

**THE VIENNA ARBITRAGE / DIKTAT,
IN THE PRESENT ROMANIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY.
ETHICS “VERSUS” HISTORY (1989-2010)¹**

Stelian MÂNDRUȚ²

Abstract. Dialogue and scientific debate on the interpretation of a written site / theme role locally / nationally represented and continues to mean a heavy doubtful and defining project for the current Romanian historical science. The confrontation of ideas between representatives of different generations in the years 1990-2010 reached a climax of its intention to review and augmentation itself hermeneutizării issues and consequences in space and time. Speech "emotional" and declined once professed latest results from specific optical aiming to establish a documentation and interpretation. Forward exegetical tint can help simplify the approach wrought possibility of democratization in / through historical study practiced permanently and innovating, in form and substance. So, compulsionările partisan series of omissions, speculation by eclecticism, trends objective / subjective expressed in double tone, balanced / emotional, marked by re-writing, overflowing loads dislike or lack the required postings, can not obstruct the manifestation of normal capacity duct chronological fined beneficial ways contextualization and conceptualization in comparative and interdisciplinary spirit of European origin.

Keywords: Romania, Hungary, 1940, Germany, Italy, Vienna, historiography, historians

Referring to the subtitle, we try to deal with the multitude of the possible human being interpretations and actions of those who created the past. Still, we wonder whether the truth is accessible, or to what measure it could become as such, because we have two hypothesis: a) evoking the past may seem either improbable, as well as the use of history in order to get history knowledge; b) the past must be accepted even by its specific culture, history meaning in this case, the mere reflection of one's own dominant restlessness.

Exploring the past time and events implies a certain kind of knowledge, mainly relying on a necessary axiological horizon, doubled by comprehension ability and assumed expression. The analysis of the “self-referencial” paradigm may confirm/deny the inflation and/or the neglect of the apart “ego”. Applying the “de-construction” concept, frequently contested in an empirical way, by deductive methods, is confirmed by one of the thesis expressed in the past by philosophers, about the inexistence of facts and the uncertainty of interpretations. The near

¹ Interrogative opinion on the occasion of the session entitled: Arbitrajul de la Viena din 30 august 1940. Antecedente și consecințe(30th August 1940. The Vienna arbitrage and its records and consequentlies), Satu Mare, 2-3 septembrie 2010. See, the genuin romanian version, in “Satu Mare. Studii și Comunicări”, XXVII/II, Supplementum, 2011, p. 9-25.

² Stelian Mândruț, Ph. D., Researcher, Institute of History “George Barițiu, Cluj-Napoca; smandrut@yahoo.com SMandrut@hotmail.com

consequence is not revealing objectively, the historical truth, considered a mere cultural concept, denoting thus the absence of legitimacy, of the essential distinction between past and myth.

The question of the Vienna “arbitrage/diktat” (August 30, 1940) was investigated in the Romanian historiography through a specific conceptual-methodological approach before and after 1989, including both the (i)maculation of the past, and the transition from negation to assumption and justification of a new/other version. This reflected just the measure to which “the December events” affected the whole system.³

The psychological and sociological outline of the historian contemporary to the totalitarian epoch is still marked by a certain ideological fact, mentality, social background and cultural education, with an important informative place/role in (re)generating many faults, aggravated and distorted by the regime. To all the levels of the national-communist historiography, the active principle was the official hierarchy and the definitely imposed dedication. Its characteristic was already revealed by the proper deeply authoritative control, leading and discipline mentality, in case of possible private and contradictory opinions. Certain fundamental options were however, in contradiction in some directions (hierarchical, resentful, vindicate), especially under the impact of another generation, that was thinking and elaborating in another type of language, resulting thus a phase delay and an obvious individual and collective handicap. There also persisted a typical dominating “documentary” interest in a category of specialists, at the moral level. We might ask how many of the authors concerned with some deficiencies in the conceptual-thematic area, have still preserved their inner balance and the free spirit?

The adjustment of the historians to the communist system meant in time and space, the full identification of the reality conscience, without any inner or outside impediments, to cause inaccessibility or unfulfillment. The great part of the actors, contemporary professionals, were captured by this “mania”, characteristic to the epoch, having no other marks of alternative/parallel systems. Its emissaries were genetically adapted and obedient, by education, temperament and survival instinct,

¹ See, in general: Lucian Boia, *Romanian Historiography after 1989*, in “Österreichische Osthefte”, 44, 2002, nr. 1-2, p. 499-506; Harald Heppner, *Die rumänische Historiographie seit 1989*, in Idem, p. 507-512; Smaranda Vultur, *New topics, new tendencies and new generations of historians in Romanian historiography*, in *(Re)writing history. Historiography in Southeast Europe after socialism*. Münster, 2004, p. 236-276; see, especially: Gheorghe Buzatu, *The Diktat of Wien in contemporary historiography*, in “Transylvanian Review”, 2, 1993, nr. 1, p. 66-75. [“TR”]; Cornel Grad, *Istoriografia marilor cesiuni teritoriale românești din vara anului 1940 (Historiography of the Romanian territorial losses in summer 1940)*, in “Caiete Silvane”, 5, 2002, nr. 3-4, p. 60-65; Ioan Scurtu; Gh. Buzatu, *Istoriografia și izvoarele (Historiography and the sources)*, in *Istoria Românilor. 1918-1940 (History of Romanians)*, vol. VIII., București, 2003, p. XXV, XXVIII, XXIX; Mihail E. Ionescu, *Rumänien in Zweiten Weltkrieg (1939-1945). Die rumänische historiographische Perspektive*, in “Militär-geschichtliche Zeitschrift”, 63, 2004, nr. 1, p. 153-165.

proving a kind of double natural and career pact. A general mirage process came gradually over that of constant alienation, obviously out of instinct and vocation, leading to a necessary precaution, useful as an adjustment talent at different levels.

However, there were some purely theoretical and retractile tendencies, of collaboration and guilt. Many of the authorized experts of the interwar, or pre and post war epoch or the international relations wrote honestly their works, from an acceptable and legitimate interpretation angle. Meanwhile, a few others, obviously avoided the answers proper to the analysis of that part of 1940, for instance! The majority were career people, following their own public exposure, by social promotion and the official recognition of their “partisan” talent.

Their training was constantly illustrated by ambiguity and duplicity, as the epoch up to 1989 presented the dominating reality with/by segments of mentality in an atmosphere of total resignation and servitude. It is worth mentioning that blackmail and terror, not only economical, by diversified in the 80’s of the past century annihilated any attempt of interrelation, ideological conscience and civic courage, generating many compromises and hermeneutical cowardice.

Therefore, now, but especially in the 9th decade, the year 1940 - accepted in a distorted mirror concerning the territorial “rapes” in June 28 and August 30, 1940 - was freely regarded on a background of traditional and positivist representations, echoing abroad through the millitantism of the historiographical interrogation, merely concerned with alterity and comparative analysis, as an appropriate signs of mature education.

The historical perspective after 1989, after the alterations of social behaviour and evaluation nets, a new/other complex of ideological and moral complex, was entirely changed. The utopian attempt, from a critical, professional and rational point of view was prevented by political inherited sensitivity, by old limits or new intellectual superstitions. Even if the traditional canonized system was declared null and worthless, a triple deficit, even in documents, interpretation and innovation was due to the complicity of various degrees in the mechanisms of the present, adopted by the historical science, too. The influence and social interconditioning inevitably acted too, affecting and implying the contribution of the specialists in contemporaneous, with direct concerns for the native interwar and post war past. Many of these belonged to the generation that witnessed and created the common social-economical and cultural-scientific existence, and still keeping free of the shortcomings of conformism, of the imitation and habitual spirit contamination, as compared to others, who represented the new generation, justified and meant to join a new/other set of ethical-civic criteria, objective within the Romanian historiographical area, in the 90’s of the 20th century and the first decade of the 3rd chiliad.

But, what is going on in fact with the native historical writing, related to the moment 1940? First, there is a successful attempt to fit into the context, without any particular expressive angle. In other words, the connexion lacked the possibility of an

individual/collective reflection, on logical and well defined basis, a mental gradual process in the first years of the 3rd chiliad. This was due to the fact, that the already existing competition data transmitted by the supporters of the above mentioned historical writing, as an alternative, formally rejected the official frames, taken over and little altered at first, not admitting the hierarchy and the implied values. The act in itself, was gradually accepted, not only as an immediate assumption and opening to the “old” and the “old ones”, but also as an admittance and investment of the “new” by the “innovators”, only through the filter of one’s own experience, and in spite of the outside methodological influence. Thus, they were still looking for a new constructive and positive solution in the multifunctional and interdisciplinary (re)hermeneutisation of the year 1940’s impact, to replace the late official options, but which became gradually depersonalized in the last years of the 20th century.

The more so, as after a lap of relative disinhibition and re-orientation, that left space to the start of the “de-secretization” of the archives, the instinctive and minimal de-synchronizations or differences of horizons, programmes perception levels had been slowed down, including the representatives of the same generation. There was now a possibility to enlarge the incidence angle among those concerned with the study of the process of the “arbitrage /diktat” process within the native area.

Attempts to clarify meanings and semantics in the terminology have already existed, so as to get over the inertness and continuity of the system, partly abolished in the collective mentality, as well as in the specific inter and post war historical one. The entire image of the bilateral Romanian-Hungarian relations has easily got over the conventional one, full of stereotypes. The actual frame proved an imminent level of release, objectivity and distance from the touch of reality. At the same time, there was a comprehension capacity in defining and evaluating the psychology of the participants to the historical moment, involved in the study of the complex issue of the year 1940. The dialogue or the scientific debate among the professionals were but mere and daring attempts to demolish an out of date frame, made of resentments and frustrations, vindictive tendencies and latent aggressivities, at the risk to premeditate a part or a total failure in the domain. There was still an inherited type of balance, between the conventional option and the official one, but also a set of diminished national feelings, jeopardizing affectively and effectively the historiographical relations.

Within this context marked after 1989, by gradual political destruction of the native historic writing, the interpretative discourse on the year 1940 in the history of the Romanians (including Bessarabia and North Bukovina and Herța), in the arbitrage/diktat, rightly accused the lack of inhibition and repression. So that, we could see and rightly state, that profound changes took place in the professional historian’s conscience, too. The real moment of change towards the comparative and common analysis of the diplomatic acts in June 28 and August 30, had been related to regeneration and functioning of the constitutive frame system, in the attempt to de-

mystify the year 1940. The cleavage illustrated now, between the success in content and the success in publicity in the mentioned direction, was possible because the frequent mediatization with a precise target, as a result of the purely social relations, prestigiously supported by different (in)visible means. There certainly was a necessity of an analysis according to the principle of authenticity, personality and originality. The absolute claim of the critical spirit was often implied, at the same time with the rejection of the canon and hierarchy of values, ideologically imposed. Gradual proofs of negativism, denial imposing the right to personal opinion, in re-writing the history of 1940, were mainly persistent, especially in the last years of the framed historiographically selected period of time.⁴

The double challenge for the historians was now, the investigation of the past in a recovering way, and the substantial renewal of the professional interpretation. The disagreement between the “political reconciliation” attempt and the modulations of the “historical discourse” contributed to the stagnations within the conceptual-methodological area, directly influencing both the necessary contents changes and the reconstruction of the social images at the collective perception level, influenced by the persistence of myths, prejudices and stereotypes. The recrudescence of the professionally “compromised” specialists determined the appeal to the edification of the scientific defensive means in relation to the “upright” wing and the public interest in the national past, by the series of discoveries concerning the year 1940.

The attempts to re- analyse the interpretations of the above mentioned moment, with special impact on the Romanian-Hungarian dialogue, were deeply marked in the last decade of the 20th century, by the duality in the evolution of the political factor, in the attempt to accept the benefit of partnership, suggested implicitly by the European Community institutions. The double angle approach, chronologically and on issues, the intensity of the research of the existing specificity at different levels of expression, was influenced by the absence of initial contacts, between 1990-1994, followed inevitably by the reconciliation effect in 1996, having profound subsequent echoes. The “narcissistic” priorities on both sides suffered an outer amendment, received and publicly induced by the interdependence of many factors of the altered vision in the political comparatively and interdisciplinary historic discourse. The fact was also influenced by the contribution of the young generation of specialists, trained abroad, manifesting critical attitudes to the obsession of facts and the theoretical ignorance about the suggestions of “de-mythization” and “involution” of the moment 1940, within Central and South–East European context.

⁴ The bibliographical references were extracted from the specific subdivisions of the respective tomes, of the series : *Bibliografia Istorică a României (The Bibliography of Romanian History)*. Vol. VIII-XII/1-2 (1989-2008). București, Cluj-Napoca, 1996-2010.

The concept of mutual interdependence and the notion of fatality constituted thus, a constructive practical paradigm.⁵

More directions of scientific work have been effectively used in the (re)documentation effort and (re)interpretation of the development or stagnation in the bi-lateral relations in 1940. In the first case, the rarity of monographies was not at all surprising, after 1989, as, according to the spare previous tradition, “the challenge” of the subject could have unforeseen consequences at an amiable level. Therefore, the preliminary statistics include a set of four studies (Gh. Buzatu, 1991; N. Cosma, 1996; C. Grad, 1998/2000; O. Trașcă, 2009) and a new edition (A. Simion, 1996) with special significance and interpretation certainties, in the national historiography.⁶ The authors and their origin have an important role for the professional message lacking the hidden political influence. The impact of the “arbitrage/diktat” is revealed under another angle of analysis, that, either takes over and adjusts in a “renewed” shape, certain out of date thesis, or legitimate the new arguments in the interpretation of the phenomenon under study. Two of the authors, belonging to another generation compete with two others, from an altered conceptual- methodological area, who validate their opinions, both through documents and interpretation. The increasing interest, in changing the thinking manner of the events of the 1940 summer is thus motivated by objective/subjective causes, by the competition and professional charge of the new generation. The working manner of the researchers trained and educated in important European historiography schools, and not only, enabled the development of mental structures directly connected to the data and the inner and outer facts, the comprehension and use of evaluation in the evolution of the events in Romania and Hungary, in 1940, in their implication in the political-military diplomacy of the time. The frequent question, meaning “unde malum”, could only be partly solved, by minimum and unique approaches in form and content, published at some time after the change of the regime in 1989, and by going back to the normal bilateral relations after 1996. The courage of some authors both in concept and methodology includes the intrinsic attempt to appeal to subjects considered embarrassing, in general, according to the (re)evaluation of some marks considered as basis of the edifice built within the native historic writing space and time. Thus, the unique “intruding” of A. Simion, reconsolidated in 1996, by the reprint of the enlarged edition represents a predictive way, followed by other young appreciated specialists, among who, there are the two mentioned above.

⁵ See Stelian Mândruț, *Istoriografia autohtonă “postdecembristă” despre relațiile româno-maghiare între anii 1939-1945 (“Post- December 1989” Romanian historiography about the Romanian-Hungarian relations between the years 1939-1945)*, in *Istoria culturii, cultura istoriei (The history of culture, the culture of history)*. Cluj-Napoca, 2010, p. 448-454.

⁶ See **Annex III.**; A new name in the Hungarian historical writing, see: Balogh Béni, *A magyar-román kapcsolatok 1939-1940 és a második bécsi döntés (The Hungarian-Romanian relations between 1939-1940 and the second Vienna’s arbitrage)*. Csikszereda, 2002.

The synthesis, with large themes coverage and profound approach have been frequently published in the last two decades, concerning the native past, or some significant moments of development (administration, army, church, culture, law, state etc.), or the strictly Transylvanian geographical area.⁷ The multitude of authors and teams was the result of the joined efforts of some traditional centres of local/national research (Bucharest, Cluj, Jassy etc.) for new historiographical “productions”, of different values, created by the documentation circumstances, the interpretation and edition, with the particular/general view, as well as the academic opportunities or the demands for the interpretation of the past. At the very beginning, the professional dimension was significant in the general attempt, so that many clichés and stereotypes connected with the “de-constructive” criticism of the Vienna arbitrage/diktat (August 30, 1940), persisted for a long time. The subsequent questions, after a profound reading were related to the concepts and the methods, in the attempt to put into equation the specific components of the year 1940, insisting on the effects and diplomatic-political attempts in June and August, but also the geostrategically position of the area. We are now witnesses to the rethinking and re-setting of some fixed notions in the collective conscience of totalitarianism, about the merely sketched aspects, neglected up to the end and without any logical continuity in the interpretation of the facts of that epoch. Most of the initial absences and the deliberate errors are completed or replaced by rational arguments, based on new documents, mainly archives, entirely changed throughout the years, due to the unlimited access, and the elimination of any kind of restriction. Regardless of the documents and interpretations of the authors interested in the 1940 moment - related in interdependence by the collective or local past – we consider that the thesis favoured the image of the unity between shape and content within the whole, even if, some distinct “parts” still belonged to authors of different generations. Natural questions and pertinent answers appear in connection with the place/role specific for the “frontier” in space and time, considered as “a defence wall or bridge”, with the meaning of “surrender” or “resistance” in terms of the present and subsequent “isolation” within the “auto-isolation” paradigm, for different objective and subjective reasons. In relation to the abroad circumstances, the polemical and revenging tone gradually decreases, giving way to agreement by dialogue and scientific debate, reciprocally professional.

The documentary and memoryalistic sequence in the native historiography of 1940, reveals a balance between local and general, both in interwar, and, especially pre-war epoch, in the narrative and reconstructive attempt. The documents were found and studied in time, from the internal and external archives, some of them had not been published up to 1989. Their various and rich content concern fragments from the recent Transylvanian past (M. Fătu, 1999 etc.), or that of Romania’s (I.

⁷ See **Annex I.**

Scurtu, 1995 etc.)⁸ Even at the risk of repeating the problems and emphasizing the interference and the relative “self-censorship” in many areas, the volumes, more numerous and more valuable in time, are more important, because the sources, the analysis and diplomatic comprehension of the events in the summer of 1940. Of course, they contain and purposeful exhibit the specific intention and uncertainty concerning the good will or correctness/reliability of selection in the field. The expression and interpretation” by omission”, has been gradually abolished, especially that the “de-secretization” process of the central and local archives offered the possibility of an adjustment control. Suggestive in this sense, is the investigation of many diplomatic reports, evaluated either for each country, or on certain domains, reflecting thus, the double perception of Romania’s condition in 1940, as well as the collective and particular impact of the Vienna “arbitrage/diktat”. In the case of documentary volumes the truth implied relied to a great measure on the author’s involvement, when the memoirs were either contemporary to the related events, or at some distance in time, the hypothetical distance of the subject was relevant and connected to the author’s own implication, as a political man, diplomat, army man, or just witness of the events.

The diaries and memoirs reflect major elements of the Romanian-Hungarian dispute of the time, connected to the multitude of details needed by the historian in the interpretation of the facts, in order to re-create the context in August 1940. Many of the authors have been and still are significant for the historical moment they wrote about, according to the complexity of the motivations implied.⁹ Their narrative attempts, in a descriptive/positivist manner, but also interpretative, in the sense of the rhetorical interrogation, determined that the public significance of their opinions, addressed to the future, should be amended both by the public, and especially by the historians. These volumes still contributed to the answers of many diplomatic, political, military questions around the confrontation between Romania and Hungary, in the summer and autumn of 1940. Both categories are imaginary reflections that enable us to look at the recent past, in our own way.

The proper terms and the semantics used in drawing the facts of August 30, 1940 have undergone multiple alterations in expression and interpretations, throughout half of century. The sudden and unpredictable pain of the “territorial division” was hardly accepted and understood “sine ira et studio”, when the general complaint “vae victis” had been manipulated politically, for different reasons. The series of articles/studies published in the last two decades, point out the more outstanding difference between the notions of “arbitrage” and “diktat”, with obvious emphasis on the last term, imposed and used because of many factors. The generation and professional training of the authors, their knowledge and historical interpretation, the illusion of the everlasting national historiographic past, as related to the one

⁸ See **Annex II.**

⁹ **Ibidem.**

revealed after 1989, connected to the “cosmopolitan” outside influences, contributed to the existence of two, or several ways of expression: Gh. Buzatu, N. Dascălu, V. F. Dobrinescu, A. Simion, I. Scurtu, etc.(diktat/ultimatum), C. Grad, V. Puscaș, O. Trașcă, C. Vișoianu (arbitrage/surrender).¹⁰ A single author, a man of law, tried an explanation of the double meaning notion, from a semantic point of view, admitting the existence or co-habitation of terms, but only within a well-defined international legal background.¹¹ Not at all in disagreement with the inter and post war Hungarian historiography, that openly expressed the “inner” trauma concerning the provisions of the Trianon Peace Treaty (June 4, 1920), the Romanian national-communist history, but even the present one, reveal an exaggerated set of sensitivities, pointed out by the notion itself and the structure of many collective and individual studies. An emotional tone, a martyrdom image and a passionate spirit are still present at many authors, under the influence of the sources in the analysis of the 1940 events, in a mental natural trap, re- projecting the present events within the recent past background. The frequently used terms such as “battle”, “dramatic”, “the force right and the force of the right”, “irrationality”, “perfidy”, “collapse”, “braking”, “blackmail”, “tragedy” lead to the idea of a great deal of negative facts, obsessively and excessively repeated, in the prejudice of the actual reader. There is an identical process in the case of some names used by the native historical literature in relation to the facts in Bessarabia, North Bukovina and Herța, in the summer of 1940, with a difference in accent and terms claimed by the specialists from the Republic of Moldavia. The Romanian involvement in this case is restricted, for reasons of reciprocal understanding and diplomacy, mutually expressed.

The series of articles, studies and collective works with a view to explore and exploit the original material at home and abroad archives, was meant to complete the information and interpretation, the conclusions after the study of the scientific sources (documents and memoirs), proving constant editions and themes, in the years after 1989. The subjects suggested by some authors, among whom we mention the most representative ones for their analysis (C. Botoran, I. Calafeteanu, N. Dascălu, Al. Duțu, C. Grad, P. Otu, D. Preda, V. Puscaș, O. Trașcă etc.),¹² are rich in objectives and fulfillments, as a result of joined research. They have been continued in the bilateral Romanian-Hungarian relations, emphasizing the importance of “diplomatic competition/battle for Transylvania” in 1940, being either starting attempts for new approaches to the conceptions, statutes, geopolitical context, internal/external implications, demographic/social/economic/cultural impact etc. The measure of the attempt was generated by the great opening to such sources and the adjustment to new strategies in the methodological approach, that enabled the convergence of new

¹⁰ See all three segments of **Annex**.

¹¹ Victor Duculescu, *Sentința de la Viena, arbitraj sau diktat? (The Vienna sentence, arbitrage or diktat?)*, in “Acta Musei Napocensis” Cluj-Napoca, 32, 1995, nr. 2, p. 37-40.

¹² See **Annex III**.

directions in the ambi- or bivalent attitudes, specific to the two neighbour countries, in their way towards an imminent conflict, mainly favoured from abroad. The important and significant issues revealed now, in direct relation with Romania's and Hungary's attitude, within a triple context (continental, Central and South-East European) are thoroughly studied for the interval 1939-1940, pointing out aspects related mostly to the Hungarian revisionism (I. Calafeteanu, 1995),¹³ the double mischief proved by the Nazist Germany and Soviet Russia, in the complete isolation of the area under discussion/dispute, in the summer of 1940, the failed negotiations from Turnu Severin,¹⁴ according to a well established plan, where the "irrationality" of the game forces/interests, about the messages sent in June and July 1940, on the equation of "peace", or the "arbitrage", caused the marginal options and the triumph of violence, in the detriment of peaceful co-habitation within the strategically and tactically disputed area. There is still a strongly persuasive influence about the version induced to Romania, during the proceeding moments of August 30, 1940, in close connection to the state of mind inside the country and abroad, to stop the unreal possibility of interrogation/delay, predictable in both cases, to Moscow's ultimatum, and in connection to the final decision adopted in Vienna. Together with many Romanian authors, such as M. Retegan (Bucharest, 1993), V. Pușcaș (Cluj-Napoca, 1995), V. F. Dobrinescu (Bucharest, 1996), N. Dascălu (Bucharest, 2004), O. Trașcă (Cluj-Napoca, 2009),¹⁵ there is now a complete and valid attempt, in a double sense, documentary and interpretative, belonging to the Hungarian historian Balogh Béni (2002), who brought under the scientific investigation another interesting angle of perception of the bilateral relations between 1939-1940.¹⁶

The aspect of the military involvement in the political-diplomatic dispute between the two countries found a reasonable impact on the attempts of the specialist

¹³ **Ibidem.**

¹⁴ See the contribution signed by the Polish historian, Agnieszka Kastory, *Les pourparles roumano-hongrois de Turnu Severin en 1940*, in "Revue Roumaine d'Histoire", 39, 2000, nr. 1-4, p. 215-229. ["RRH"]

¹⁵ See, in **Annex III.**; and Ottmar Trașcă, *Relațiile politico-militare româno-germane. Septembrie 1940-August 1944 (Romanian-German political and military relationships between September 1940-August 1944)*. Teză de doctorat (Doctoral paper). Cluj-Napoca, 2009.

¹⁶ See note 4 and other approaches, at Balogh Béni, *Az erdélyi magyar menekültkérdés szociális vonatkozása 1939-1944 között (Social characteristic of the Hungarian refugees problem in Transylvania between 1939-1944)*, in *Emlékkönyv Kiss András 80-ik születésnapjára (Homage to Kiss András 80th birthday anniversary)*. Kolozsvár, 2003, p. 29-39; Idem, *A magyar-román viszony és az erdélyi kérdés 1940-1944 között (The Hungarian-Romanian relations and the Transylvanian question between 1940-1944)*, in "Korunk", 17, 2006, nr. 2, p. 4-10; see also other Hungarian historians whose works were published in Romania: Lipcsey Ildikó, *A magyar-román viszony alakulása 1937-1940 között. I-II. (The evolution of Hungarian-Romanian relationships between 1937-1940)*, in "Korunk", 8, 1997, nr. 1, p. 120-129; nr. 2, p. 92-97; Réti György, *Olasz diplomáciai dokumentumok a második bécsi döntésről (Italian diplomatic documents about the second Vienna arbitrage)*, in "Korunk", 11, 2000, nr. 1, p. 104-116.

historians, who, concerned with the extension/enlargement Romania's the mutual relations in interwar (either with the western countries, or the new states of the area, after 1918), did not neglect, but on the contrary, emphasized the course and nature of the relations between Bucharest and Budapest. The access to new documents, significantly increased after 1989, the thorough research in order to define the investigated area, both from an external point of view, – with sudden or long term impact on Romania's geostrategical and military position –, and the internal factors during the interwar 30's, determined an interpretative effort in the approach of the possibilities of study, either specific or at random, on the existence and action of the native army. The levels of investigation evolution/involution implied the necessity to clarify the material and moral data of the whole Romanian military frame, under the pressure of the events, at the limit of understanding the desperation caused by the possible withdrawal, but also by the general moral-willful hope, of a rapid recovery from the collective studies lethargy. The case studies, rich in documentation and interpretation, took into account the existent state of mind at the western border of the country. The place and strategic role of Charles'II fortification line in Bihor (C. Moșincat, 1998 etc.)¹⁷ and the importance of the north–west area (Maramureș and Sătmar etc.), in the hypothesis of the breakout of an armed conflict, have been minutely studied, making possible the gradual transition to the interdisciplinary approach of the war phenomenon between 1938-1940. The description of the increasing revisionist–revenge trend, characteristic to the Transylvanian area, became now on original question, in relation to the archive's documents pointing out the special efforts of the Hungarian intelligence and the Romanian counter-intelligence at the time (I. Dumitru, 1990 etc.).¹⁸ The legislative measures to consolidate the defence and collective mobilization adopted along the years, were not omitted by the military historians, so as to compare the Romanian army's spirit with the extreme situations of the neighbouring countries (Czechoslovakia, Poland etc.). The documentary and interpretative contribution of the professional researches represent a new/another possibility in the benefit of science, even if only to infer and understand Romania's army actions during World War II.

The balanced and uniform research concerns in the recent Romanian historiography, to process the data of the internal macro and micro system for the summer and autumn of the year 1940, were favoured by multiple objective causes, among which, the relatively easy access to the archive sources, both central and local, the amplitude of the attempt of the historians from different domains (archives, associations, libraries, institutes, museums, societies etc.). The attempt to recreate the background of the society of that time, under the shock of the decision from August 30, 1940, implied a mixture of conceptions and methods, a variety of scientific approaches, derived from the multitude of different sources under investigation.

¹⁷ See **Annex III**.

¹⁸ See **Annex I**.

Many of the thesis revealed various ways of historical thinking, the conclusions were meant to establish the stages/levels for certain facts, imposed as guiding marks in the attempt to reconstruct the antinomy or the dialogue between particular and general. The directions of investigation aimed now the place/role of royalty, the political parties and the respective leaders (N. Iorga, I. Maniu etc.), the Parliament, especially the Senate in the direction of home and foreign policy in 1940 (Gh. Sbârână, 2000 etc.).¹⁹ The problem to ensure the “internal order” to save the patrimony interests, had been much debated, together with that of the manifestation of the internal and external public opinion (R. W. Seton Watson) both at the local and central level, in concentrated actions, demonstrations/meetings and press or other media references. The existing state of mind had been influenced by the information element, and by the protest of the ecclesiastical institutions, especially the Orthodox and Greek-Catholic from Transylvania and the whole country. In this respect, the manifestation between confession and ethnic was emphasized, as well as the different divergent attitudes in north and south Transylvania. The demographic phenomenon was also taken into account (V. T. Ciubăncan, 2004 etc.),²⁰ the emigration/immigration procedures and the evacuation/change of population, with social- economical consequences in time and space. The issues about the local past favoured the thorough studies concerning the counties, such as (Bihor, Mureș, Sălaj, Sătmar, Târnava, etc.), especially in the Szekler’s land, where the local specialists, both Hungarian and Romanian (I. Chira, Oradea, 2001 etc.)²¹ analyzed complex administrative, religious, economical, political, social processes. The attitude of the occupation army was different, according to documents, as for instance the excesses in the border area, or on the territory of some counties with a majority of Romanian population (Oradea, 1997, Baia Mare, 2002, Satu Mare, 2003, Bucharest, 2008/2009 etc.).²² Though at the beginning, both interpretative and as far as documents are concerned, the question of the Holocaust became gradually an interesting subject, for the specialists, on basis of relevant documents on the amplitude of the phenomenon in Romania and Transylvania, during the first war years (Bucharest, 2007 etc.).²³

The dialogue and the debate on the stage of the arbitrage/diktat validation and its national and local consequences represented and still are of great importance and a defining project in the development of the present Romanian historical science. The confrontation of the ideas belonging to different generations, with a definite place and role, assumed by the young researchers, trained within a completely changed mental attitude, after 1989, under different professional circumstances even abroad, reached a climax in the attempt to revise and increase the interpretation of such a

¹⁹ **Ibidem.**

²⁰ See **Annex III.**

²¹ **Ibidem.**

²² **Ibidem.**

²³ See **Annex II.**

complex subject as the Vienna arbitrage/diktat and its immediate or long term consequences. The honest and not competing involvement, but on the contrary the cooperative action of both the Romanian and Hungarian historians, might be the proof in the sense of final “reconciliation” and “partnership”, suggested at continental level, but merely applied mutually, to the historical writing area, in general. Even more, as the historiography, on both sides has proved and still proves a hidden kind of nationalism and xenophobia in the interpretation of some common history events, among which the Vienna arbitrage/diktat, stated in a comprehensive and characteristic subjective evaluation. The “affective” discourse of the past (still) comes from the convenient subjects approached by the researcher from a documentary and interpretative point of view. Re-directing the exegesis logically and systematically to certain directions may contribute to simplify the access to the necessary values, in the benefit of the researcher and the reader, in all the socio-human knowledge directions, with the good intention and courage in the permanently under change historical study, both in form and in contents. So that the limitations of truth, partisan, omission, speculations by eclectic, subjective/objective tendencies, expressed in a double meaning, balanced or/and emotional, followed by passionate descriptions or the complete necessary detaching for the sake of the historic objectivity, should hinder no more the manifestation of the strict chronology and the context and concepts typical to the thinking school to which they belong, with minor ethnic expression, and major suggestion towards the European comparatism and interdisciplinarity.

ANNEX

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. General aspects

- AELENEL, Victor. *Istoria frontierei României (History of the Romanian frontier)*. București, 2004.
- BUZATU, Gh., *România sub Imperiul Haosului. 1939-1945(The Romanians under the Chaos Empire)*. București, 2007.
- BUZATU, Gh., *România și Marile Puteri. 1939-1947(Romania and the Great Powers)*. București, 2003.
- BUZATU, Gh. *România și războiul mondial din 1939-1945(Romania and the World War)*. Iași, 1945.
- BUZATU, Gh.; BELDIMAN, Dana. *23 August 1939-1944. România și problema bumerangului(Romania and the boomerang problem)*. București, 2003.
- CALAFETEANU, Ion. *Revizionismul ungar și România (The Hungarian revisionism and Romania)*. București, 1995.
- CIOLAN, Ioan N. *Transilvania prigonită de unguri(Transylvania under Hungarian persecution)* Târgu Mureș, 1996.
- CONSTANTINESCU, Jean Leontin. *Chestiunea transilvană(Transylvania's question)*, București, 1997.

- CONSTANTINIU, Florin. *O istorie sinceră a poporului român*(A short sincerely history of Romanian peoples). București, 1997, 1998, 2002.
- DASCĂLU, Nicolae. "Nici pace, nici război". *România-Ungaria. 1913-1940*("Neither peace, not war". *Romania-Hungary*). București, 2004.
- DASCĂLU, Nicolae. *Propaganda externă a României Mari(1918-1940)*(Great Romania`s external propaganda). București, 1998.
- DOBRINESCU, Valeriu Florin. *România și Ungaria de la Trianon la Paris. Bătălia diplomatică pentru Transilvania(1920-1947)*(Romania and Hungary from Trianon to Paris. *The diplomatical battle for Transylvania*). București, 1996.
- DOBRINESCU, Valeriu Florin; PĂTROIU, Ioan. *Anglia și România între anii 1939-1947*(*England and Romania between 1939-1947*). București, 1992.
- DUMITRIU-SNAGOV, Ion. *România în diplomația Vaticanului(1939-1944)*(*Romania and the Holy See diplomacy*). București, 1999.
- DUMITRU, Ioan. *Spionajul maghiar în România (1918-1940)*(*The Hungarian espionage and Romania*). București, 1991.
- DUȚU, Alecsandru. *România în istoria secolului XX*(*Romania in the 20th century`s history*). București, 2007.
- DUȚU, Alecsandru; BOTORAN, Constantin; RETEGAN, Mihai. *Transilvania în evoluția relațiilor româno-ungare*(*The Romanian-Hungarian relationships evolution about Transylvania*). București, 1993.
- xxx *Erdély közigazgatás története*(*History of Transylvania`s administration*). Szerkesztette: Székely Zsolt. Sepsiszentgyörgy, 2003.
- xxx *Frontiera de Vest în istoria contemporană a României. 1939-1947*(*The Western frontier in the Romania`s contemporary history*). Ediție de Constantin Moșincat. Oradea, 1998.
- Ghibu, Octavian. *De la răscoala lui Horea la Dictatul de la Viena*(*From the Horea`s uprising to the Vienna Diktat*). București, 2001.
- GIURESCU, Dinu C. *România în al doilea război mondial. 1939-1945*(*Romania in the Second World War*). București, 1999.
- GOCIMAN, Aurel. *România și revizionismul maghiar*(*Romania and the Hungarian revisionism*). Ediție de Nicolae Mocanu. Cluj-Napoca, 1996.
- HERBAN, Adela Maria. *România-Vatican. 1920-1940. Relații diplomatice*(*Romania-Holy See. Diplomatical relationships*). Deva, 2002.
- HLIHOR, Constantin. *Istorie și geopolitică în Europa secolului XX*(*History and geopolitics in XX-th century Europe*). București, 2001.
- IONIȚĂ, Gheorghe. I. *Istoria Românilor de la Marea Unire din 1918 până în prezent*(*Romanians History from 1918 to present*). București, 1995.
- xxx *Istoria României*(*History of Romania*). București, 1998.
- xxx *Istoria României. Compendiu*(*History of Romania. Compendium*). Coordonatori: Ioan Aurel Pop, Ioan Bolovan. Cluj-Napoca, 2004, 2007.
- xxx *Istoria României. Transilvania. Vol. II(1867-1947)*(*History of Romania. Transylvania*). Coordonator: Anton Drăgoescu. Cluj-Napoca, 1999.
- xxx *Istoria Românilor*(*History of Romanians*). București, 1999.
- xxx *Istoria Românilor. Vol. VIII. România întregită(1918-1940)*(*History of Romanians. The unitary Romania*). Coordonator: Ioan Scurtu. București, 2003.

- xxx *Istoria Românilor. Vol. IX. România în anii 1940-1947*(*History of Romanians. Romania between the years 1940-1947*). Coordonator: Dinu C. Giurescu. București, 2008.
- LUPU, Corvin. *România, Axa și Aliații. Aspecte ale politicii externe a României(1939-1944)*(*Romania, The Axis-States and the Allied. Romania foreign policy aspects*). Sibiu, 2003.
- MILLEA, Zeno. "Chestiunea" Transilvaniei versus "Problema transilvană"("The Transylvanian problem" versus "The question of Transylvania"). București, 2004.
- MOISIN, Anton. *Transilvania. Sinteză istorică și documentară*(*History of Transylvania. Historical and documentary synthesis*). S. I., s.n., 1997.
- MOISUC, Viorica. *Premisele izolării politice a României. 1919-1940*(*Premises of Romania's political isolations*). București, 1991.
- MOȘINCAT, Constantin. *Semnături decisive pentru politica de apărare a Vestului României(1930-1940)*(*Defining signatures for the defence policy in Western Romania*). Oradea, 2008.
- xxx *Ordinea internă și apărarea României(1939-1941)*(*Internal order and Romania's defence protection*). Coordonator: Adrian Bălan. București, 1999.
- OTU, Petre. *Politica militară a României în perioada 1 septembrie 1939-22 iulie 1941*(*Romania's military policy in the period of September 1st, 1939 and July, 22th, 1941*). București, 2006.
- PASCU, Ștefan. *A history of Transylvania*. New York, 1990.
- PREDOIU, Cristina Mihaela. *Planuri de apărare a graniței României cu Ungaria între 1930-1940*(*Defence plans for the Romanian border with Hungary between 1930-1940*). În: "Revista Istorică"[București], 18, 2007, nr. 5-6, p. 561-572. ["RI"]
- xxx *Realități istorice din Vestul și Nord-Vestul Transilvaniei. Studii și documente*(*Historical realities from West and North-Western Transylvania. Papers and documents*). Coordonator: Andrei Caciora. Arad, 2006.
- xxx *România de la război la pace. 1939-1947. Semnificații politico-militare*(*Romania from war at peace. Political-historical significations*). Coordonator: Alecsandru Duțu. București, 1996.
- xxx *România în anii celui de-al doilea război mondial. Vol. I-III.*(*Romania during the Second World War*). București, 1989.
- xxx *România în ecuația păcii și a dictatului*(*Romania in the peace and diktat equation*). Coordonator: Gheorghe Nicolescu. Pitești, 2001.
- SBÂRNĂ, Gheorghe. *Parlamentul și politica externă a României(1919-1940)*(*The Parliament and the foreign policy of Romania*). București, 2000.
- SCURTU, Ioan. *Civilizația românească interbelică(1918-1940)*(*Interwar Romanian civilization*). București, 2008.
- SCURTU, Ioan. *Istoria contemporană a Românilor(1918-1940)*(*Contemporary history of Romanians*). București, 2003.
- SCURTU, Ioan; BUZATU, Gheorghe. *Istoria Românilor în secolul XX. 1918-1948*(*Romanians history in the XXth century*). București, 1999.
- SCURTU, Ioan; HLIHOR, Constantin. *Complot împotriva României(1939-1947)*(*Plot against Romania*). București, 1994.
- STAN, Ana Maria. *Relații franco-române(1940-1944)*(*French-Romanian relationships*). Cluj-Napoca, 2006.

- ȘANDRU, Dumitru. *Mișcări de populație în România. 1940-1948*(Romania's population movements). București, 2003.
- ȘTIRBAN, Aurelia; ȘTIRBAN, Marcel. *Din istoria Bisericii Române Unite de la 1918 la 1941*(From the history of the Romanian Greek Catholic Church from 1918 to 1941). Satu Mare, 2005.
- ȘUTA, Ion. *Transilvania, himera ungarismului irredentist*(Transylvania, a chimera of Hungarian irredentism). București, 1995.
- TEȘA, Ion. *Relațiile româno-germane(1938-1944)*(The Romanian-German relationships). Constanța 2006.
- xxx *Tragedia României(1939-1947)*(Romania's tragedy). Ediție de Ion Solacolu. București, 2004.
- VASILE, Valentin. *Trecerile ilegale de frontieră din vestul României(1939-1945)*(Illegal crossing of the Romania's western frontier). În: "Pietre de Hotar"[Oradea], 5, 2005, p. 167-183.
- VÎLCU, Alexandru. *Relațiile româno-maghiare, dar nu numai*(The Romanian-Hungarian relationships, but not only). București, 2002.

II. Historical sources

- xxx *Al III-lea Reich și Holocaustul din România. 1940-1944. Documente din arhivele germane*(The Third Reich and the Holocaust in Romania. Documents from the German archives). Editori: Ottmar Trașcă, Dennis Deletant. București, 2007.
- ANCA, Alexandru. *Destin ardelenesc*(Transylvanian destiny). Ediție de Gheorghe I. Bodea. Cluj-Napoca, 2001.
- xxx Antonescu-Hitler. *Corespondență și întâlniri inedite(1940-1944)*. Vol. I-II(Correspondence and unknown appointments). Editori: Vasile Arimia, Ion Ardeleanu, Ștefan Lache. București, 1991.
- Atașajii militari transmiți. Vol. I-II(1938-1944)*(The military attachés conveys). Coordonator: Alecsandru Dușu. București, 2001, 2002.
- xxx *Armata română de la ultimatum la dictat. Anul 1940. Documente*. Vol. I-II.(The Romanian army from ultimatum to diktat. Documents). Ediție de Florica Dobre, Vasilica Manu, Lenuța Nicolescu. București, 2000.
- BÁNFFY, Miklós. *Emlékeimből. 25 év(1945)*.(Memoirs. 25 years). Szerkesztette Dávid Gyula. Kolozsvár, 2001.
- BARBUL, Gheorghe; SOLACOLU, Ion. *Schimbarea alianțelor României. De la Titulescu la Antonescu*(Changes of Romania's alliances policy. From Titulescu to Antonescu). Iași, 1995.
- BÂTEA, Ioan; CIOLTE, Aurel. *Cartea refugiatului român*(Romanian refugee's book). Baia Mare, 2006.
- BOSSY, Raoul. *Amintiri din viața diplomatică(1918-1940)*. Vol. I-II.(Diplomatic life's remembering). Ediție de Stelian Neagoe. București, 1993.
- BOSSY, Raoul. *Jurnal(2 noiembrie 1940-9 iunie 1969)*(Diary). Ediție de Ion Mamina. București, 2001.

- BUTCOVAN, Gavril. *O pagină de istorie scrisă cu sânge; mărturiile unui supraviețuitor al masacrului de la Ip(A page of history blood written; testimonies of a survivor of the massacre from Ip)*. Zalău, 2006.
- CAROL al II-lea. *Între datorie și pasiune. Însemnări zilnice*. Vol. III.(1939-1940). Vol.IV.(1943-1944). Ediție de Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, Narcis Dorin Ion. București, 2000.
- xxx *Confidențial București-Berna; rapoartele diplomatice ale lui René de Weck(1940-1944)(Confidential diplomatical reports)*. Ediție de Dumitru Hîncu. București, 2002.
- CRETZIANU, Alexander. *Relapse into bondage. Political memoirs of an Romanian diplomat. 1919-1947*. Editor: David Sherman Spector. Iași, Oxford, Portland, 1998.
- xxx *Dictatul de la Viena din 1940 și biserica românească din nordul Transilvaniei(1940-1944). Documente(The 1940 Vienna`s diktat and the northern Transylvanian Romanian church. Documents)*. Ediție de Mihai Fătu. Alexandria, 2001.
- xxx *Din istoria Transilvaniei. Documente(1931-1945)(Out of Transylvania`s history. Documents)*. Ediție de Mihai Fătu. Alexandria, 1999.
- DINA, Doru; IVAȘCU, Ion; URĂTU, Ștefan. *Pierderile umane și materiale suferite de România în vara și toamna anului 1940, reflectate în documente(Romania`s human and material losses in the summer and autumn 1940, reflected by documents)*. Slatina, 2001.
- xxx *Diplomați germani la București. 1937-1944(German diplomats at Bucharest)*. Ediție de Cristian Scarlat. București, 2001.
- xxx *Documente britanice despre România anilor 1940-1945(British documents about Romania between 1940-1945)*. Ediție de Ionel Sârbu. Iași, 2004.
- xxx *Documente privind istoria României între anii 1918-1944(Documents concerning Romanian history between 1918-1944)*. Coordonator: Ioan Scurtu. București, 1995.
- DUMITRAȘCU, Sever; ZAINEA, Ion. *Două documente inedite privind pactul Ribbentrop-Molotov și dictatul de la Viena (Two unpublished documents concerning the Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty and the Vienna diktat)*. În: “Analele Universității din Oradea. Seria Istorie-arheologie”, 12, 2002, p. 273-303.
- xxx *Ecouri dintr-o epocă tulbură. Documente elvețiene(1940-1944)(Echos from a trouble epoch. Swiss documents)*. Ediție de Andrei Șiperco. București, 1998.
- FILIMON, Mihail. *Însemnări din taberele suferinței. 1940-1944(Notes from the sufferings camps)*. Târgu Mureș, 2004.
- GAFENCU, Grigore. *Jurnal 1940-1942(Diary)*. Editori: Ion Ardeleanu, Vasile Arimia. București, 1991, 2006.
- GAFENCU, Grigore. *Misiune la Moscova. 1940-1941(Mission at Moscow)*. Coordonator: Ion Calafeteanu. București, 1995.
- GRAD, Cornel; BEJINARIU, Corina; OROS, Ioan Maria. *Memorii, jurnale și însemnări transilvane(1938-1989)(Transylvanian memories, diaryes and notes)*. Zalău, 2000.
- HUDIȚĂ, Ioan. *Jurnal politic 1940-1941. Vol.I-II.(Political diaryes)*. Editor: Dan Berindei. București, Iași, 1997-1998.
- IANCU, Gheorghe; TRĂȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Situația politică a României în perioada septembrie 1939-septembrie 1940, reflectată în rapoarte ale atașatului militar american din București, J. P. Ratay(România`s political situation between September 1939 and September 1940, relected in the reports of the American military attaché in Bucharest)*. În: “Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Cluj-Napoca”, 43, 2004, p. 265-315. [“AIICN”]

- xxx *Nicolae Iorga și revizionismul maghiar*(*N. Iorga and the Hungarian revisionism*). Ediție de Constantin Bușe, Nicolae Dascălu. București, 1995.
- MANOILESCU, Mihai. *Memorii, iulie-august 1940. Dictatul de la Viena*(*Memories, July-August 1940. The Vienna diktat*). Ediție de Valeriu Dinu. București, 1991.
- MASICHIEVICI, Partenie. *Skizzenblätter aus den Jahren 1940-1941*. Bucarest, 2006.
- POP, Valeriu. *Amintiri politice(1936-1945)*(*Political remembering*). Ediție de Sanda Pop. București, 1999.
- POP, Valeriu. *Bătălia pentru Ardeal*(*The battle for Transylvania*). Ediție de Nicolae Mareș, Sanda Pop, Nicolae C. Nicolescu. București, 1992.
- POP, Valeriu. *Suferințele din Ardeal*(*Transylvanian sufferings*). Ediție de Sanda Pop. Bacău, 2008.
- xxx *Recensământul din 1941. Transilvania*(*The census of 1941. Transylvania*). Coordonator: Traian Rotariu. Cluj-Napoca, 2002.
- xxx *Relațiile militare româno-germane. 1939-1945. Documente*(*Romanian-German military relations. Documents*). Coordonatori: Valeriu Florin Dobrinescu, Ion Pătroi, Gheorghe Nicolescu. București, 2000.
- xxx *România în jocul Marilor Puteri(1939-1940). Documente*(*Romania and the joke of Great Powers. Documents*). Ediție de Cornel Mihai Lungu, Ioana Alexandru Negreanu. București, 2000.
- SCURTU, Ioan. *România și Marile Puteri(1933-1940). Documente*(*Romania and the Great Powers. Documents*). București, 2000.
- SCURTU, Ioan; STANCIU-STĂNESCU, Teodora; SCURTU, Georgiana Margareta. *Istoria Românilor între anii 1918-1940. Documente și materiale*(*The history of Romanians between 1918-1940. Documents and materials*). București, 2001.
- SEBASTIAN, Mihail. *Jurnal. 1935-1944*(*Diary*). București, 1998.
- xxx *Stenogramele ședințelor Consiliului de Miniștri. Guvernarea Ion Antonescu. Vol. I-III*(*Minutes of the Ministry Council meetings. Ion Antonescu government*). Ediție de Marcel Dumitru Ciucă, Aurel Teodorescu, Bogdan Florin Popovici. București, 1997-1999.
- ȘORBAN, Raoul. *Invazie de stafii. Însemnări și mărturii despre o altă parte a vieții*(*Phantoms invasion. Notes and evidences about an other site of life. Memories*). București, 2002.
- WECK, René de. *Jurnalul unui diplomat elvețian în România(1939-1945)*(*Diary of an Swiss diplomate in Romania*). Ediție de Viorel Grecu, Claudia Chinezu. București, 2000.

III Special aspects

- AGRIGOROAIEI, Ion. *Le Diktat de Vienne*. În: "RRH", 34, 1995, nr. 3-4, p. 315-330. xxx *Arbitrajul de la Viena între documentul de arhivă și memoria colectivă*(*The Vienna arbitrage between the archival document and collective memory*). Editori: Valentin Orga, Claudiu Porumbăceanu. Cluj-Napoca, 2007.
- BAICU, Ion Ștefan. "Să nu uităm odiseea Transilvaniei" și "Tratatul de pace de la Trianon"(*D`ont forget Transylvania`s odysees and the Trianon peace treaty*). Ploiești, 2001.
- BEREKMÉRI, Szabó Árpád. *A tartalékos tisztképzés Marosvásárhelyen és a város magasabb katonai vezetése 1940-1944 között*(*Training of the reserve officers in Târgu*

- Mureș between 1940-1944*). In: *Marosvásárhely történetéből (Out the history of Târgu Mureș)*. Vol. II. Marosvásárhely, 2007, p. 138-166.
- BOLOVAN, Ioan. *Consideration on the Romanian-Hungarian negociations held in the summer of 1940*. În: "Transylvanian Review", 9, 200, nr. 4, p. 93-97.
- BOLOVAN, Sorina; BOLOVAN, Ioan. *Inițiativa românești privind problemele schimbului de populație în primii ani ai celui de-al doilea război mondial(1939-1941)(Romanian initiatives concerning the question of the population changes in the first years of World War II.)*. În: *România și relațiile internaționale în secolul XX(Romania and the international relationships in XXth century)*. Cluj-Napoca, 2000, p. 90-116.
- BOTORAN, Constantin. *Perfidia rusească și Dictatul de la Viena(Russian fullness and the Vienna Diktat)*. În: "Revista de Istorie Militară", 1995, nr. 1, p. 31-35.
- BUZATU, Gheorghe. *Dictatul de la Viena(The Vienna diktat)*. Iași, 1991.
- BUZATU, Gheorghe. *La Roumanie face à l'écroulement de ses frontières en 1940; isolement es auto-isolement*. În: "RRH", 34, 1995, nr. 3-4, p. 253-269.
- BUZATU, Gheorghe; DOBRINESCU, Valeriu Florin. *Tragedia României(1940); între ultimatum și dictat(The tragedy of Romania; between ultimatum and dictate)*. În: "Revista Română de Studii Internaționale"[București], 24, 1990, nr. 3-4, p. 153-175. ["RRSI"]
- CHIRA, Ioan. *Rugul durerii. Ocupația ungară horthystă. Mărturii și adevăruri; septembrie 1940-octombrie 1940(Stake of pain. The Hungarian occupation. Evidences and facts)*. Oradea, 2001.
- CIOBANU, Vasile. *Dictatul de la Viena(30 august 1940), reflectat în presa săsească(The second Vienna diktat reflected in the Transylvanian saxon press)*. În: "Transilvania"[Sibiu], 34, 2005, nr. 10-11, p. 88-90.
- CIUBĂNCAN, Vasile T. *România 1940. Pierderile economice și de populație(Romania 1940. Economic and populational losses)*. Cluj-Napoca, 2004.
- CIUBĂNCAN, Vasile. *România 1940. Pierderile economice din Transilvania de Sus la 30 august 1940(Romania 1940. Economic losses in Upper Transylvania in August 30th)*. Cluj-Napoca, 2005.
- CONSTANTINIU, Florin. *O pagină neagră a istoriei naționale. Dictatul de la Viena(A black page of national history. The Vienna diktat)*. În: "RRSI", 24, 1990, nr. 3-4, p. 177-185.
- CORNEANU, Ion; MOIȘ, Vasile. *Intoleranță și crimă. Golgota sătmăreană. 1940-1944(Illiberalism and crime. The sufferinces of Sătmărean county)*. Satu Mare, 2003.
- COSMA, Neagu. *Dictatul de la Viena(30 august 1940)(The Vienna diktat)*. București, 1996.
- DASCĂLU, Nicolae. *Dictatul de la Viena în viziune americană(The American vision about the Vienna diktat)*. În: *Relații româno-americane în timpurile moderne(Romanian-American relationships in modern times)*. Iași, 1993, p. 231-250.
- DASCĂLU, Nicolae. *Italia și dictatul de la Viena din 30 august 1940(II.)(Italy and the Vienna diktat)*. În: "RI", 2, 1991, nr. 3-4, p. 137-154.
- DOBRINESCU, Valeriu Florin. *Relațiile româno-ungare de la notele ultimative sovietice la Dictatul de la Viena(The Romanian-Hungarian relationships from the Russian ultimative notes at the Vienna's Diktat)*. În: "Sargetia"[Deva], 26, 1995-1996, nr. 2, p. 507-513.
- DUDAȘ, Florian. *Teroare în Maramureș(Terror în Maramuresch Land)*. Oradea, 1997.
- DUȚU, Alecsandru; IGNAT, Maria. *1940. Drama României Mari. Rapt și umilință(The tragedy of Great Romania.Tearing and humility)*. București, 2000.

- FERENCZY, György. *A Transzilvániai magyarság és a revízió*(*The Transylvanian Hungarians and the revisionism*). Bukarest, 2006.
- GHERGHEȘ, Ilie. *Maramureșul între Dictatul de la Viena și Conferința de pace de la Paris*(*The Maramuresch between the Vienna Diktat and Paris peace Conference*). Baia Mare, 2002.
- GIURCĂ, Ion. *Drama României Mari*(*The tragedy of Great Romania*). București, 2000.
- GRAD, Cornel. *Al doilea arbitraj de la Viena*(*The second Vienna arbitrage*). Iași, 1998.
- GRAD, Cornel. *Al doilea arbitraj de la Viena. Poziția armatei române*(*The second Vienna arbitrage. Romanian army's situation*). Zalău, 2000.
- GRAD, Cornel. *Guvernul român și Dictatul de la Viena*(*The Romanian government and the Vienna Diktat*). În: "Acta Musei Porolissensis"[Zalău], 17, 1993, p. 241-269.
- GUȚ, Ion Teodor. *Revizionismul și dictatul de la Viena. Implicații asupra județului Bihor*(*Revisionism and the Vienna diktat. Implication on the Bihor county*). Cluj-Napoca, 2002.
- HÁMORI, Péter. *Észak-Erdélyi egyházak és társadalom 1940 és 1944 között*(*Church and society in Northern Transylvania between 1940-1944*). În: "Keresztény Szó"[Kolozsvár], 17, 2006, nr. 10, p. 8-14.
- LAZĂR, Liviu. *Starea de spirit profund antirevizionistă în rândul populației din Transilvania în preajma Dictatului de la Viena*(*The Transylvanian population's anti-revisionistic spirit in vicinity of Vienna Diktat*). În: "Corviniana"[Hunedoara], 6, 2000, nr. 6, p. 307-318.
- MAN, Aurel Emilian. *Erorile nefaste ale istoriei*(*History's illfated errors*). Oradea, 2001.
- MARINESCU, Aurel Sergiu. *Înainte și după Dictatul de la Viena*(*Before and after Vienna's Diktat*). București, 2000.
- MARINESCU, Constantin Gheorghe. *Revizionismul ungar și România în contextul politicii marilor puteri*(*The Hungarian revisionism and Romania in the political context of great powers policy*). În: "Europa XXI"[Iași], 3-4, 1994-1995, p. 250-262.
- MÁRTON, József. *Ökumené Dél-Erdélyben 1940 és 1944 között*(*Ecumenism in South Transylvania between 1940 and 1944*). În: *Emlékkönyv Gálfy Zoltán 80. születésnapjára*(*Homage to Gálfy Zoltán at 80 years*). Kolozsvár, 2004, p. 144-151.
- MÎLOIU, Silviu. *Finnish views and political attitudes concerning the Romanian-Hungarian clash over Transylvania(1941-1942)*. În: *Studia Universitatis "Babeș-Bolyai. Studia Europea"*[Cluj-Napoca], 51, 2006, nr. 1, p. 105-119.
- MOȘINCAT, Constantin. *Aspecte ale activității Comisiei mixte româno-ungare pentru evacuarea Ardealului cedat. Septembrie 1940*(*The activity of the Romanian-Hungarian Commission for Transylvania's evacuation. September 1940*). În: *România în contextul internațional la sfârșitul celui de-al doilea război mondial*(*Romania in the international context at the end of the Second World War*). București, 2005, p. 377-391.
- MOȘINCAT, Constantin; ȚĂRAU, Augustin. 1940. *Evacuarea județelor din Nord-Vestul Transilvaniei (1940) și consecințele acesteia asupra județului Bihor*(*The evacuation of the Northern- Western Transylvanian countis and its consequences on Bihor county*). Oradea, 2005.
- MUREȘAN, Camil. *Opinia publică din Transilvania și Dictatul de la Viena*(*The Transylvanian public opinion and the Vienna Diktat*). În: "AMN", 32, 1995, nr. 2, p. 63-67.

- MUȘAT, Mircea. 1940. *Drama României Mari*(*The tragedy of Great Romania*). București, 1992.
- MUSTAȚĂ, Constantin. *Teroare în Ardeal. Vol. I-II.*(*Terror in Transylvania*). București, 2008-2009.
- OLÁH, Sándor. *Székelyföldi szövetkezetek 1940-1944 között*(*Economic associations from the Szekler's Land during 1940-1944*). În: *Szövetkezetek Erdélyben és Európában*(*Associations in Transylvania and Europe*). Kolozsvár, 2007, p. 271-299.
- OTU, Petre. *Axa preocupată de aplicarea Dictatului de la Viena*(*The Axis-States and the application of the Vienna Diktat*). În: "Cetatea Bihariei"(Oradea), 13, 2004, nr. 1, p. 61-70.
- PLĂMĂDEALĂ, Antonie. *Biserica și Dictatul de la Viena*(*The Church and the Vienna Diktat*). În: "AMN", 32, 1995, n. 2, p. 23-31.
- PUȘCAȘ, Vasile. *Transilvania și aranjamentele europene(1940-1944)*(*Transylvania and the European arrangements*). Cluj-Napoca, 1995.
- RACOVITAN, Radu. *R. W. Seton Watson și al doilea arbitraj de la Viena(30 august 1940)*(*R. W. Seton Watson and the second Vienna arbitrage*). În "Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis. Series Historia", 5, 2008, p. 192-205.
- ROTCHE, Andreea. *Problema Transilvaniei în raporturile României și Ungariei cu Germania(1 septembrie 1940-1 ianuarie 1943)* (*Transylvania's question in the Romanian and Hungarian relationships with Germany*). În: "Angustia" (Sfântu Gheorghe), 5, 2000, p. 147-156.
- RUSU, Dumitru D. *Nicolae Iorga în apărarea statului național unitar român. 1939-1940*(*Nicolae Iorga and the defence of the Romanian national unitary states*). În: *Analele Științifice ale Universității "Al. I. Cuza" din Iași*, 44-45, 1998-1999, p. 77-100.
- SANDACHE, Cristian. *Poziția Mișcării Legionare față de Dictatul de la Viena*(*The Iron Guard attitude's concerning the Vienna Diktat*). În: *Radiografia dreptei românești(1927-1941)*(*Romanian right forces radiography*). București, 1996, p. 255-261.
- SCURTU, Ioan. *The international statute of Romania(1940-1944)*. În: "Nouvelles Etudes Historiques"[Bucarest], 11, 2005, p. 223-237.
- SCURTU, Ioan. *Un episod dramatic. 30 august 1940*(*A dramatically episode: August 30th, 1940*). București, 1990.
- SIMION, Aurică. *Dictatul de la Viena*(*The Vienna diktat*). București, 1996; 2nd edition.
- STAN, Ana Maria. *L'évolution des rapports diplomatiques franco-roumains de juin au septembre 1940*. În: *Guerre et société en Europe*. Bucarest, 2004, p. 221-266.
- STAN, Ana Maria. *Relațiile franco-române în timpul regimului de la Vichy: 1940-1944*(*French-Romanian relations during the Vichy regime*). Cluj-Napoca, 2006.
- STAN, Constantin I. *Dr. Constantin Angelescu și drama României Mari din vara anului 1940*(*Dr. C. Angelescu and the tragedy of Great Romania in summer 1940*). În: "Mousaios"[Buzău], 6, 2001, p. 347-362.
- STAN, Constantin I. *Ultimatumul sovietic din iunie 1940, prolog al Dictatului de la Viena*(*The Soviet ultimatum from Juni 1940, as prologue of Vienna's Diktat*). În: "AMN", 32, 1995, nr. 2, p. 323-337.
- SZAVAI, Attila. *Magyar berendezkedés Észak-Erdélyben(1940, szeptember – 1941, április)*(*Hungarian structures in Northern Transylvania between September 1940 and April 1941*). În: "Magyar Kisebbség"(Kolozsvár), 9, 2004, nr. 4, p. 272-304.

- TEODORESCU, Virgiliu Z. *Din însemnările unui contemporan al zilelor impunerii Dictatului de la Viena*(From the notes of an contemporary concerning the days to establish the Vienna Diktat). În: "Marisia"(Târgu Mureș), 26, 2000, p. 309-322.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Aspects of the Romanian-Hungarian relations between 1940 and 1941*. În: "TR", 4, 1995, nr. 4, p. 45-59.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Implicațiile arbitrajului de la Viena din 30 august 1940 și situația economică a României; un raport inedit al Legației Germaniei din București*(Effects of the Vienna arbitrage in August 30th, 1940 on Romania's economic situation; an unknown report of Germania's Legation in Bucharest). În: "Orizont XXI"(Pitești), 1, 2006, nr. 2, p. 14-19.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Planul de atac al armatei maghiare împotriva României din 23 august 1940*(The battle plan of Hungary armie's against Romania) . În: "AIICN", 38-39, 1999-2000, p. 219-230.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Relațiile româno-maghiare și problema Transilvaniei. 1940-1944*(The Romanian-Hungarian relations and the question of Transylvania). În: Anuarul Institutului de Istorie "A. D. Xenopol" Iași, 42, 2005, p. 377-408.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Stenogramele Consiliului de Miniștri al Ungariei din 22, 28, 29 și 31 august 1940 referitoare la cel de-al doilea arbitraj de la Viena* (The Hungarian Ministries Council minutes concerning the second Vienna arbitrage). În: "AIICN", 37, 1998, p. 177-200.
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *Transilvania sub "arbitraj" german*(Transylvania under German "arbitrage"). În: "Dosarele Istoriei"(București), 5, 2000, nr. 7, p. 51-54. ["DI"]
- TRAȘCĂ, Ottmar. *U. R. S. S. și diferendul româno-maghiar din vara anului 1940*(The Soviet Union and the Romanian-Hungarian dispute in summer 1940). În: *România și relațiile internaționale în secolul XX*(Romania and the international relationships in XXth century). Cluj-Napoca, 2000, p. 188-203.
- TREBICI, Vladimir. *Pierderile teritoriale ale României în vara anului 1940: bilanț demografic*(Romania's territorial damages in the summer 1940: demographical survey). În: "AMN", 32, 1995, nr. 2, p. 49-61.
- ȚURLEA, Petre. *Antonescu și Transilvania "răpită"*(Antonescu and the "ravished" Transylvania). În: "DI", 7, 2002, nr. 6, p. 27-32.
- ȚURLEA, Petre. *Ip și Trăsnea. Atrocitățile maghiare și acțiunea diplomatică românească. Studiu și documente*(Hungarian atrocities and Romania's diplomatical activity. Paper and documents). București, 1996.
- VIȘOIANU, Constantin. *Geneza arbitrajului de la Viena*(Creation of the Vienna arbitrage). În: "Magazin Istoric"(București), 28, 1994, nr. 5, p. 17-20.