania will hold the presidency of the EU Council in the time span July –December 2019), as well as changing the numbers necessary for a vote based on the principle of qualified majority. According to the Nice Treaty, Romania has votes in the EU Council. At this moment, the Romanian representatives in the EU Parliament are designated by the Romanian legislative forum. By the Accession Treaty, Romania is obliged to hold elections for the European Parliament before December 31st 2007. The elected EU MPs will hold this office until June 2009, when elections will be held in all the member states. Also as a novelty element, as of now the Romanian National Bank is part of the European System of Central Banks and its governor is a full member in the General Council of the Central European Bank.

Romania wishes to bring its own contribution to the completion of the projects on the European agenda. In the beginning, one can shape the interaction with the states and the inhabitants of the Union. Becoming EU members, the Romanian citizens traveling outside the national territory benefit from the wrights conferred by the basic EU treaties to all its citizens.

Also, since accession, the Romanian citizens have the right to work in the communitarian institutions. Any Romanian citizen who meets the conditions demanded by the communitarian institutions that place adds for open positions may present him or herself
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17 www.mae.ro: The number of Romanian civil servants ascended into the EU political structures: Based on the Accession Treaty, Romania holds the following offices within the European institutions: 1 European Commissioner – Leonard ORBAN, who has been assigned the multilinguism portfolio, 35 European MPs, 1 Judge at the European Communities Court of Justice –Camelia TOADER, 1 Judge at the First Appeal Tribunal –Valeriu CIUCĂ, 1 member at the Accounts Court –Ovidiu ISPIR, 15 members on the Economic and Social Committee, of which 5 representatives for the unions, 5 representatives of the employers confederations and 5 representatives of the civil society, 15 members on the Regions Committee. The European Commission has set as one of its goals to hire until 2011, 1058 new civil servants, of which 698 Romanians and 360 Bulgarians.
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at the periodic contests. The quality of being an EU member state does not imply only decision wrights and leading the communitarian policies but also to the point fulfillment of certain obligations. These are set by the communitarian acquis. For the case of the newly acceding states a set of requests has been drawn up and they refer to the economic, judicial and internal affairs domain19.

In view of the actual integration Romania is to assume- when the case manifests itself- the set of similar values with the one of the Western European states. This I say because many or the principles have been perverted or destroyed by the fascist and communist totalitarian regimes. There is also a historical gap that needs to be filled. Large masses of the population lack the fundamental values of the European civilization. In the situation in which the idea of national sovereignty does not satisfy any longer the political demands of the project called EU, it is supposed that a special care will be granted to the relation between the national and the European identity. This is a great challenge and a priority for the intelligentsia and the politicians. To speak about the idea of belonging to the contemporary European civilization in the Western sense of the term implies several features that the societies of East-Central Europe will have to adopt. Investing in education, respectively, in human resources continues to be one of the great goals. The hardships of the time are due to the slow process of cultural re-formation, more specifically to the delay of educational reforms. The Romanian education is the first field of action that will be able to contribute decisively to the formation of the human personality, to the re-conversion of the work force, to instating the norms of European habitation. It will have to promote the set of values based on the Western civic code, values that demand the transition from the ethic of sentiments to the ethic of responsibility. This will mean the renewal of mental reflexes.

Failing to grant priority to the populations’ social and psychological wounds, the policies of the post revolutionary period gave rise to a set of reproaches between the authorities and the citizens. The ideals of the 1989 Revolution have been only partially materialized. There is an acute need for great civic debates from which to create generous ideas and rational decisions in the benefit of a better functioning of the national public, regional and local administration. Up to now the changes have been associated with a certain level of discomfort, with serious political turmoil and social protests. Concluding, Romania’s accession to NATO and the EU has been the most difficult task of the stately post revolutionary policy, as the integration will be a longer process, demanding ample structural reforms.
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