

**“BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY CLUJ-NAPOCA  
FACULTY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF SOCIOLOGY**

**ROMANIAN NATIONAL MEMORY:  
THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION AND  
RECONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL PAST.  
STRUCTURAL RESISTANCES AND SUBSTANTIAL  
TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE POLITICAL MANAGEMENT  
OF ROMANIAN PAST**

**– ABSTRACT–**

**Ph.D. advisor  
Professor Petru ILUȚ**

**Ph.D. student  
Mihai Stelian RUSU**

**CLUJ-NAPOCA, 2013**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables.....	3
List of figures.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	5
Programmatic prologue: the comprehensive approach of memory.....	6
1. Introduction: the epistemological triptych of the sociological research of memory .....	18
1.1. The sociological assault on common sense .....	21
1.2. Conceptual clarifications: the epistemic promises of analytical sociology .....	27
2. Theories of collective memory .....	56
2.1. Presentist theoretical formations.....	59
2.1.1. Constructionist perspectives .....	59
2.1.2. Instrumentalist theories .....	81
2.2. The conservatist paradigm of collective memory.....	97
2.2.1. Dynamic perspectives .....	97
2.2.2. Resistive perspectives .....	106
3. Methodology of oblivion .....	120
3.1. From controlling memory to programming oblivion.....	120
4. Romanian national memory, between national identity, state education, and official history .....	131
4.1. The memory road to the nation.....	132
4.2. Nation-state and state-education: institutionalizing national identity through the educational system.....	148
4.2.1. Romanian didactic literature: from "bucoavnă," through spelling book, towards the textbook.....	150
4.2.2. National history textbook: "weapon of mass instruction" .....	155
5. Questions of method: discursive hermeneutics.....	157
5.1. Discourse analysis of history schoolbooks as vectors of national memory.....	157
5.1.1. Social documents analysis and the critique of "armchair sociology" .....	162
6. Pedagogy of the nation: teaching Romanianness through history school textbooks .....	164
6.1. Civic pre-nationalist patriotism (1831-1859/1864) .....	171
6.1.1. Political framework.....	171
6.1.2. Educational system .....	175
6.1.3. The understanding of nationality .....	183
6.1.4. Collective memories. Separate managements of the past.....	196
6.2. Herderian ethnic nationalism (1859/1864-1918).....	234
6.2.1. Political framework.....	234
6.2.2. Educational system .....	237
6.2.3. The understanding of nationality: from civic patriotism to Herderian ethnic nationalism.....	243
6.2.4. Collective memory: nationalizing the Romanian past .....	251
6.3. Between critical nationalism and fanatic nationalism (1918-1947) .....	273
6.3.1. Political framework.....	273
6.3.2. Educational system .....	274
6.3.3. The understanding of nationality .....	280
6.3.4. National memory.....	286
6.4. Communist anti-nationalism (1948-1964).....	309
6.4.1. Political framework.....	309
6.4.2. Educational system .....	311
6.4.3. The understanding of nationality .....	314
6.4.4. Anti-national memory: socializing the Romanian history .....	317

6.5.	Communist nationalism: the national torsion of communism (1964-1989).....	337
6.5.1.	Political framework.....	337
6.5.2.	Educational system .....	339
6.5.3.	The understanding of nationality .....	343
6.5.4.	National-communist memory: de-sovietization, indigenization, hyperbolization 345	
6.6.	From post-communism to post-nationalism (after 1989) .....	374
6.6.1.	Political framework.....	374
6.6.2.	Educational system .....	380
6.6.3.	The understanding of nationality: the resurgence of ethnicity as identity marker 385	
6.6.4.	Post-national memory: from inertia, through anti-communism, towards Europeanization .....	392
6.7.	Setting the historical record straight between the present and the past: transitional politics of memory .....	417
6.7.1.	Discursive articulation of anti-communism as official rhetoric.....	417
6.7.2.	Collective memory in the context of transitional justice .....	418
6.7.3.	Tismăneanu Report: historical truth by political fiat .....	419
6.7.4.	Nostalgic resistance: the red memory of communism.....	424
6.7.5.	Vicarious nostalgia: longing after a pre-biographic past .....	434
6.7.6.	The patterns of settling the accounts between the present and the past.....	447
7.	General conclusions .....	451
8.	References.....	461
8.1.	The avant-garde of the Romanian social political and historical reflection .....	461
8.2.	The arriè-re-garde of the societal consensus. Didactic literature.....	464
8.2.1.	Spelling books, readers, primers .....	464
8.2.2.	Romanian history textbooks.....	465
8.2.3.	Miscellanea: legislation, references, yearbooks etc.....	469
8.2.4.	Databases and reports of public opinion polls .....	470
8.3.	Specialty literature: books and articles .....	471

**Key words:** collective memory, national memory, politics of memory, discourse analysis, didactic literature, nationalism, nation-state and nation-state building, national identity, public education, Romanians history, epistemology of history.

## ABSTRACT

This paper sets as its main objective to decrypt the process by which Romanian national memory has been discursively constructed and then recursively reconstructed in the different political systems and social orders, each of them with their own ideological secretion, which unfolded during the last two centuries of Romanian historical existence. With this purpose in mind, the analytical endeavor initiated in the present paper aimed at capturing the critical moments, those points of inflexion, which marked the process of the discursive construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of Romanian historical consciousness. The basic theoretic assumption, against the background of which the entire analysis unfolds, consists in the idea that collective memory is not a “given” of the past (*datum*) imposing itself in the present as the truthful representation of the past. Instead, collective memory is understood from a presentist angle, as a socio-cultural construction reflecting the interests of the present rather than the realities of the past. Seen from this theoretical angle, the past appears to be a symbolic resource that the political elites and the cultural intelligentsia are trying to exploit for defining the collective identity of a social community. As such, the past, far from being accurately reflected by the collective memory that is socially shared within a given community, is rather a resource useful in identity design and construction, being thus the subject of continuous political management.

The thesis is structured in six chapters during which the theoretical argumentation and the empirical analysis unfold, prefaced by a “Programmatic prologue” advocating for a comprehensive approach of memory, and ended by the general conclusions followed by the reference list. The first chapter introduces the general scheme upon which the thesis is structured, describing the “epistemological triptych of the sociological research of memory.” This is inspired by the precept formulated by G. Bachelard, that a social fact must be won, constructed, and confirmed. With this precept in mind, collective memory can be understood as a phenomenon that sociology must *win* at the discipline level, must *construct* at the conceptual level, and *confirm* at the empirical level. Chapter one is the place where the action of sociologically winning memory is being initiated. Traditionally, memory is a notion under the disciplinary jurisdiction of psychology. The preliminary stake of the thesis consists in creating two successive epistemological ruptures, whose cumulative result to legitimate the sociological approach of memory: i) first, by illustrating the *social* character of individual memory, and ii) second, by proving the *societal* nature of collective memory. Presenting the views of the classics of social memory – M. Halbwachs and F. Bartlett –, in contrast to the psychologistic position assumed by H. Ebbinghaus, becomes instrumental in highlighting the

inherently social nature of individual memory. The first breach in the disciplinary monopoly over memory exercised by psychology is thus created. A truly sociological approach of memory can be launched only by enlarging the initial breach through a second epistemological break, meant to throw light on the societal nature of memory. Resorting to the legacy of ideas handed down by the same M. Halbwachs, the thesis pleads the case for crediting the idea that social communities too, not only individuals, have their own collective memories. That is to say that social communities construct and preserve their own systems of socially shared representations of the past by which the groups try to define their own collective identities. Attempting to clarify the semantics of collective memory, the thesis advances as a working definition the proposition stating that collective memory is a retro-projectional system of social representations promoted by the current social order about its own past. We are talking about a “retro-projectional system” since the social representations of the past are always retrospective projections made from the reality of the present.

The second chapter aims at *constructing theoretically* a comprehensive understanding of collective memory. As a preliminary exercise to the elaboration of a theoretical model of collective memory, the paper realizes a vast panorama of the spectrum of theories engaging the phenomenon of memory. The multitude of theoretical angles existing in the literature circulated in social sciences and humanities are classified in two major antithetical perspectives: i) the theoretical bloc made up of *presentist* conceptions, and ii) the theoretical bloc made up of *conservatist* conceptions. The two theoretical sets are not perfectly unitary and internally homogenous. Although the similarities between the different perspectives placed under these umbrellas are considerable, sharing visible “family resemblances” (Wittgenstein, 2003, p. 133) [1953: CF, §67], the two theoretical blocs are not monolithic. Thus, each of the two theoretical formations can be further divided in two subcategories. Presentist theories can be classified in: i) *constructionist theories* and ii) *instrumentalist theories*; conservatist theories can be further classified in: i) *dynamic theories* and ii) *resistive theories*. A synoptic table can offer a synthetic view of the theories and sub-theories making up the theoretical spectrum of collective memory.

Table 1. The spectrum of theories of collective memory

<b>Theoretical bloc</b>	<b>Presentist theories</b>		<b>Conservatist theories</b>	
Sub-category	Constructionism	Instrumentalism	Dynamicism	Resistism
Theoretical “temper”	Moderate	Radical	Moderate	Radical
Exponents	M. Halbwachs	G.H. Mead, E.J. Hobsbawm	A.D. Smith, B. Schwartz	M. Schudson, E. Shils

Source: own elaboration

The theories distributed in the four sub-categories are not mutually exclusive; the demarcation lines separating them are far from being natural and self-evident. The differences are rather in shade and intensity of how much they highlight some aspects of collective memory and not other. For instance, concerning the class of presentist conceptions, the axial idea underpinning all the perspective inspired by this theoretical orientation resides in the thesis that the past and collective memory are put in the service of the present. But while the theories placed in the constructionist box highlight that the past and collective memory are retrospective socio-cultural constructions developed under the pressure of the necessities, constrains, ideals, and aspirations of the present, the theories allocated in the sub-category made up of instrumentalist perspective radicalize the constructionist discourse, adding an element of manipulation from the part of power elites. Thus, collective memory is theorized as being largely a fiction, or even an invention, deliberately concocted by the dominant class in order to legitimize the *status-quo* and for perpetuating the system of hierarchies working in their favor and strengthening their domination. Regarding the theoretical bloc of conservative perspectives, the central idea is that the past and collective memory are not so malleable as they are seen from the presentist perspective. The dynamic theories of memory, although acknowledge that collective memory is fashionable and made to promote the ideological agenda of the existing order, they nonetheless attempt to dilute the radicalism of the assertions made by the advocates of instrumentalist presentism. Dynamic perspectives point out the elements that impose restrictions over the degree in which the past can be fictionalized. On the other hand, resistist theories, making up the more radical component of the conservative bloc, underline the inertia of collective memory and of the facts of the past included in collective memory, pointing out that these impose themselves in the present against the struggle of contemporary social actors, or even against their will.

Mapping out the diverse theoretical prisms through which memory can be approached reveals the co-existence of two distinct and opposite theoretical blocs, or conceptual formations, each highlighting different aspects of collective memory. Deliberately

simplifying in order to synthesize the positions and clarify the oppositions, it can be said that the presentist paradigm reveals the fragility, precariousness, plasticity, and the usable nature of collective memory. On the other hand, the conservative paradigm insists upon the solidity, inertia, and refractory nature of collective memory, that not only resists against being manipulated by the current will of the interested actors, but that also has the power to determine in certain degree aspects of the present social order. Once this mapping of the theories of collective memory is being done, the thesis makes a series of “theoretical weldings” whose result is the development of an *evolutionary model of collective memory*. The model claims to offer a perspective managing to conciliate between the different contradictory approaches of memory into a unified theoretical framework. In a concentrated formula, the evolutionary model of collective memory advanced by the thesis is founded upon a series of propositions:

- a) *Collective memory is socially constructed*, i.e. the general image of the past is the product of the labor of selecting, interpreting, organizing, and systematizing facts about the past into a synthetic and coherent representation. Moreover, this implies the existence of an *institutional infrastructure of memory* responsible for producing, administrating, and displaying the publicly accepted version of the collective past (the educational system, the family, mass media, and the museum are the most relevant memory institutions to this process – Misztal, 2003).
- b) *The social construction of mnemonic order follows the blueprint sanctioned by the current dominant ideology*, meaning that collective memory is put to work in the service of the present, being shaped by the political and ideological imperatives of the present times.
- c) *Socio-political change triggers the change of collective memory*, meaning that a socio-political revolution will generate as a secondary effect a *mnemonic revolution*, by which the entire image of the past promoted by the former social order is overthrown and replaced by another representation of the past that is compatible with the new project of social order. In short, the overthrow of social order causes the collapse of the mnemonic order, and any post-revolutionary blueprint for constructing a new social order must include a new *regime of memory* fully consonant ideologically with that blueprint.
- d) *On the long run, the evolution of collective memory follows the model of “punctuated equilibrium”* (Eldredge and Gould, 1972), i.e. the process of

building a new mnemonic order is a slow and cumulative one. For a long while, the mnemonic order will be in a state of stagnation (*stasis*). Nonetheless, in the course of time, the state of stagnation will be affected by moments of “collective effervescence” (Durkheim, 1995) [1912], usually in the guise of social movements, that have a creative/renewal effect on social order, causing significant mutations. These disruptions in the structure of social order redound upon the structure of the mnemonic order, the latter suffering adaptive changes to the new social order.

- e) The periods of crisis, when the old order of memory starts to disintegrate due to the unfolding of socio-political events create a time window within which a battle over the collective past is being fought. This battle over memory will be won by the view that resonate most harmonically with the new social and political condition and that promises the most valuable ideological services to the new order in the process of consolidation. Defeated memories will not disappear though, but they will be eliminated from the circuit of the public sphere. Nonetheless, they will continue to exist in the guise of *counter memories*.

The third chapter changes the approach angle, engaging collective memory not from the vantage point of how the system of representations of the past is being socially constructed, but from the perspective of how oblivion is being socially programmed. As the title of this third chapter suggests – “The Methodology of Oblivion” –, in this section of the thesis the focal point moves from “the control of memory” towards “the programming of oblivion.” The main forms of social organization of oblivion are identified and theorized. These forms are the following: a) repressive erasure, b) prescriptive forgetting, c) forgetting that is constitutive in the formation of a new identity, d) structural amnesia, e) forgetting as annulment, f) forgetting as planned obsolescence, g) forgetting as humiliated silence (Connerton, 2008). The repertory of methods of socially organizing oblivion is completed by the lists of techniques of mnemonic obliteration made up by T. Todorov (2003), who points out: a) destruction of evidence, b) intimidation and prohibition, c) euphemisation, and d) lie and propaganda. As for the control exercised by the state over memory by producing official narratives of the past, J.V. Wertsch (2002) catalogues four such means: a) the control over the informational content, b) the control of doubt, c) the control of alternative sources, and d) the control of narrative performance. All of these methods and techniques of promoting oblivion at the collective level make up what can be called “the methodology of oblivion.” The



preliminary conclusion drawn at this point of the argument is that collective memory is the result of the *dialectics between remembering and forgetting*: due to the highly selective nature of memory, remembering implies inevitably forgetting. Every social system is a community of memory engaged in the construction, management, and publicly exhibiting the relationship established with its own past. One of the basic premises of this thesis is that the past that society incorporates in the present through different memory practices is not an objective given, but a social construction conditioned by the social, cultural, and political imperatives of the present.

The fourth chapter inaugurates the transition from abstract theorizing collective memory towards *Romanian national memory*, on which the thesis states that it starts to take shape within the coordinates defined by national identity, state education, and official history. The title of the chapter, “Romanian national memory, between national identity, state education, and official history” follows directly from this assumption. The first main argument elaborated in this section is synthetically exposed in the formula “the memory road towards the nation.” Simplifying to the extreme, the chapter states the idea that the foundation upon which Romanian modern nation has been built (and upon which the Romanian nation-state has also been based) was the common past, which Moldavian and Wallachian annalists and then the scholars of the Transylvanian School “imaginatively discovered.” Romanian nation has been constructed *via* collective memory. What this proposition wants to say is that the first step in the long process of building Romanian nation consisted in developing a relationship with the past. Constructing a collective memory (ethnic, and then national memory), Romanian intellectuals claimed political rights on the basis of the privileged relationship that Romanian nation possessed with its own past.

Romanians constructed their national identity by imaginatively discovering their past. But this was entirely the work of the elites, and the political consciousness of Romanian identity remained strictly localized in their minority category. The diffusion of national identity from elites towards the masses has been made through the educational system, by which the “nationalization” of the people was possible. The educational system, understood as a transmission belt connecting the high culture elaborated by elites and the popular culture of the masses, played a cardinal role in institutionalizing Romanian national identity and in consolidating the collective memory into which national identity was firmly anchored. The shaping of collective consciousness in the mold represented by the idea of the Nation could not be realized without an educational infrastructure through which the new identities developed by elites to be diffused in the social body. This is precisely why examining the

evolution of the national idea (and of collective memory in its trail) cannot be dissociated from investigating the creation and evolution of the public educational system.

As basic component in the institutional infrastructure underpinning the modern state, the school represents the transmission belt ensuring the transfer of the value-consensus established by the political and intellectual elites towards the lower strata of society. The schoolbook, especially the national history schoolbook, is the vehicle by which the states put into effect “the pedagogy of the nation.” Mass public schooling was the agent of nationalization by which the institutionalization of national identity and the configuration of a collective memory were materialized. The thesis moves on to analyze the socio-genesis and historical evolution of Romanian didactic literature, following its transition from the “epoch of the *bucoavna*” [religious schoolbooks written in Romanian language with Cyrillic characters], through the period of the spelling book, towards the domination of the textbook. The analysis focuses on national history textbooks, seen both as vectors of collective memory and as “weapons of mass instruction” (Ingrao, 2009) used by the nation-state in order to impose within the public consciousness its own self-legitimizing vision of the past. History schoolbooks can also be seen as the basic textual units upon which the “textual community” of the nation takes shape. Analyzing the re-appearance of literacy in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries in Western Europe, B. Stock traces the formation of what he calls to be “textual communities,” i.e. “micro-societies organized around the common understanding of a text” (Stock, 1990, p. 23). Collectively reading the canonic texts in the Middle Ages led to the emergence of “textually oriented societies” (p. 19). Borrowing and adapting the conceptual apparatus developed by B. Stock to the study of national memory, the thesis argues that the “textual community” of the nation is an interpretive macro-society organized around common understanding of texts codifying scriptically the collective past of the community (i.e. national history schoolbooks). The school is the institution socially programmed to serve this purpose. According to B. Stock, the emergence and functioning of a textual community depend on three elements: i) oral contact, by which outsiders enter in contact with an already existing textual tradition; ii) an educational process, by which the textual tradition is maintained and reproduced; iii) the historicizing of the community, by which the textual community endows itself with a past (i.e. the community is discursively constructing a collective memory). As “realm of national memory” (*lieu de mémoire*), the school fulfills all the three functions necessary for the functioning of the textual community of the nation. First, the school ensures the institutional *locus* in which the new members of the community to enter in *oral contact* with the tradition of memory instituted by the society, facilitating thus

the *mnemonic socialization* and their development of a *socio-biographical memory*. Second, the primary social function of the school is to ensure an *educative process*, by which the cultural legacy of the society to be maintained and handed down. Lastly, by creating historical narratives in the form of history schoolbooks, the textual community of the nation *historicizes* its existence by elaborating a meta-narrative of the origin, of the destiny, and of its historical becoming. Thus, school is the cardinal institution of the textual community of the nation, and the schoolbooks are the textual building blocks of the tradition preserved by these interpretive communities. Focusing the analysis upon the content of the didactic literature in general and on history schoolbooks in particular facilitates not so much to capture the interpretive innovations in the field of historiography, but it rather allows for the hermeneutical mapping of the officially approved societal consensus about the past. Instead of an analysis focused on tracking the emergence of innovative ideas (i.e. heterodox interpretations), this thesis proposes an analysis of the ideas turned into historiographical orthodoxy as a result of their promulgation by state authorities and made popular by their diffusion through the state sponsored educational system. In their capacity as expressions of the stated approved official consensus, history schoolbooks can be taken as making up the building blocks of national memory.

Chapter five hosts the exposition of method. The thesis uses discursive analysis of didactic literature in general and of history schoolbooks in particular, attempting to do a “discursive hermeneutics” of Romanian national memory. Discourse is understood as an interrelated set of texts, including the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception (Phillips and Hardy, 2002, p. 3). Base on this generic definition, the thesis aimed at capturing the points of inflexion of the process of the discursive construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of Romanian national memory through the didactic literature promoted by the state through the public mass educational system. The research questions that impelled the endeavor of this thesis addressed the following issues: how is collective memory discursively constructed? More precisely, how is Romanian historical consciousness structured by way of discourse? At the institutional level, which are the institutions of memory responsible for producing, managing, disseminating, and reproducing the body of knowledge composing Romanian national memory? Which is the regime of memory and how does the dominant discourses influence, interfere, and/or facilitate the production and reproduction of national memory? What are the mechanisms by which a specific understanding of the past becomes articulated? In the long historical run, how do these

discursive blocs evolve and what kind of transformations do they suffer? What are the connections between memory-discourse, hegemonic ideologies, and state-institutions?

The answers to these series of questions were formulated as a result of the discursive analysis of national history schoolbooks published in the last two centuries of Romanian historical existence (starting from 1839, the year of the first history schoolbook published in the Romanian countries, until the present day). The sample analyzed includes 87 original editions (97 volumes including the re-editions) of history schoolbooks and other schoolbooks (spelling books, readers, primers). An exhaustive analysis covering the entire collection of history schoolbooks published in the Romanian didactic literature was not possible due to reasons concerning both the inaccessibility of the schoolbooks and the impossibility of analytically processing such a large volume of works. In these conditions, using a sample turned out to be the only feasible solution. However, the large number of materials included in the collection of schoolbooks, as well as the scrupulosity of including in the sample schoolbooks published during the entire period taken into consideration ensure a large degree of representativeness.

The sixth chapter, entitled “The Pedagogy of the Nation: Teaching Romanianness through history schoolbooks” argues the idea that nationalism was the identity doctrine that decisively marked the structuration of Romanian historical memory. Starting with the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the national idea, followed by the nationalist ideology, had a profound influence over Romanian collective consciousness in general, and over historical consciousness in particular (Boia, 1995, p. 7). The nationalist doctrine’s influence over Romanian identity was so formidable that starting with the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards, the entire historical discourse will be cast in nationalistic molds. Romanians identity, as well as their historical consciousness, entered under the spell of the national idea. Romanian collective memory cannot be understood but through the lenses of the doctrine of nationalism and its historical evolution.

Grounded on the theories of nationalism elaborated by L. Greenfeld (1992) and M. Hroch (1985), the thesis develops a sequential model describing the evolution of Romanian nationalism in terms of which the configuration and reconfiguration of Romanian historical memory is being analyzed. The trajectory of Romanian nationalism follows this sequence: a) *(pre-)nationalistic civic patriotism*, temporally localized in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, specific to the Romanian Enlightenment; b) *Herderian ethnic nationalism*, which dominated the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, specific to the romanticism embraced by post-forty-eighters; c) *nationalism* ramified in its *critical* and *fanatical* versions, during the interwar period; d) *anti-nationalism* during the first phase of communism; e) *national socialism*, during the

national phase of mature communism; f) *orthodox ethno-nationalism*, during the first phase of Romanian post-communism; g) *post-nationalism*, currently in the process of consolidation following the European integration of Romanian society. Against the background of this scheme, the thesis traces how each of these identity-transitions (reflected by the changing conception of the nation) triggered the restructuring of the image of the collective past. Since Romanian historical discourse has been cast in nationalist molds, it is expectable that each transformation concerning the conception of nationality to entail significant changes at the level of the basic categories of Romanian national memory: origin, antiquity, continuity, spirituality, unity, and independence of the Romanian people in the course of history.

The analysis covered a period of two centuries of the existence of the national idea, starting from the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the contemporary period. Romanian national memory begins to take shape starting with this period, while until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century this process of constitution to be largely completed.

Our analytical endeavor is tributary to M. Halbwachs's (1992) [1925] theory of the social frameworks of memory, whose main innovation consisted in pointing out that individual memory is always framed by some social context (family, peer group, professional group, religious confession, etc.). Its main theoretical thrust states that the individual remembers past events and experiences only with the help of the group, as a member of a social collectivity. As such, these social frameworks shape the memory of the individual, giving it a group perspective. Halbwachs's theory of the social frameworks of memory refers only to individual memory, leaving aside the collective one. Building on Halbwachs's seminal ideas, the thesis develops a "theory of the societal frameworks of collective memory," constructed by extrapolating Halbwachs's individualist conception at a collective level. The power lines of the theory of the societal frameworks of collective memory state that the way in which the past is managed within the historical consciousness of a social community is conditioned by a series of societal frameworks (like the political regime and political organization, the degree of the centralization of state-authority, the level of institutional articulation of the mass public educational system, the prevalent ideology in the public consciousness, etc.). Collective memory is subjected to the carving effects of these societal frameworks, its content taking the shape allowed by the societal frameworks. The theoretical premise of our approach guiding the entire analysis is that Romanian national memory is shaped by multiple societal frameworks, the main ones being the following: the political regime, or the state of the polity; the degree of the organization of the primary and secondary public education; and the ideological framework concerning the conception of the

nation, nationality, and nationalism. The Romanian nation-state represents, in this scheme of things, the meta-framework subsuming all other frames, since national memory is intrinsically tied and intimately interlaced in the process of building the Romanian nation-state.

The argument insisted upon the fact that common *origin*, historical *continuity*, ethnic, cultural, and state *unity*, political *independence*, and (orthodox) *spirituality* are the archetypical mythologeme into which collective memory in general and Romanian national memory in particular are being organized. A special attention was given to *the socio-political logic of historical periodization*. How the collective past is being periodized, as well as the evolution in the course of time of these temporal structures, has first order social and political consequences: by establishing temporal thresholds of high symbolical charge, the periodization of the past reflects the values, ideals, and aspirations of the current regime. Sequenced in full consonance with the imperative of the current political agenda, the past is thus put in the service of the present in order to bolster the existing social order.

After the section in which the analytical scheme according to which the empirical research was projected to unfold (i.e. the discursive analysis of the content of Romanian didactic literature), the rest of the sixth chapter hosts the bulk of the empirical research proper. *The political framework, the educational system, and the conception of nationality* are being analyzed, tracing the effects of these “societal frameworks” upon collective memory in each of the seven sequences of the evolution of Romanian nationalism. In a schematic form, the synthetic results of the research can be presented in the following synoptic table.

Tabel 2. The synthetic results of the thesis organized according to the analytical scheme of the research

Historical period	Societal framework	Collective memory
1831-1859/1864	<b>Political framework:</b> fragmented statehood, Ottoman vassalage (in the Danubian Principalities) and Austrian vassalage (in Transylvania).	<b>Separate managements of the past.</b> The Romanian past is politically managed separately in terms of the existing state frontiers. Didactic literature in general and history schoolbooks in particular fashion <i>collective memories</i> specific to each Romanian principality. Even if the common Latin origin, the historical continuity of the Romanian kin, the kin-unity of the Romanians, and their Orthodox
	<b>The educational system:</b> the start of the process of creating a network of primary schools financed by the state (post 1781 in Transylvania – <i>Norma regia</i> , post 1831 in Danubian Principalities – <i>Organic Regulation</i> and <i>The Regulation of the public schools</i> in Wallachia and Moldova). History education is being introduced and starts to take shape, but	

	<p>does not succeed to overthrow the supremacy of Christian (Orthodox) morals that continues to dominate in an indisputable fashion the textual universe of didactic literature. The educational process of this period can be describes as a <i>pedagogy of obedience towards the lordship</i>.</p> <p><b>The conception of nationality:</b> pre-nationalist civic patriotism, whose cardinal virtue lied in the fulfillment of the civil duties towards the “Lordship” and God. Within the avant-garde of the social and political reflection, the political program of unifying all Romanians in a single nation-state takes shape around the Revolution of 1848. The didactic literature, reflecting the officially approved societal consensus, is largely still foreign to the nationalist thrill already vibrating in the political imagination of Romanian intelligentsia.</p>	<p>spirituality are widely acknowledged as common denominators, each Romanian state outline its own <i>state memory</i>, tributary to its own political frame of reference and to its own region-centric logic of conceptualizing the past.</p>
<p><b>1859/1864-1918</b></p>	<p><b>Political framework:</b> the build-up of Romanian statehood by the articulation of the minimal formula of the Romanian nation-state following the union of Wallachia and Moldova in 1859. Hereditary monarchy is instituted by enthroning Carol I as prince (1866), and then raised to the rank of king (1881) following the winning of state independence (1878) in the “War for the Salvation of Romanian People.” The period is marked by the building of the nation and by the consolidation of the Romanian state around the idea of dynastic monarchy.</p> <p><b>The educational system:</b> the institutionalization of public mass education occurs, following the law of primary instruction issued in 1864, which decreed the principles of mandatory and universal public schooling. The authorities of the newly made Romanian nation-state created in 1859 launch a powerful campaign of enlarging the network of school units, whose apex will be reached by Spiru Haret’s reforms of rural education. History education too is institutionalized, becoming a core discipline in the school programs of the new Romanian nation-state. Starting with the 70s, a true publishing boom of history schoolbooks occurs. History</p>	<p><b>Nationalizing Romanian historical memory.</b> The creation of the Romanian nation-state by the union of 1859 produced the major restructuration of the main coordinates defining collective memory. The previously separated political managements of the Romanian past have now been replaced by a single framework within which the different pasts of the Principalities were merged into a unique national memory. Once with the erasure of the political frontiers dividing the Danubian Principalities, the demarcation lines separating the provincial histories were also dissolved. The process can be described as one of <i>nationalizing</i> the Romanian past, by which the region-centric memories of the Principalities were homogenized into a Romanian national memory. Nationalism, whose ideological forces were unfettered in the avant-garde of the romantic “forty-eightism,” has been assumed by the state and</p>

	<p>schoolbooks become the textual building blocks by which state authorities try to construct Romanian national identity and historical memory. Against the background of the changing conception of nationality, education begins to promote more intensely a <i>pedagogy of xenophobia</i>.</p> <p><b>The conception of nationality:</b> the period following the union of the Danubian Principalities in the Romanian nation-state witness the intensification of the identity discourse centered upon the ethnic factor. The transition from a patriotism suffused with Christian morals based on civic obedience towards a <i>Herderian ethnic nationalism</i> occurs. Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, <i>Romanianism</i> erupts in the collective consciousness as an identity discourse permeated by xenophobic accents. The identity promoted by Romanianism is defined by the destiny of the “national soul” in history and against the <i>foreignism</i>, which is vigorously denounced as tainting the purity of the Romanian soul. The indigenist discourse, which will reach its supreme climax only in the interwar period, find its roots deeply planted in this period.</p>	<p>transformed in the guiding-idea of the Romanians history propagated by the school textbooks only after the unification of the Danubian Principalities. Consequently, the previously separated pasts along the lines of the political frontiers between Romanian principalities are now merged into a unitary whole. The separated histories of Wallachia, Moldova, and Transylvania are synthetized in <i>the national history</i> of the Romanian people, who finds its symbolic and political crown in the institution of kingship.</p>
<p><b>1918-1947</b></p>	<p><b>Political framework:</b> the sequence of political events leading to the formation of the Romanian nation-state finds its apotheosis in the Great Union of 1918. “Every Romanian’s” “millenary dream” fulfilled in the political creation of Greater Romania. On the other hand, along with the territories incorporate, the expanded Romanian state also received a high procent of ethnic minorities that threaten its internal homogeneity. Against this politico-demographical background, state authorities intensified their efforts to Romanianize the population. On the political plane, in this short temporal period, the façade democracy was overthrown, its place being taken by the royal dictatorship (1938-1940), then by the military dictatorship of general Antonescu (1940-1944), which was itself overthrown by the communist dictatorship (1947-1989) that lasted more than half a century.</p>	<p><b>National memory in discursive duality.</b> The two front of the avant-garde (the nationalistic fanaticism of the cultural, political, and ideological reflection on the one hand, and the critical nationalism of the professional historiographical reflection) have their mirrors in the didactic literature through which national memory was configuring. National memory is being defined both in a radical nationalist formula, and on the coordinates of the critical historiography established by the “new school.” The historiographical discourse diffused through schoolbooks evolves thus in two parallel registers in the discursive scale of nationalism: i) the discourse in <i>nationalism-major</i> (nationalistic</p>



	<p><b>The educational system:</b> in the new demoterritorial conditions brought by the unification and the ethno-cultural heterogeneity created by it, state authorities launched a <i>National Kulturkampf</i> in the educational sphere. The main goal was the unification and the centralization of the educational system, while ideologically, the main objective was to transform the school into an institutional locus for molding the “national man.”</p>	<p>fanaticism), and ii) the discourse in <i>nationalism-flat</i> (critical nationalism). Within this nationalist concert, in which the two different scores can be identified, the <i>consolidation of Romanian national memory</i> constructed in the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century occurs.</p>
	<p><b>The conception of nationality:</b> within the “nationalist consensus” prevailing in the epoch, two ramifications of nationalism can be identified. On the one hand, the indigenist discourse become more and more radical, taking the shape of what we have called <i>nationalistic fanaticism</i>, i.e. the fanatical belief in the historical destiny of the national idea. On the other hand, along the line of Junimea’s tradition, a <i>critical nationalism</i> takes shape. This second type of moderate nationalism keeps the political faith in the national idea, but is it is not ready anymore to sacrifice truth on the altar of nationalism.</p>	
<p><b>1947-1964</b></p>	<p><b>Political framework:</b> the inaugural event of this period consists in the abolishment of the monarchy and the institution of the regime of “popular democracy,” in fact a communist regime vassal to USSR. The new regime launches its own program of <i>socializing</i> Romanian society by nationalizing the industry, collectivizing agriculture, liquidating political opposition, and reconfiguring the social structure. The state violence that went along these structural reforms justifies the label of Romanian Stalinism.</p>	<p><b>Anti-national memory and the Sovietization of Romanian past.</b> The sudden twist from nationalism to socialism redounded upon Romanian memory, whose historically sedimented formula within nationalistic frames has been disintegrated and reconstructed on socialist grounds. The origin of Romanians was Slavized, and the entire history of Romanians has been reviewed from a Soviet-centric perspective. The indigenism prevailing during the Romanian nationalist century turns into slavonism. Another significant mutation occurs in the conception concerning the unity of Romanian people. National unity gave way to working-class unity, as part of a more general process of socializing the national. On similar lines, the motif of independence is also</p>
	<p><b>The educational system:</b> Romanian education was itself the subject of a structural reform launched by the new regime. This disrupted the tradition of Romanian education from its nationalist path into which it historically evolved, repositioning it along Soviet lines. Private education was dissolved, while the public one has been explicitly ideologized. Another break with the Romanian pedagogical tradition consisted in the introduction of single textbooks, by which authorities gained total</p>	

	<p>control over the educational process. As education was oriented in a <i>technical</i> and <i>industrial</i> direction, the school became an instrumental institution in the project of building the socialist society.</p>	<p>reviewed: geo-politically, the idea of independence is now thought of not as the political freedom of the Romanian nation-state, but as economic independence from Western imperialism. Internally, the idea of independence takes the semantics of class struggle in the name of the egalitarian ideal, a struggle that will be led by the Romanian Communist Party starting with the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The monarchic component of national memory, added during the nationalist century following the political evolutions in the direction of constituting a dynastic monarchy, received a fatal blow. The monarchic idea is abolished from Romanian historical memory just as monarchy has been abolished from the state's political organization.</p>
<p><b>1964-1989</b></p>	<p><b>Political framework:</b> the second period of Romanian communist is opened by the "Declaration of Independence" towards Moscow issued by the Romanian Workers Party in April 1964. This declaration symbolizes the indigenization of Romanian society and the start of the torsion towards national-communism. The tendency will be accentuated by the N. Ceausescu's non-conformist political act from 1968 (the condemnation of the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact troops) and then by the intensification of nationalism</p>	<p><b>National-communist memory: de-Sovietization, indigenization, hyperbolization.</b> Shyly started as early as the 60s, the political indigenization and cultural autarchization of Romanian society intensifies progressively, reaching the climax towards late 80s. The transformations of Romanian historical memory mirror the political evolution. The most remarkable mutation is the re-nationalization of Romanian</p>

	<p>within the framework of communism that will reach grotesque heights during the 80s.</p>	<p>memory after in the first phase of socialism the national fiber was completely taken out of the historical understanding of Romanians' past. From "national in form, socialist in substance," Romanian historical memory became "national in form, <i>nationalist</i> in substance," although it still kept a strong socialist element. The nationalist view that dominated the spirit of Romanian historiography starting with the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until 1947 has been re-installed as the official lenses through which the past has to be seen. The ideas that obsessed the Romanian nationalists (state and political continuity, "the eternal Romania," national independence, the perennial unity of Romanians) have been amplified by the national-communist historical discourse. The national legacy of the Romanian cultural tradition has been completely recovered. Romanian historical memory re-became <i>the national memory</i>. The process of re-nationalizing the Romanian historical memory entwined increasingly close with the subordination of contemporary history to the Communist Party. 20<sup>th</sup> century in general and contemporary history in particular (the latter defined as starting in 1918) are almost completely colonized by the Party. They can easily be read as the institutional biography of the Party and especially as the personal biography of Nicolae Ceausescu.</p>
	<p><b>The educational system:</b> strictly quantitatively speaking, communism completed the modernizing project of Romanian public education started in 1864. Communist reforms finalized the modernizing project of Romanian mass public schooling. Qualitatively speaking, the evolution of geo-politics in the direction of cooling off Romanian-Russian relationship favored the reintroduction of the national factor in the content of education. The laws of education adopted in 1968 and then in 1978 politicize the institution of the school, which has to fulfill now, besides its strictly educational-instructive functions, also the role of ideological modeling of "militant citizens working for the construction of socialist and communist society." Ideological education becomes thus part and parcel of the educative process. The <i>Law of education</i> from 1978 specified, among other "fundamental objectives of education," the project of <i>socialist anthropomorphosis</i>. "The formation and education of the new man" becomes a tangible objective given that school becomes an explicit agent of ideologization working every day, for at least ten years, to sculpt the communist self of the children.</p>	
	<p><b>The conception of nationality:</b> in the trail of political events, the national idea suffered a new plenary bloom. The turntable towards nationalism on which the mature communist regime engaged led from "the suppression to the reaffirmation of national values" (Verdery, 1991, p. 98). As the American researcher points out, "the national idea" in whose name O. Goga confessed his fanatical faith has been recovered and re-worked as "master symbol." The identity discourse reconfigured around the idea of the Nation, which has regained its central place that it held starting with the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Romanians' self-consciousness (Verdery, 1991, p. 122).</p>	
<p><b>Post-1989</b></p>	<p><b>Political framework:</b> the entire period following the revolution of December 1989 can be described by the formula "The grip of the</p>	<p><b>Post-national memory: from inertia, through anti-communism, towards Europeanization.</b> The fall</p>

	<p>past over the present and the difficult coping with the legacy of the past.” The overthrow of the communist regime by the revolution of 1989 does not propelled Romanian society out of communism. The transition from a totalitarian, Stalinist type, closed society towards a pluralist, democratic, and open society was to be not only a long and exhausting one, but would occur (mostly) under the direct political guidance of the former communist elite. In spite of hesitations and conservative power bases, democratic forces succeeded on the long run to prevail, orienting Romanian society on the Western path and firmly engaging Romanian political elite in the direction of Europeanization. These efforts were to be fulfilled by the acceptance of Romania in NATO (2004) and its integration in the European Union (2007).</p>	<p>down of the communist regime did not trigger an immediate major restructuring of the collective understanding of the Romanian past. For more than one decade after the Romanian revolution of 1989, the main way of seeing the past has been marked by <i>discursive inertia</i>. Then, as the efforts of integrating in the Euro-Atlantic structured gained momentum, the old nationalistic image of a heroic indigenist past has been succeedingly reviewed. A major change was made by the introduction of alternative textbooks starting with 1997-1998. This move pulverized the old monophonic discourse, its place being taken by a <i>discursive polyphonia</i> where both conservative and nationalist voices, but more pregnantly reflexive and even postmodernist voices could be heard. The historical consciousness promoted by the history schoolbooks has been disrupted from its traditional framework defined by the nation-state and nationalist ideology starting with 2004, when the analytical programs for teaching history issued by the state authorities dissolved the national framework of the Romanian past. Starting with the 4<sup>th</sup> through the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, “The History of Romanian” turned into “History,” and the Romanian past has been approached only from a European perspective and within a continental geographical frame of reference. All these restructuring highlight <i>the post-national condition of Romanian historical memory</i>.</p>
	<p><b>The educational system:</b> the breakdown of the communist regime in December 1989 brought to light the structural crisis that existed in a latent form from much earlier that the revolutionary moment. The explicit consciousness of the total crisis of Romanian society (political, economic, cultural, moral crises, etc.) developed in the context dominated by two power-ideas taken as guiding principles in the Romanian post-communism: i) the necessity of <i>transition</i> from closed society to open society, made by ii) <i>systemic reform</i>. In education, the reform lagged behind for one decade after the revolution, being launched only towards the end of the 90s. There were two crucial transformations: i) the introduction of alternative textbooks; and ii) the intense propagation of Europeanism along with the cooling down of ethno-national identification.</p>	
	<p><b>The conception of nationality:</b> after a first phase in which ethnic nationalism was resurrected, a post-nationalist conception became more and more prevalent. The progressive Europeanization of Romanian society and the integration of the Romanian state in the Euro-Atlantic structures finalized with its acceptance in the European Union in 2007 cooled off the nationalistic passions so</p>	

	<p>incandescent at the beginning of the transition in the early 90s. Despite formidable indigenist resistances, Europeanism replaced nationalism as the dominant political attitude in the Romanian collective mind. It can be argued that in the period following Romania's acceptance in the European Union, Romanian society entered into the <i>post-nationalist</i> stage.</p>	
--	---	--

The synoptic table presents, in an extremely concentrated manner, the evolution of national memory in the last two centuries of Romanian historical existence. It highlights the connections between the substantial transformations occurred in the political management of Romanian past and the transformations occurred in the political framework, the educational system, and the conception on nationality.

Mapping the different configurations of Romanian historical memory, we have marked out a series of seven succeeding formulas according to which the legacy of the collective past has been politically managed. The decisively factor, indeed the structuring one, was identified as *the conception of nationality*. In terms of how nationalism evolved, seven phases in which Romanian historical memory condensed can be carved out: i) “pre-nationalist civic patriotism” during the “Epoch of the Organic Regulation” (1831-1859/1864), a period dominated by the philosophy of the Enlightenment, when the Romanian national state was not yet centralized and the public schooling systems were beginning to institutionalize. In these conditions, the Romanian states developed *collective memories*, each of them regionally relative to the existing states. The political management of the past is done in different ways, each principality developing its own particular understanding of the past cast in the molds of its own statehood. Nonetheless, a series of common features are being shared by all the three Romanian memory systems (Wallachian, Moldavian, and Transylvanian). The common denominator resides in the basic postulates of the Latinist paradigm developed by the Transylvanian School; ii) the provincial views of the Romanian past codified in collective memories specific to each principality are subjected to a process of *nationalization* following the creating of the Romanian unitary nation state in 1859. Under the spell of “ethnic nationalism” that gained ideological momentum in the last half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and using the educational infrastructure whose pillars were set by the reform of 1864, *the Romanian national memory* starts to takes shape. The process of merging the provincial perspectives of the Romanian pasts into a single national view of the Romanian past intensified towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and was finally completed in the verge of the making of Greater

Romania in 1918; iii) the making of Greater Romania in the aftermath of the “War for the Unification of the Nation” had as an ideological effect the bifurcation of nationalism between a radical variant promoting a *xenophobic Romanianism* (“nationalistic fanaticism”) and a moderate version promoting a “critical nationalism.” Within this “nationalist consensus” in two tones, the *national memory* became consolidated during the Romanian interwar period, taking in both fanatic and critical accents; iv) World War 2 ended with the overthrow of the hereditary monarchy, introduced in the Romanian political system in 1866, and its replacement by a regime of “popular democracy” ruled by the communists who seized power with the help of the Soviet tanks stationed in Romanian territory. Under the influence of *proletarian internationalism* and *socialist patriotism* (in fact, both of them anti-nationalist ideologies), the first phase of Romanian socialism (1947-1964) dramatically restructured the historical memory settled in the collective memory, by taking out the nationalist core from the Romanian memory. The national past is subjected to an intense process of socialization, the result of which is an *anti-national soviet-centric memory*; v) the Romanian state’s exit from the orbit of Kremlin (April 1964) signaled the beginning of the re-nationalization of Romanian politics and culture. The second chapter of Romanian communism stands out by the recycling of the national idea, upon which the regime founds the collective identity. The Romanian historical consciousness takes the form of the *national-communist memory*, characterized by de-Sovietization, indigenization, and hyperbolization of the Romanian past; vi) the collapse of the communist regime in December 1989 produced minimal effects upon the restructuration of the memory developed during national-communism, out of which only the most evidently compromised elements were removed. In compensation to these losses, ethnicity has been completely re-habilitated in the context of the resurgence of ethnic passions in Romanian politics. The political management of the past is done in similar terms to the national-communist management. *The post-communist memory*, emerging in the first phase of Romanian transition from totalitarianism towards liberal-type of democracy falls under the logic of inertia; vii) significant transformations in the way of approaching the past can be identified only after 2000, as an effect of the cooling out of the ethnic passions, of the “comprehensive reform” of education, and most especially, of the intensification of the efforts to integrate in the Euro-Atlantic structures. Post-communist memory suffers a double transformation, turning into *post-national memory* as well as into *anti-communist memory*. The officialization of the anti-communist discourse as state rhetoric gaining discursive hegemony within the public sphere is reflected by the ordering and then assuming of the *Report of the condemnation of communism* by the Romanian Presidency in 2006.

One of the general conclusions that unfold from the exposition of the making and remaking of Romanian historical memory is the cardinal role played by the state as the main *mnemonic agent* in fashioning national historical consciousness and in the political management of the past. The school is the main instrument of the state used to socialize individuals in the tradition of memory cultivated by the official authorities. Initiated, by way of history schoolbooks, in the community's tradition of memory, individual biography becomes embedded with the collective biography of the nation. Through this process of identity alchemy, children develop the consciousness of their *sociobiography*, i.e. the individual biography embedded in the collective biography of the national community (Zerubavel, 1996).

From a theoretical point of view, the empirical analysis of the discursive construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of Romanian historical memory generally supports what we have called as the "evolutionary model of collective memory." Simplifying to the extremes, this model states that major changes occurring in the existing socio-political order (e.g. political revolutions overthrowing the political regime) put in motion a subsidiary process of significantly restructuring the consecrated order of memory. Depending on the magnitude of the political seism and on its effects on reconfiguring the political management of the collective past, the thesis distinguished between "mnemonic revolutions" and "mnemonic reforms." Seen in this conceptual light, the historical evolution of Romanian historical memory is marked by a series of substantial changes. The first crucial moment in the dynamics of Romanian historical memory occurs towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when "the national revolution" launched in the avant-garde of the social and political thinking of the forty-eighters breaks through into didactic literature. Especially through the history schoolbooks of this period, didactic literature becomes the main ideological agent in diffusing the national identity within the non-elitist strata of Romanian population. Romania has been made, Romanians were still to be made. This identity conversion, completed by the anthropological production of *homo nationalis*, was realized especially through history schoolbooks, which constructed the monumental cathedral of the Romanian past whose apostles were the teachers preaching the pedagogy of the nation. The Christian peasants were taught to be Romanians, united around the same cluster of values secreted by the same collective historical destiny. The national mnemonic revolution consisted in interlacing the provincial pasts into a single Romanian past, which justified the dissolution of regional identities (Transylvanian, Moldavian, and Wallachian identities) and the merging of these into the supreme and indivisible solidarity of the nation. This can be considered the national

revolution of Romanian historical memory, the first mnemonic revolution inaugurating the tumultuous history of Romanian memory.

A second mnemonic revolution that radically destructured the Romanian way of understanding the past has been “the anti-national revolution” launched by the communist authorities in the period immediately following WW2. Destroying the very foundations not only of the system of representations of the past developed in the trail of the national revolution, but also the entire institutional infrastructure underpinning the order of memory (Romanian Academy was dissolved, museums were closed, others were opened – like the Romanian-Russian Museum, streets were re-named, etc.), the initial phase of Romanian communism constructed a *soviet-centric socialist memory* instead. The new formula of Romanian identity was completely alien to the national idea of ethnic Romanianism. The communist regime launched its own program of political anthropogenesis in its plan to create the “new man” in the *homo sovieticus* species. From ethno-nationalist incubator suffused with xenophobic tinges, the school became a laboratory of *socialist patriotism* made to fit in the frameworks of *proletarian internationalism*. National historical memory, rose in the avant-garde of the social and political reflection as early as the forty-eighters generation and consolidated within the arrière-garde of the societal consensus represented by didactic literature starting with the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, has been replaced by a historical memory ingrained with powerful anti-nationalist tinges. As shown in the body of the thesis, this anti-national mnemonic revolution, whose main artisan was M. Roller, turned out to be an “abortive revolution.” It failed eventually because it tried to radically suppress the national spirit that historically defined Romanian historical consciousness.

The third critical moment in the dynamics of Romanian historical memory came in the wake of the nationalist twist of communism, initiated in the 60s, intensified during the 70s, and hyperbolized during the 80s. Without having the sudden and radical nature of the break produce by the anti-national revolution triggered in the aftermath of the WW2, the national-communist reshaping of Romanian historical memory can be described rather by the apparently contradictory term of “processual revolution.” The re-centering of the national idea in the very core of the Romanian historical consciousness did not come by a total rupture or by an abrupt break with Roller’s formula of the past. Instead, the breaking with it came through a series of dislocations, whose cumulated effect was nonetheless substantial. Between T<sub>1</sub> established by way of convention in 1964 and T<sub>2</sub> of 1989 there occurred a series of permutations, dismissals, and restorations within the compound of Romanian collective



memory that founded the political management of the past on radically different principles in comparison to those underpinning the Rollerian management of the Romanian past.

Finally, the last significant mutation within the structures of the national memory is currently in the making starting with the last decade and a half in Romanian society. The firm orientation towards Europeanization, democratization, and liberalization started with some delay after the change of political regime in 1989 redound upon the new identity Romanian political elites and cultural intelligentsia were struggling to impose in the collective consciousness. Europeanism, democratism, anti-communism – these have become, in time, the central axes along which the new Romanian identity is being built. In perfect conformity with the *law of the political updating of collective memory*, the past has become the subject of a refashioning project after the new identity mold promoted by the political agenda. The introduction of alternative textbooks changed the rules of the game, complicating the leverage of the state authorities in defining the reality of the national past. Following the supreme goal of integrating in the Euro-Atlantic structures, Romanian political elites once again put the didactic literature in the service of this goal, transforming the schoolbooks in general and history textbooks in particular in the carriers of the new Western values. However, when the producers of the discourse of the past crossed the line drawn by the state authorities by radicalizing the didactic message in the direction of a *postmodernist deconstructivism*, the state's mechanisms of control kicked in, eliminating from the discursive spectrum the undesirable voices (see, for instance, the “Sigma scandal” caused by the *History* textbook published by Mitu et al, 1999). Although the nation-state, through its human actors, continues to be on the defensive, protecting its foundational ideology that politically and historically legitimizes the state, Romanian society seems to have already entered under the flag of *post-nationalism*. “The fanatical faith” in the dogma of the national idea feverishly embraced in the interwar period exhausted its power of collective seduction. Didactic literature, and especially the discourse issued by history schoolbooks, now diffuses a *post-nationalist* ideological emission, in which collective identity condenses upon the support given by civic Europeanism and not on that of ethnic nationalism. The point on which collective identity is now concentrating moved towards the European super-level, while the belonging to the community of Western democratic values has gained priority over ethnic Romanian descendance.

## References

The bibliographic apparatus has been organized as to mirror the conceptual apparatus used throughout the theoretical body of the thesis. In order to maximize the clarity and to ease the navigation through the thick reference list, the works cited were divided in two main categories: a) *the avant-garde of the Romanian social political and historical reflection*, section grouping the works that launched seminal ideas in Romanian culture; b) *the arrièrè-garde of the societal consensus. Didactic literature* – representing the discourse expressing the interpretive orthodoxy of the time. For even more order, the works making up this latter category were grouped in four subcategories: i) *spelling books, readers, primers*; ii) *Romanians history textbooks*; iii) *miscellanea: legislation, references, yearbooks, etc.*; and iv) *databases and reports of public opinion polls*. The list detailing the specialty literature forms a distinct bibliographic category.

The reference section detailing the list made up of schoolbooks (spelling books, reading books, primers, history textbooks) is organized in accordance to chronological criteria. In contrast to all other sections, which are organized according to the nominal-alphabetical criterion (i.e. in the alphabetical order of the authors), I considered that in the case of didactic literature a chronological organization is more useful, making it more easy to follow. In brackets, after the title, is mentioned if the text was written in an alphabet other than the Latin one (i.e. with Cyrillic or transition characters). The titles are reproduced in the reference list in their original formulations, just as the quotations throughout the body of the thesis are.

### **The avant-garde of the Romanian social political and historical reflection**

\*\*\* (1881). *Proclamațiunea Resculareii Nationale de la 1848 în Capulă căreia s'a aflată Ion Heliade Radulescu*, București: Tipografia modernă, Grigorie Luis.

\*\*\* (1964). *Declarație cu privire la poziția Partidului Muncitoresc Român în problemele mișcării comuniste și muncitorești internaționale* adoptată de Plenara lărgită a C.C. al P.M.R. din aprilie 1964, București: Editura Politică.

\*\*\* (1975). *Programul Partidului Comunist Român de făurire a societății socialiste multilateral dezvoltate și înaintare a României spre comunism*. București: Editura Politică.

Aaron, F. (1835, 1837, 1838). *Idee repede de istoria Prințipatului Țării Rumânești*. 3 volume. București: În tipografia lui I. Eliad [With Cyrillic alphabet].

- Aaron, F. (1843). *Patria, patriotul și patriotismul*, București: Tipografia curții a lui Fr. Valbaum [Cu alfabet de tranziție].
- Bălcescu, N. (1894). *Istoria românilor sub Mihai Vodă Viteazul* (3 volume), însoțită de o precuvântare și note de Al. I. Odobescu, București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp. Edițiune școlară aprobată de Ministerul Instrucțiunii Publice și al Cultelor.
- Bărnuțiu, S. (1870). *Pedagogi'a*. Iasi: Tipariulu Tribunei Române.
- Blaa, L. (1921). Revolta fondului nostru nelatin. *Gândirea*, Anul I, numărul 10, 15 septembrie, 181-182.
- Bogdan, I. (1894). *Însemnătatea studiilor slave pentru români*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp.
- Brătianu, G.I. (1940). *O enigmă și un miracol: poporul român*. București: Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă „Regele Carol II”.
- Budai-Deleanu, I. (1991). *De originibus populorum Transylvaniae [Despre originile popoarelor din Transilvania]*. 2 volume. Ediție de Ladislau Gyémánt, cu o introducere de Ștefan Pascu și Ladislau Gyémánt; note și traducere de Ladislau Gyémánt. București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Ceașescu, N. (1971). *Propuneri de măsuri pentru îmbunătățirea activității politico-ideologice, de educare marxist-leninistă a membrilor de partid, a tuturor oamenilor muncii*. București: Editura Politică.
- Eliade, M. (1990). *Profetism românesc*. București: Roza Vânturilor.
- Giurescu, C.C. (1937). *Pentru „Vechea Școală” de istorie. Răspuns D-lui N. Iorga*. București.
- Goga, O. (1927). *Mustul care fierbe*. București: Imprimeria Statului.
- Haret, S. (1907). *Școala Naționalistă*. Extras din „Revista Generală a Învățământului”, Anul II, No. 6. București: Inst. de Arte Grafice „Carol Göbl”.
- Ionescu, N. (1930). A fi „bun român”. *Cuvântul*, 30 octombrie 1930.
- Iorga, N. (1936). *O școală nouă istorică*. Conferințe ținute la „Liga Culturală”. București.
- Iorga, N. (1972). *Bizanț după Bizanț*. București: Editura enciclopedică română.
- Kogălniceanu, M. (1837). *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie et des Valaques Transdanubiens*, Tome premiere, *Histoire de la Dacie, des Valaques Transdanubiens et de la Valachie. (1241-1792)*, Berlin: Librarie de B. Behr.
- Kogălniceanu, M. (1883). *Dorințele Partidei Naționale din Moldova*. Iași: Tipografia Națională.

- Kogălniceanu, M. (1946). *Opere. Tomul I: Scrieri istorice*. Ediție critică adnotată cu o introducere și note de Andrei Oțetea, București: Fundația regală pentru Literatură și Artă.
- Laurian, A.T. (1853). *Istoria Romanilor*. 3 volume, Iași [Cu alfabet de tranziție].
- Lovinescu, E. (1997). *Istoria civilizației române moderne*. București: Minerva.
- Maior, P. (1990). *Istoria pentru începutul romanilor în Dachia*. Iași: Junimea.
- Marin, V. (1937). *Crez de generație*. București: Tipografia Bucovina.
- Melidon, R.G. (1874). *Manualul învățietorului sau Elemente de pedagogie practica în usul școlilor populare*. Bucuresci: Tip. Naționala, ant. C. N. Rădulescu.
- Micu, S. (1995). *Istoria românilor*. 2 volume, Ediție princeps după manuscris, de Ioan Chindriș. București: Viitorul Românesc. Cuprinde *Istoria și lucrurile și întâmplările românilor* (1995a) și *Istoriia besericească a episcopiei românești din Ardeal* (1995b).
- Panaitescu, P.P. (1936). *Mihai Viteazul*. București: Fundația Regele Carol I.
- Papiu Ilarianu, A. (1852). *Istori'a Romanilor din Daci'a Superiore*. 2 volume, Viena: Cu literele lui C. Geroid și Fiiu.
- Papu, E. (1977). *Din clasicii noștri. Contribuții la ideea unui protocronism românesc*. București: Editura Eminescu.
- Petriceicu-Hasdeu, P. (1887-1898). *Etymologicum Magnum Romanicæ. Dicționarul limbei istorice și poporane a Românilor*. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic Socec & Teclu.
- Petriceicu-Hasdeu, P. (1894). *Basarabii. Cine? – De unde? – De când?*. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic I. V. Socec.
- Roller, M. (1951). *Probleme de istorie. Contribuții la lupta pentru o istorie științifică în R.P.R.* București: Editura Partidului Muncitoresc Român.
- Șincai, G. (1886). *Chronica Românilor și a mai multor nēmuri în cât Aũ fost ȳale așa de amestecate cu Româniĩ, cât lucrurile, întâmplările și faptele unora fără de ale altora nu se pot scrie pre înțeles. Din mai multe miĩ de autori, în cursul de 34 de ani, culése și după aniĩ dela nașterea Domnului Isus Hristos alcăruite*. Edițiunea a doua Tipărită de Ministeriul Cultelor și al Instrucțiuneĩ Publice. Bucuresci: Tipografia Academiei Române.
- Ureche, G. (1998). *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei*. București și Chișinău: Litera Internațional.

## The arrière-garde of the societal consensus. Didactic literature

### Spelling books, readers, primers

1797. *ABC sáu Bucavna spe folosul scolelor niamului Romanesc. ABC oder Namenbüchlein zum Gebrauche der Nazional-Schulen in dem Königreiche Ungarn.* Buda [In Romanian and German in parallel].
1828. Pleșoianu, Grigore. *Abecedar înlesnitor pentru învățătura copiilor* [With Cyrillic alphabet].
1829. Nicola, Iancu. *Manual de patriotism.* Iași [With Cyrillic alphabet].
1834. Aaron, Florian. *Catihismul omului creștin, moral și soțial pentru credința tinerilor din școalele începătoare.* București: În Tipografia lui Eliad [With Cyrillic alphabet]. Also consulted were the editions of the book from 1853 and 1873, the latter having the title *Miculu catechismu séu datoriiile omului creștinu, moralú și socialú: carte didactică autorisată de Ministeriul Instrucțiunii Publice și introdusă în modú obligatoriu în scólele primare de ambe sexse,* Bucuresci: Editura Librăriei Socek & Comp.
1838. Popescu-Scriban, Pitariu V. *Mică geografie a Daciei, Moldaviei și a Țerii Romînesci.* Eșii: În Tipografia Albineii [With Cyrillic alphabet].
1840. Gorjan, Gherasim Ion. *Școlaru sátean sau Cărticica coprinzătoare de învățături folositoare.* Bucuresci: Tipografia Pitarului Constantin Pencovici [With transition alphabet].
1853. Wilmsen, Friedrich Philipp. *Prietenul tinerimei: O carte de citire pentru școalele populare.* București: În tipografia lui F. Om [With transition alphabet].
1854. Bălășescu, Nifon. *Abecedariu pentru scólele începătoare.* Iași: Tipografia Româno-Francesă [With transition alphabet].
1858. Morariu-Andrievici, Silvestru. *Carte de cetire seaé Legendariu românesc: Pentru a treia clasă a școalelor poporene.* Viena: [Grund] [With transition alphabet].
1862. Wilmsen, Friedrich Philipp. *Prietenul tinerimei: Carte de cetire pentru skoalele populare.* Iassi: Tipografia Buciumului Romanu [With transition alphabet].
1864. Marin, Alexe. *Prima carte de lectură: Noțiuni simple assupra sciințelor, cullesse pentru usul classilor inferioare alle scholelor primare.* Bucuresci: Typhografia Theodor Vaidescu.
1868. Creangă, Ion. *Metóda nouă de scriere și cetire pentru usulu clasei I primară.* Iassy: Tipografia H.Goldner.

1870. Ștefănescu, Barbu. *Carte de lectură pentru clasa III primară: Cuprindând fabule cu morala lor, istorii morale și naționale, igienă, poezii*. București: Imprimeria Statului.
1878. Ionescu, Vasile. *Noul abecedar fonetic*. Iași: Librăria Dimitrie Daniel (Tipo-Litografia H. Goldner).
1880. Nestorescu, Vasile. *Abecedarul sau Povățuitorul la scrierea și citirea limbii române*. București: Librar-Editor, Leon Alcalay (Typografia Ștefan Mihalescu).
1885. Pârvulescu, M. *Poezii naționale și morale: Culese după diferiți autori: Pentru uzul școlilor primare de ambele-sexe*. Ploesci: Editura Librăriei George Carjean (Tipografia „Progresul”).
1894. Petri, Vasile. *Legendarul sau Carte de citire: pentru școlile populare. Partea I-ă: pentru alți 3-le și alți 4-le ani de școală*. Sibiu: Editura Autorului Vasile Petri.
1898. Odobescu, Alexandru I. și Borgovan, Vasile Grigore. *Carte de citire: pentru divizia a II-a a școlii primare rurale: Anul I și II*. București: Editura Librăriei H. Steinberg.
1899. Odobescu, Alexandru I. și Borgovan, Vasile Grigore. *Carte de citire: pentru clasa II primară urbană*. București: Editura Librăriei H. Steinberg.
1903. Laurian, Demetriu August. *Instrucțiune civică: Drept usual și economie politică: carte de școală: conformă cu programa clasei IV secundare*. București: Editura Tip. Gutenberg, Joseph Göbl.
1908. Coșbuc, G., Dima, G.A., Costescu, G.N., și Stoinescu, G. *Carte de citire: pentru divizia a III-a rurală: Anul al II-lea*. Craiova; București: Institutul Grafic „Samitca”; Tipografia Thoma Basilescu.
1913. Coșbuc, George, Dima, G.A., Pătrășcanu, D.D., Popescu, Spiridon, Stroescu, V. și Lupu, Ilie. *Carte de citire: pentru clasa a IV-a primară urbană*. București: Editura Institutului de Arte grafice „Flacăra”.
1913. Coșbuc, George, Dima, G.A., Pătrășcanu, D.D., Popescu, Spiridon, Stroescu, V. și Lupu, Ilie. *Carte de citire: pentru divizia a II-a rurală: Anul I și II*. București: Editura Institutului de Arte Grafice „Flacăra”.

### **Romanians history textbooks**

1839. Aaron, Florian. *Manual de istoria principatului României. Dela cele dintâi vremi istorice până în zilele de acum*. București: Tip. Colegiului Sf. Sava [With transition alphabet].

1845. Albineț, Ioan. *Manual de istoria Principatului Moldavei*. Iasi: Inst. Albinei [With Cyrillic alphabet].
1856. Laurian, August Treboniu. *Elemente de istorie și biografii: pentru classa II. a scólelor primare din Moldavia*. Iași: Tipografia Buciumului Român [With transition alphabet].
1857. Laurian, August Treboniu. *Elemente de istorie și biografii: pentru classa IV. a scólelor primare din Moldavia*. Iași: Tipografia Buciumului Român [With transition alphabet].
1861. Heliade Rădulescu, Ion. *Prescurtare de historia românilor sau Dacia și România*. București: Typographia Heliade și Asociați.
1862. Laurian, August Treboniu. *Elemente de istoria românilor: pentru Classile primarie*. București: Tipografia statului numită Nifon.
1864. Rusu, Ioan V. *Compendiu de Istori'a Transilvaniei cu distincta privire la romani*. Sibiu: Tiparitu si in comisiune la S. Filtsch.
1865. Rusu, Ioan V. *Elemente de istori'a Transilvaniei pentru învețiatorii și școalele populare romane*. Sibiu: Tipariu si in comisiune la S. Filtsch.
1866. Moldovan, Ioan Micu. *Istoria Ardealului, pentru scolele populare*. Blasiu: Cu Tipariul Seminariului.
1869. Heliade Rădulescu, Ion. *Elemente de Historia românilor sau Dacia și România*. București: Typographia Statului.
1870. Laurian, August Treboniu. *Elemente de istoria romanilor: pentru classile primarie*. București: Imprimeria Statului.
1876. Melidon, Georgiu Radu. *Istoria națională pentru popor și Némul, sapa, arma, casa și mintea Românilor prin toate timpurile și locurile*. București: Din stabilimentul în artele grafice Socec, Sander & Teclu.
1889. Tocilescu, Grigore G. *Istoria română: pentru scólele primare de ambe-sexe*. București: Imprimeria Statului.
1890. Xenopol, Alexandru D. *Istoria românilor: pentru clasele primare de ambe-sexe*. Iași: Editura Librăriei „Școalelor” Frații Șaraga.
1896. Tocilescu, Grigore G. *Istoria romanilor cu narațiuni, întrebări și rezumate: pentru classa IV-a urbană și a V-a rurală: Cursul superior*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Co.
1897. Xenopol, Alexandru D. *Curs de istoria românilor pentru școalele secundare întocmit după noul program*. Iași: Editura Librăriei Frații Șaraga și Tipografiei H. Goldner.

1910. Iorga, Nicolae. *Istoria Românilor pentru clasa a IV-a și a VIII-a secundară*. Ediția a II-a. Vălenii de Munte: „Neamul Românesc” Tipografie–Editură–Legătorie de cărți.
1923. Floru, Ion. *Istoria românilor: pentru clasa IV-a secundară*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Co.
1928. Constantinescu, N.A. *Istoria Românilor: pentru clasa IV secundară*. Ediția a doua. București: Cartea Românească.
1930. Floru, Ion. *Istoria românilor: pentru cursul superior de liceu*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Co.
1931. Floru, Ion. *Istoria românilor: pentru clasa III-a secundară*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Co.
1935. Petrescu, Marin, Ilie, Remus și Totoiu, Ion. *Istoria românilor pentru clasa VIII-a secundară*. București: Cartea Românească.
1935. Tafrales, Oreste. *Istoria românilor: Pentru clasa VIII-a secundară de băieți și fete*. București: Editura Ziarului „Universul”.
1936. Ilie, Remus. *Istoria Românilor*. București: Editura „Cugetarea”.
1937. David, R. *Istoria Românilor: pentru clasa a IV-a secundară a școlilor cu limba de predare germană*. Sibiu: Honterus.
1937. Patrașcanu, D.D. *Istoria Românilor: pentru clasa IV secundară*. București: Cultura Românească.
1939. Lambrino, Scarlat, Lazăr, Gheorghe și Arbore, Virgiliu P. *Istoria Românilor: pentru clasa VIII-a secundară*. București: Ed. Autorilor Asociați.
1942. Giurescu, Constantin C. *Istoria românilor: pentru clasa VIII-a secundară*. București: Cugetarea - Georgescu Delafras.
1952. Roller, Mihail. *Istoria R.P.R.* București: Editura de stat didactică și pedagogică.
1957. Almaș, Dumitru și Petric, Aron. *Istoria patriei: manual pentru clasa a IV-a*. București: Editura de Stat Didactică și Pedagogică. Also consulted were the editions of the same textbook from 1966, 1976, 1979, 1986, written starting with 1969 by Almaș, Dumitru and Fotescu, Eleonora.
1971. Dragne, Florea, Ionescu, Matei și Iordănescu, Aurel. *Istoria României: manual pentru clasa a VIII-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1972. Daicoviciu, Constantin; Constantinescu, Miron și Pascu, Ștefan. *Istoria României: manual pentru anul IV licee de cultură generală și de specialitate*. București: Editura de Stat Didactică și Pedagogică. Also consulted was the edition of the same textbook issued in 1979.



1977. Daicoviciu, Hadrian, Teodor, Pompiliu și Cîmpeanu, Ioan. *Istoria antică și medie a României: manual pentru clasa a VIII-a*. București: Editura de Stat Didactică și Pedagogică. Also consulted were the editions of the same textbook issued in 1984, 1991 and 1992.
1983. Petric, Aron și Ioniță, Gh. I. *Istoria contemporană a României: manual pentru clasa a X-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1988. Hurezeanu, Elisabeta, Smarandache, Gheorghe și Totu, Maria. *Istoria modernă a României: manual pentru clasa a IX-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1990. Panaitescu, Petre P. *Istoria românilor*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1993. Manea, Mihai și Teodorescu, Bogdan. *Istoria românilor. Epoca modernă și contemporană. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1994. Almaș, Dumitru. *Istoria românilor: manual pentru clasa a IV-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1994. Cristescu, Octavian, Pasailă, Vasile, Teodorescu, Bogdan și Tomi, Raluca. *Istoria Românilor. Epoca modernă și contemporană. Manual pentru clasa a VIII-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1994. Manea, Mihai și Teodorescu, Bogdan. *Istoria românilor de la 1821 până la 1989. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1994. Manea, Mihai, Pascu, Adrian T. și Teodorescu, Bogdan. *Istoria românilor: din cele mai vechi timpuri până la revoluția din 1821: manual pentru clasa a XI-a*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
1998. Ochescu, Maria și Oane, Sorin. *Istoria românilor. Manual pentru clasa a IV-a*. București: Teora.
1998. Vulpe, Alexandru, Păun, Radu G., Băjenaru, Radu și Grosu, Ioan. *Istoria Românilor VIII* [pe pagina de gardă figurează titlul mai convențional *Istoria Românilor. Manual pentru clasa a VIII-a*]. București: Sigma.
1999. Dumitrescu, Nicoleta, Manea, Mihai și Niță, Cristian. *Istoria românilor. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a*. București: Humanitas Educațional.
1999. Mitu, Sorin, Copoeru, Lucia, Țîrău, Liviu, Țîrău, Virgiliu și Pecican, Ovidiu. *Istoria românilor: manual pentru clasa a XII-a*. București: Sigma.
1999. Scurtu, Ioan, Curculescu, Marian, Dincă, Constantin și Soare, Aurel Constantin. *Istoria românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri până astăzi. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a*. București: Petrion.

2000. Brezeanu, Stelian, Cioroianu, Adrian, Müller, Florin, Căpiță, Carol și Retegan, Mihai.  
*Istoria românilor. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a.* București: Rao Educațional.
2006. Giurescu, Dinu Constantin, Berciu-Drăghicescu, Adina și Grigore, Simona Daniela.  
*Istorie: manual pentru clasa a IV-a.* București: Sigma.

### **Miscellanea: legislation, references, yearbooks, etc.**

- \*\*\* (1864). *Legea asupra instrucțiunii* – Lege nr. 1.150 din 25 noiembrie 1864 publicată în Monitorul Oficial din 25 noiembrie 1864.
- \*\*\* (1924). *Legea învățământului primar al statului și învățământului normal-primar*, publicată în Monitorul Oficial din 26 iunie 1924.
- \*\*\* (1925). *Legea asupra învățământului particular* prin care se stabilesc scopul și categoriile de școli particulare, administrarea și funcționarea acestora, limba de predare etc., publicată în Monitorul Oficial nr. 283 din 22 decembrie 1925.
- \*\*\* (1928). *Legea nr. 79/1928 pentru învățământul secundar*, publicată în Monitorul Oficial, Partea I nr. 105 din 15 mai 1928.
- \*\*\* (1948). *Decretul nr. 175 pentru reforma învățământului*, publicat în Monitorul Oficial, Partea I nr. 177 din 3 august 1948.
- \*\*\* (1968). *Lege nr. 11 din 13 mai 1968 privind învățământul în Republica Socialistă România*, publicată în Buletinul Oficial nr. 62 din 13 mai 1968.
- \*\*\* (1978). *Lege nr. 28 din 21 decembrie 1978 – Legea educației și învățământului*, publicată în Buletinul Oficial nr. 113 din 26 decembrie 1978.
- \*\*\* (1995). *Legea învățământului* – Legea Nr. 84 din 24 iulie 1995, Republicată în Monitorul Oficial al României nr. 606 din 10 decembrie 1999.
- \*\*\* (1999). *Legea nr. 151 din 30 iulie 1999 privind aprobarea Ordonanței de urgență a Guvernului nr. 36/1997 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii învățământului nr. 84/1995.*
- Angelescu, C. (1926). *Activitatea Ministerului Instrucțiunii: 1922-1926.* București: Cartea Românească.
- Angelescu, C. (1939). *Evoluției învățământului primar și secundar în ultimii 20 de ani.* București: Imprimeriile „Curentul”.
- Antonescu, G.G. și Gabrea, I.I. (1933). *Organizarea învățământului în România–Albania–Anglia–Austria–Belgia–Bulgaria–Cehoslovacia–Danemarca–Elvația–Finlanda–Franța–Germania–Grecia–Irlanda–Italia–Jugoslavia–Japonia–Norvegia–Olanda–*

*Polonia–Portugalia–Rusia Sovietică–Scoția–Spania–Statele Unite–Suedia–Turcia–  
Ungaria*. București: Editura „Institutului Pedagogic Român”.

Bârsănescu, Ș. și Bârsănescu, F. (1978). *Dicționar cronologic: Educația, învățământul,  
gândirea pedagogică din România*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Bordeianu, M. (1979). *Învățământul românesc în date*. Iași: Junimea.

Bunescu, G. (Coord.). (2004). *Antologia legilor învățământului din România*. București:  
Institutul de Științe ale Educației.

Comisia Națională pentru Statistică. (1991). *Anuarul Statistic al României 1991*. București.

Human Development Indicators. (1990). În *Human Development Report 1990* (pp. 124-161),  
Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), New York și  
Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manolache A. și Pârnuță G. (Coord.). (1993). *Istoria învățământului din România, Vol. II.  
1821-1918*. București: Editura Didactică și Enciclopedică.

Marga, A. (1999). *Educația în tranziție*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.

Marga, A. (2007). *Anii reformei 1997-2000*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Fundației pentru Studii  
Europene.

Miroiu, A., Pasti, V. și Ivan, G. (1998). *Învățământul românesc azi: studiu de diagnoză*. Iași:  
Polirom.

Pascu, Ș. (Coord.). (1983). *Istoria învățământului din România, Vol. I. De la origini până la  
1821*. București: Editura Didactică și Enciclopedică.

Ștrempel, G. (Coord.). (1984). *Bibliografia Românească Modernă 1831-1918, Vol. I. A-C*.  
București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Ștrempel, G. (Coord.). (1986). *Bibliografia Românească Modernă 1831-1918, Vol. II. D-K*.  
București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Ștrempel, G. (Coord.). (1989). *Bibliografia Românească Modernă 1831-1918, Vol. III. L-Q*.  
București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Ștrempel, G. (Coord.). (1996). *Bibliografia Românească Modernă 1831-1918, Vol. IV. R-Z*.  
București: Editura Academiei Române.

### **Databases and reports of public opinion polls**

Biroul de cercetări sociale. (2009). *20 ani de la evenimentele din 1989*. Sondaj de opinie  
publică finanțat de Marsh Copsey + Associates, Inc. – Washington DC, SUA, 15 – 19  
octombrie 2009.

- BOP. (1998-2004). *Barometrul de Opinie Publică*, Baza de date consolidată 1998-2004. Fundația Soros România, București.
- BOP. (2005-2007). *Barometrele de Opinie Publică*, Bazele de date din mai 2005, noiembrie 2005, mai 2006, octombrie 2006, mai 2007, octombrie 2007, Fundația Soros România, București.
- EVS. (2011). *European Values Study Longitudinal Data File 1981-2008* (EVS 1981-2008). GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA4804 Data file Version 2.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.11005.
- IICCMER. (2010). *Atitudini și opinii despre regimul comunist din România*. Sondaj de opinie publică, CSOP, 20 septembrie 2010.
- IRES. (2010). *Nostalgia trecutului. Sacrificiile prezentului*. Sondaj de opinie publică, Institutul Român pentru Evaluare și Strategie, 1-3 iulie 2010.
- Rose, R. (2010). *New Europe Barometer I-XV Trend Dataset, 1991-2007*. 2nd Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive. SN: 5241.
- Rose, R. și Mishler, W. (2007). *New Europe Barometer VII, 2004-2005*. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive. SN: 5243.

### **Specialty literature: books and articles**

- Abraham, F. (2008). Raportul Comisiei Tismăneanu: analiză istoriografică. În V. Ernu, C. Rogozanu, C. Siulea și O. Tichindeleanu (Eds.). *Iluzia anticomunismului: Lecturi critice ale Raportului Tismăneanu* (pp. 7-42), Chișinău: Cartier.
- Abric, J.C. (1993). Central System, Peripheral System: Their Functions and Roles in the Dynamics of Social Representations. *Papers on Social Representations*, 2(2), 75-78.
- Adler, P.A. și Adler, P. (1998). *Moving Backwards în Ethnography at the Edge: Crime, Deviance, and Field Research*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Administrația Prezidențială, Comunicat de presă, 20 Aprilie 2006, available online at <http://presidency.ro/?RID=det&tb=date&id=7386&PRID=ag>, last accessed in 3 July 2013.
- Adorno, T.W. (1986). What does coming to terms with the past mean?. În G. Hartman (Ed.). *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective* (pp. 114-129), Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Agabrian, M. (2006). *Analiza de conținut*. Iași: Polirom.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. Notes towards an Investigation. În L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Monthly

Review Press, available online at <http://www.marxistsfr.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>, last accessed in 10 October 2013.

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities*. Londra și New York: Verso.
- Anderson, N. (1923). *The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Andreescu, G. (2003). *Extremismul de dreapta în România*. Cluj-Napoca: Centrul de resurse pentru diversitate etnoculturală.
- Appadurai, A. (1981). The Past as Scarce Resource. *Man*, 16(2), 201-219.
- Aristotel. (2007). *Metafizica*. București: Humanitas.
- Assmann, A. (2002). Canon and Archive. În A. Erll și A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 97-108). Berlin și New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Assmann, A. (2008). Transformations between History and Memory. *Social Research*, 75(1), 49-72.
- Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, A. și Shortt, L. (2012). Memory and Political Change: Introduction. În A. Assmann și L. Shortt (Eds.), *Memory and Political Change* (pp. 1-16), Palgrave Macmillan.
- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125-133.
- Assmann, J. (1997). *Moses the Egyptian. The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Assmann, J. (2006). *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Assmann, J. (2008). Communicative and Cultural Memory. În A. Erll și A. Nünning (Eds.). *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 109-118). Berlin și New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Bachelard, G. (2002). *The Formation of the Scientific Mind. A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*. Manchester: Clinamen Press.
- Balibar, E. (1996). The Nation Form: History and Ideology. În G. Eley și R.G. Suny (Eds.). *Becoming National: A Reader* (pp. 132-150), Oxford și New York: Oxford University Press.

- Barbu, D. (2008). O istoria naturală a comunismului. În V. Ernu, C. Rogozanu, C. Siulea și O. Tichindeleanu. (Eds.), *Iluzia anticomunismului: Lecturi critice ale Raportului Tismăneanu* (pp. 71-104), Chișinău: Cartier.
- Barnes, J.A. (1990). *Models and Interpretations*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartlett, F.C. (1932). *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bastide, R. (1978). *The African Religions of Brazil: Toward a Sociology of the Interpenetration of Civilizations*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Băban, A. (2002). *Metodologia cercetării calitative*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Bădescu, G., Comșa, M., Gheorghită, A., Stănuș, C., Tufiș, C.D. (2010). *Implicarea civică și politică a tinerilor*. Constanța: Editura Dobrogea.
- Bell, D.S.A. (2003). Mythscapes: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity. *British Journal of Sociology*, 54, 63–81.
- Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S.M. (1985): *Habits of Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles și Londra: University of California Press.
- Benda, J. (1993). *Trădarea cărturarilor*. București: Humanitas.
- Bentley, J.H. (1996). Cross-Cultural Interaction and Periodization in World History. *The American Historical Review*, 101(3), 749-770.
- Berger, P.L. (1963). *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. New York: Doubleday.
- Berger, P.L. (1967). *The Sacred Canopy. Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Berger, P.L. și Kellner, H. (1964). Marriage and the Construction of Reality: An Exercise in the Microsociology of Knowledge. *Diogenes*, 46, 1-23.
- Berger, P.L. și Luckman, T. (2008). *Construirea socială a realității. Tratat de sociologia cunoașterii*. București: Editura Art.
- Berger, P.L. și Zijderveld, A. (2009). *In Praise of Doubt: How to Have Convictions Without Becoming a Fanatic*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bishai, L. (2000). Forgetting Ourselves: Nietzsche, Critical History, and the Politics of Collective Memory. Paper presented at *Political Studies Association-UK 50th Annual Conference*, 10-13 aprilie 2000, Londra.

- Bodnar, J. (1992). *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boia, L. (1995). Istorie și ideologie națională, în L. Boia (Ed.). *Mituri istorice românești* (pp. 7-30). București: Editura Universității București.
- Boia, L. (1997). *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*. București: Humanitas.
- Boia, L. (2011). *Istoria și mit în conștiința românească*. Ediția a treia. București: Humanitas.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The Forms of Capital. În J. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258), New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J.C., și Passeron, J.C. (1991). *The Craft of Sociology. Epistemological Preliminaries*. Berlin și New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Braudel, F. (1982). *On History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Contemporary Nationalism: Civic, Ethnocultural, and Multicultural Politics*. Londra: Routledge.
- Buier, N. (2007). *Officializing the Past. An Analysis of the Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania*. Lucrare de disertație, Budapesta: Central European University.
- Burke, P. (1990) *The French Historical Revolution. The Annales School, 1929-89*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burke, P. (1992). Overture: the New History, its Past and its Future. In P. Burke (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (pp. 1-24). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Burke, P. (1992). Preface. În M. Bloch. *The Historian's Craft* (pp. vii-xviii). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Burke, P. (2011). History as Social Memory. În J.K. Olick, V. Vinitzky-Seroussi și D. Levy (Eds.). *The Collective Memory Reader* (pp. 188-192), Oxford și New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butterfield, H. (1931). *The Whig Interpretation of History*. Londra: G. Bell.
- Cahill, T. (1995) *How The Irish Saved Civilization (Hinges of History)*. New York: Doubleday.

- Campbell, D.T. (1969). Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-Scale Model of Omniscience. În M. Sherif și C.W. Sherif (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences* (pp. 328-348). Chicago: Aldine.
- Carlyle, T. (1841). *On Heroes, Hero Worship & the Heroic in History. Six Lectures*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- Câmpeanu, P. (1993). *De patru ori în fața urnelor*. București: All.
- Cesereanu, R. (2005). *Gulagul în conștiința românească. Memorialistică și literatura închisorilor și lagărelor comuniste (eseu de mentalitate)*. Iași: Polirom.
- Chelcea, S. (1996). Memoria socială. În A. Neculau (Ed.), *Psihologie socială: aspecte contemporane* (pp. 109-122). Iași: Polirom.
- Chelcea, S. (2001) *Metodologia cercetării sociologice: Metode cantitative și calitative*. București: Editura Economică.
- Chelcea, S. (2006). *Psihosociologie. Teorie și aplicații*. București: Editura Economică.
- Chirot, D. (1975). The Market, Tradition and Peasant Rebellion: The Case of Romania in 1907. *American Sociological Review*, 40(4), 428-444.
- Ciobanu, M. (2009). Criminalising the past and reconstructing collective memory: the Romanian truth commission. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 61 (2), 313-336.
- Cioflâncă, A. (2010). Nostalgia pentru comunism. *Revista 22* (28 septembrie 2010), available online at <http://www.revista22.ro/nostalgia-pentru-comunism-8962.html>, last accessed in 3 July 2013.
- Comisia Prezidențială pentru Analiza Dictaturii Comuniste din România (2006). *Raport Final*, available online at [http://www.presidency.ro/static/ordine/RAPORT\\_FINAL\\_CPADCR.pdf](http://www.presidency.ro/static/ordine/RAPORT_FINAL_CPADCR.pdf), last accessed in 2 July 2013.
- Comte, A. (1999). *Discurs asupra spiritului pozitiv*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Connerton, P. (2008). Seven types of forgetting. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 59-71.
- Connerton, P. (2009). *How Modernity Forgets*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Constantiniu, F. (2011) *O istorie sinceră a poporului român*. Ediția a patra. București: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Cooley, C.H. (1902). *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York: C. Scribner's sons.
- Cooley, C.H. (1918). *Social Process*. New York: C. Scribner's sons.
- Cornea, P. (1973). *Originile romantismului românesc: spiritul public, mișcarea ideilor și literatura între 1780-1840*. București: Cartea Românească.



- Coser, L.A. (1992). The Revival of the Sociology of Culture: The Case of Collective Memory. *Sociological Forum*, 7(2), 365-373.
- Croce, B. (1921). *Theory & History of Historiography*. Londra: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd.
- Culic, I. (2002). *Câștigătorii: elita politică și democratizare în România: 1989-2000*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes.
- Culic, I. (2005). Re-Writing the History of Romania after the Fall of Communism. *History Compass*, 3(1), 1-21.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Diaconescu, M.G. (2004). Gândirea politică a lui Ștefan Jósika, cancelarul principelui Sigismund Báthory (Paternitatea unei idei politice: unirea Transilvaniei cu Țara Românească și Moldova). *Acta Transylvanica. Anuarul Centrului de Istorie a Transilvaniei*, vol. I, 17-42.
- Djuvaru, N. (2008). *Există istorie adevărată?* București: Humanitas.
- Dobrincu, D. și Iordachi, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Țărănimea și puterea: procesul de colectivizare a agriculturii în România (1949-1962)*. Iași: Polirom.
- Docea, V. (2010). History, Ideology and Collective Memory. Reconstructing the Identities of Timișoara by Means of Monographies and Street Names during the Communist Regime (1947-1989). *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae. European and Regional Studies*, 1(1), 83-102.
- Dogan, M. și Pahre, R. (1997). *Noile Științe Sociale. Interpenetrarea disciplinelor*. București: Editura Alternativ.
- Douglas, M. (1986). *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Dragnea, M. (2001). Reformele lui Cuza: schimbarea la față a României. *Historia.*, available online at [http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv\\_web/general/articol/reformele-lui-cuza-schimbarea-fa-romaniei](http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/general/articol/reformele-lui-cuza-schimbarea-fa-romaniei), last accessed in 10 October 2013.
- Dumitran, D. (2004). Reacții transilvănene la edictul de toleranță iosefin, *Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Historica*, 8, 87-98.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *Formele elementare ale vieții religioase*. Iași: Polirom.
- Durkheim, E. (2002). *Regulile metodei sociologice*. Iași: Polirom.
- Eastman, L. (1990). *The Abortive Revolution: China Under Nationalist Rule, 1927-1937*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ebbinghaus, H. (1913). *Memory: A Contribution to Experimental Psychology*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, available online at

<http://psy.ed.asu.edu/~classics/Ebbinghaus/index.htm>, last accessed in 10 October 2013.

- Eldredge, N. și Gould, S.J. (1972). Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism. În T.J. Schopf (Ed.), *Models in Paleobiology* (pp. 82-115). San Francisco: Cooper & Co.
- Elias, N. (1956). Problems of Involvement and Detachment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 7(3), 226-252.
- Elias, N. (2002). *Procesul civilizării. Cercetări sociogenetice și psihogenetice*. Vol. I: *Transformări ale conduitei în straturile laice superioare ale lumii occidentale*, Vol. II: *Transformări ale societății. Schița unei teorii a civilizării*. Iași: Polirom.
- Elster, J. (2004). *Closing the Books: Transitional Justice in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Ernu, V., Rogozanu, C., Siulea, C. și Tichindeleanu, O. (Eds). 2008. *Iluzia anticomunismului: Lecturi critice ale Raportului Tismăneanu*. Chișinău: Cartier.
- Evans, R.J. (1997). *In Defence of History*. Londra: Granta Books.
- Febre, L. (1982). *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: The Religion of Rabelais*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1975). *Against Method*. Londra și New York: Verso.
- Flaherty, M. și Fine, G.A. (2001). Present, Past, and Future: Conjugating George Herbert Mead's perspective on time. *Time & Society*, 10(2-3), 147-161.
- Flonta, M. (2004). Studiu introductiv. În B. Russel. *Problemele filosofiei* (pp. vii-xxi), București: Editura All.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice: selected essays and interviews*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. În C. Gordon (Ed.). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writing 1972-1977* (pp. 109-133), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1998). *Ordinea discursului: un discurs despre discurs*. București: Eurosong & Book.
- Foucault, M. (1999). *Arheologia cunoașterii*. București: Univers.
- Frisch, M. (1989). American History and the Structures of Collective Memory: A Modest Exercise in Empirical Iconography. *The Journal of American History*, 75(4), 1130-1155.
- Gallagher, T. (2004). *Furtul unei națiuni. România de la comunism încoace*. București: Humanitas.

- Gallie, W.B. (1956). Essentially Contested Concepts. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 56, 167-198.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Ideology as a Cultural System. În *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (pp. 193-233), New York: Basic Books.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gellner, E. (1988). *Plough, Sword and Book: The Structure of Human History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Georgescu, V. (1992). *The Romanians. A History*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Georgescu, V. (2008). *Politică și istorie: cazul comuniștilor români 1994-1977*. București: Humanitas.
- Gerth, H.H. și Mills, W.C. (1946). Introduction: The Man and His Work. În *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 3-74). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gheorghiuță, A. (2010). Trecutul comunist în conștiința adolescenților, în G. Bădescu et al, *Implicarea civică și politică a tinerilor* (pp. 64-71). Constanța: Editura Dobrogea.
- Ghibu, O. (1975). *Din istoria literaturii didactice românești*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Gillis, J.R. (1994). Memory and Identity: The history of a Relationship. În J.R. Gillis (Ed.), *Commemorations. The Politics of National Identity* (pp. 3-24). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Glass, J., Bengtson, V.L. și Dunham, C.C. (1986). Attitude Similarity in Three-Generation Families: Socialization, Status Inheritance, or Reciprocal Influence? *American Sociological Review*, 51(5), 685-698.
- Goina, C. (2000). *The ethnicization of politics: the case of Targu-Mures, 1990*. Teză de disertație, Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Goldthorpe, G.H. (1991). The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on some Recent Tendencies, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42, 211-230.
- Goody, J. (2006). *The Theft of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenfeld, L. (1992). *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and conversation. În P. Cole și J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58.), New York: Academic Press.

- Grosescu, R. și Ursachi, R. (2009). *Justiția penală de tranziție. De la Nurnberg la postcomunismul românesc*. Iași: Polirom.
- Gross, P. și Tismăneanu, V. (2005). The End of Postcommunism in Romania. *Journal of Democracy*, 16(2), 146-162.
- Habermas, J. (2005). *Sfera publică și transformarea ei structurală*. București: comunicare.ro
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. Chicago și Londra: The University of Chicago Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (2007). *Memoria colectivă*. Iași: Institutul European.
- Haugen, E.I. (1966). Linguistics and Language Planning. În W. Bright (Ed.). *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference 1964* (pp. 50-71), The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Hitchins, C. (1987). *Conștiința națională și acțiune politică la românii din Transilvania, 1700-1868*, Volumul I, Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.
- Hitchins, C. (1998a). *Românii 1774-1866*. București: Humanitas.
- Hitchins, C. (1998b). *România 1866-1944*. București: Humanitas.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1983). Introduction: Inventing Tradition. În E.J. Hobsbawm și T. Ranger (Eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (pp. 1-14), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1983). Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914. În E.J. Hobsbawm și T. Ranger (Eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (pp. 263-308), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1997). *On History*. New York: The New Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. și Ranger, T. (1983). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howards, J.E. (1986) The New Historicism in Literary Studies. *English Literary Renaissance*, 16(1), 13-43.
- Hroch, M. (1985). *Social Preconditions National Revival in Europe. A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Huntington, S.P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hutchison, J. și Smith, A.D. (1994). *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ianoș, N.R. (2010). *Educația în învățământul primar român din Transilvania (1850-1870)*, Teză de doctorat, Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Iluț, P. (1997). *Abordarea calitativă a socioumanului: concepte și metode*. Iași: Polirom.
- Iluț, P. (2000). *Iluzia localismului și localizarea iluziei. Teme actuale de psihosociologie*. Iași: Polirom.
- Iluț, P. (2009). *Psihologie socială și sociopsihologie*. Iași: Polirom.
- Iluț, P. (2011). The necessity of complementarity in socio-human sciences. *International Colloquium of Social Sciences ACUM*, 5(2), 9-13.
- Iluț, P. și Rusu, M.S. (2013). Sociologia postmodernă și capcanele teoretizării *haute couture*. În P. Iluț (Ed.). *În căutare de principii. Epistemologie și metodologie socială aplicată* (pp. 91-112), Iași: Polirom.
- Ingrao, C. (2009). Weapons of Mass Instruction: Schoolbooks and Democratization in Multiethnic Central Europe. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 1(1), 180-189.
- Jack, F. și Hayne, H. (2007). Eliciting adults' earliest memories: does it matter how we ask the question?. *Memory*, 15(6), 647-63.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jarman, D., D'Amico, S.C. și Ward-Jackson, N. (1986). *Caravaggio*, DVD. Directed by Derek Jarman, British Film Institute (BFI).
- Jelin, E. (2003). *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jenkins, K. și Munslow, A. Introduction, În K. Jenkins și A. Munslow (Eds.). *The Nature of History Reader* (pp. 1-18). Londra: Routledge.
- Karnouh, C. (2011). *Inventarea poporului-națiune: cronici din România și Europa Orientală: 1973-2007*. Cluj-Napoca: Ideea Design & Print.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Thousand Oaks, Londra, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Kuhn, T.S. (2008). *Structura revoluțiilor științifice*. București: Humanitas.

- Lakatos, I. (1978). *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. Philosophical Papers Volume 1*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Laudan, L. (1978). *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley, Los Angeles și Londra: University of California Press.
- Laudan, L. (1978). *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth*. Berkeley și Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Le Goff, J. (1992). *History and Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lenin, V.I. (1964). Revoluția socialistă și dreptul națiunilor la autodeterminare. În *Opere complete*. Vol. 27 (pp. 260-274), București: Editura Politică.
- Lenski, G. (2002). *Putere și privilegii: o teorie a stratificării sociale*. Timișoara: Amarcord.
- Leroi-Gourhan, A. (1993). *Gesture and Speech*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lewis, B. (1975). *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lewis, B. (2008). The Periodization of History. Prelegere ținută la Universitatea Tel Aviv în 7 ianuarie 2008.
- Livezeanu, I. (1998). *Cultură și naționalism în România Mare: 1918-1930*. București: Humanitas.
- Locke, J. (1961). *Eseu asupra intelectului omenesc*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Lowenthal, D. (1998). *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: Free Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (2002). *Trecutul este o țară străină*. București: Curtea Veche Publishing.
- Löwy, M. (1976). Marxists and the national question. *New Left Review*, I/96, 81-100.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1993) *Condiția postmodernă: raport asupra cunoașterii*. București: Editura Babel.
- Maier, C.S. (1988). *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maines, D.R., Sugrue, N.M. și Katovich, M.A. (1983). The Sociological Import of G.H. Mead's Theory of the Past. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 161-173.
- Malinowski, B. (2004). Myth in Primitive Psychology. În *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays* (pp. 72-124), New York: The Free Press.
- Mannheim, K. (1952). The Sociological Problem of Generations. În *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 276-323), Londra: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Marcu, O. (2011). Funcția educativă a istoriei la Aaron Florian (1805-1887), *Transilvania*, nr. 6-7, 114-122.

- Marx, K. (1960). Optsprezece brumar al lui Ludovic Bonaparte. În K. Marx și F. Engels, *Opere*, Vol. 8 (pp. 115-227), București: Editura Politică.
- Marx, K. și Engles, F. (1958). Manifestul Partidului Comunist. În K. Marx și F. Engels, *Opere*, Vol. 4 (pp. 461-500), București: Editura Politică.
- Mârza, I. (1982-1983). Manuale de istorie folosite la școlile din Transilvania între mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea și mijlocul secolului al XIX-lea. *Sargetia*, XVI-XVII, 577-605.
- McNeill, W.H. (1986). Mythistory, or Truth, Myth, History, and Historians, *American Historical Review*, 91, 1-10.
- Mead, G.H. (1929). The Nature of the Past. În J. Coss (Ed.), *Essays in Honor of John Dewey*. New York, NY: Henry Holt & Co., available online at [http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Mead/pubs2/papers/Mead\\_1929d.html](http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Mead/pubs2/papers/Mead_1929d.html), last accessed in 10 October 2013.
- Mead, G.H. (1932). *The Philosophy of the Present*. LaSalle, IL: Open Court.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, R.K. (1973). The Normative Structure of Science. În *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* (pp. 223-280), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Middleton, D. (1987). Collective Memory and Remembering: Some Issues and Approaches, in *The Quaterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 9(1), 2-5.
- Mills, C.W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C.W. (1975). *Imaginația sociologică*. București: Editura Politică.
- Misztal, B.A. (2003). *Theories of Social Remembering*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Mitu, S. (1997). *Geneza identității naționale la românii ardeleni*. București: Humanitas.
- Mullaney, J. (2001). Like A Virgin: Temptation, Resistance, and the Construction of Identities Based on “Not Doings”. *Qualitative Sociology*, 24(1), 3-24.
- Murgescu, M.-L. (1999). *Între „bunul creștin” și „bravul român”. Rolul școlii primare în construirea identității naționale românești (1831-1878)*. Iași: Editura A'92.
- Neusner, J. (1996). *The Presence of the Past, the Pastness of the Present: History, Time, and Paradigm in Rabbinic Judaism*. Bethesda, MA: Capital Decisions Limited.
- Nicolescu, B. (1999). *Transdisciplinaritatea (manifest)*. Iași: Polirom.

- Nietzsche, F. (1994). *A doua considerație inoportună. Despre folosul și neajunsurile istoriei pentru viață*. București: Ararat.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations*, 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory, 7-24.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Olick, J.K. (1998). What does it mean to normalize the past? Official memory in German politics since 1989. *Social Science History*, 22 (4), 547-571.
- Olick, J.K. (1999). Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory*, 17(3), 333-348.
- Olick, J.K. (2006). Products, Processes, and Practices: A Non-Reificatory Approach to Collective Memory. *Biblical Theology Bulletin: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 36(5), 5-14.
- Olick, J.K. (2007). 'Collective memory': A memoir and prospect. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 19-25.
- Olick, J.K. și Levy, D. (1997). Collective Memory and Cultural Constraint: Holocaust Myth and Rationality in German Politics, *American Sociological Review*, 62(6), 921-936.
- Olick, J.K. și Robbins, J. (1998). Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 105-140.
- Olick, J.K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. și Levy, D. (Eds.). (2011). *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford și New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ornea, Z. (1996). *Anii treizeci: Extrema dreapta românească*. Ediție revăzută. București: Editura Fundației Culturale Române.
- Pascu, Ș. și Gyémánt, L. (1991). Studiu introductiv. În I. Budai-Deleanu. *De Originibus Populorum Transylvaniae [Despre Originile Popoarelor din Transilvania]*. București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Pârâianu, R. (2002). National Prejudices, Mass Media and History Textbooks: The Mitu Controversy. În B. Trencsényi, D. Petrescu, C. Petrescu, C. Iordachi și Z. Kántor (Eds.). *Nation-Building and Contested Identities Romanian & Hungarian Case Studies* (pp. 93-117), Budapesta/Iași: Regio Books/Polirrom.



- Peirce, C.S. (1931). CP 1.13, 1.37, 1.141 în *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, C. Hartshorne și P. Weiss (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Petre, Z. (2010). Cum au reinventat istoricii comuniști biografia lui Burebista. *Historia*, 99, available online at [http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv\\_web/general/articol/cum-au-reinventat-istoricii-comunisti-biografia-lui-burebista](http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/general/articol/cum-au-reinventat-istoricii-comunisti-biografia-lui-burebista), accesat 10 octombrie 2013.
- Petreu, M. (2009). *Diavolul și ucenicul său: Nae Ionescu - Mihail Sebastian*. Iași: Polirom.
- Phillips, N. și Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction* (Vol. 50). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Pleșa, L. (2006). Mihail Roller și „stalinizarea” istoriografiei românești. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Historica*, 10(1), 165-177.
- Plumb, J. D. (1969). *The Dead of the Past*. New York: Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Popper, K.R. (1981). *Logica cercetării*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Popper, K.R. (2005). *Societatea deschisă și dușmanii ei*. Vol I: *Vraja lui Platon*, Vol. II: *Epoca marilor profeții - Hegel și Marx*. București: Humanitas.
- Popular Memory Group. (1998). Popular memory: Theory, politics, method. În R. Perks și A. Thomson (Eds.). *The Oral History Reader* (pp. 75-86), Londra și New York: Routledge.
- Prager, J. (2001). Collective Memory, Psychology of. În N. Smelser și P.B. Baltes, (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 2223-2227), Elsevier Science.
- Prodan, D. (1984). *Supplex Libellus Valachorum. Din istoria formării națiunii române*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Ranger, T. (1993). The Invention of Tradition Revisited: The Case of Colonial Africa În T. Ranger și O. Vaughan (Eds.). *Legitimacy and State in Twentieth Century* (pp. 62-111), Londra: Macmillan.
- Renan, E. (1990). What is a Nation? În H.K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and Narration* (pp. 8-22). Londra și New York: Routledge.
- Rezachevici, C. (2000). Legenda și substratul ei istoric. Mihai Viteazul "Restitutor Daciae"?. *Magazin Istoric*, Octombrie 2000, available online at <http://web.archive.org/web/20071121152143/http://www.itcnet.ro/history/archive/mi2000/current10/mi8.htm>, last accessed in 10 October 2013.
- Richardson, J. (2008). Nietzsche's Problem of the Past. În M. Dries (Ed.). *Nietzsche on Time and History* (pp. 87-112), De Gruyter.
- Ricœur, P. (2001). *Memoria, istoria, uitarea*. Timișoara: Amarcord.

- Roper, S.D. (2000). *Romania: The Unfinished Revolution*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic
- Rosenau, P.M. (1992). *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences. Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rotariu, T. (2013). Sociologia ca știință. În P. Iluț (Ed.). *În căutare de principii: epistemologie și metodologie socială aplicată* (pp. 27-61), Iași: Polirom.
- Rotariu, T. și Iluț, P. (2006). *Ancheta sociologică și sondajul de opinie*. Ediția a doua. Iași: Polirom.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1957). *Contractul social*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Rusu, M.S. (2011). The Colonization of the Past and the Construction of Mnemonic Order. *Studia UBB Sociologia*, 46(2), 39-57.
- Ryan, D. (2005). Time and Social Theory. În *The Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (pp. 837-840). Thousand Oaks, Londra, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Samuel, R. (1994). *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. Londra și New York: Verso.
- Schacter, D.L, Gilbert, D.T. și Wegner, D.M. (2009). *Psychology*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Schifirneș, C. (2004). *Formele fără fond, un brand românesc*. București: comunicare.ro
- Schudson, M. (1987). Preservation of the Past in Mental Life, *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 9(1), 5-11.
- Schudson, M. (1989). The Present in the Past versus the Past in the Present. *Communication*, 11, 105-113.
- Schudson, M. (1995). Dynamics of Distorsion in Collective Memory. În D.L. Schacter (Ed.), *Memory Distortion: How Minds, Brains, and Societies Reconstruct the Past* (pp. 346-364). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, B. (1996). Introduction: The Expanding Past. *Qualitative Sociology*, 19(3), 275-282.
- Schwartz, B. (1996). Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War II, *American Sociological Review*, 61(5), 908-927.
- Schwartz, B. (2000). *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schwartz, B. (2007). Collective Memory. În G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* (pp. 588-590), Maldem, MA și Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shafir, M. (2007). Raportul Tismăneanu: Note din public și din culise. *Tribuna*. (1-15 martie).

- Shils, E. (1971). Tradition. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13(2), 122-159.
- Shils, E. (1981). *Tradition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Siani-Davies, P. (2006). *Revoluția română din decembrie 1989*. Humanitas: București.
- Smith, A.D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of the Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, A.D. (1991). *National Identity*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Smith, A.D. (1998) *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Sontag, S. (2011). *Privind la suferința celuilalt*. București: Humanitas.
- Southgate, B. (2001). *History: What & Why? Ancient, Modern, and Postmodern Perspectives*. Ediția a doua. Londra și New York: Routledge.
- Stan, L. (2013). *Transitional Justice in Post-Communist Romania: The Politics of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stan, L. și Turcescu, L. (2007). *Religion and Politics in Post-Communist Romania*. Oxford și New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, L. (2010). To the letter: Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant* and writing a life, sociologically. *Life Writing*, 7(2), 139-151.
- Stock, B. (1990). *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Teitel, R.G. (2000). *Transitional Justice*. Oxford și New York: Oxford University Press.
- Teodor, P. (1970). *Evoluția gândirii istorice românești*. Cluj: Dacia.
- Thomas, W.I. și Thomas, D.S. (1928). *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs*. New York, NY: Knopf, available online at [http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Thomas/Thomas\\_1928\\_13.html](http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Thomas/Thomas_1928_13.html), last accessed in 10 October 2013.
- Thompson, K. (2002). *Emile Durkheim*. New York: Routledge.
- Tilly, C. (1980). Historical Sociology. *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, 1, 55-59.
- Tilly, C. (1984). *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Tismăneanu, V. (2005). *Stalinism pentru eternitate*. Iași: Polirom.
- Tismăneanu, V. (2012). *The Devil in History: Communism, Fascism, and Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley și Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Tismăneanu, V. (2013). Stânga, dreapta și catastrofa comunistă. *Evenimentul zilei* (13 mai 2013), available online at <http://www.evz.ro/detalii/stiri/stanga-dreapta-si-catastrofa-comunista-1037058.html>, last accessed in 3 July 2013.
- Tocqueville, A. de (1841). *Democracy in America*, Vol. 2, New York: J. & H.G. Langley.

- Todorov, T. (2003). *Hope and Memory. Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tomiță, A. (2007). *O istorie „glorioasă”. Dosarul protocronismului românesc*. București: Cartea Românească.
- Tota, A. L. (2001). Homeless Memories: How Societies Forget their Past. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 1, 193-214.
- Trevor-Roper, H. (1983). The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland. In E.J. Hobsbawm și T. Ranger (Eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (pp. 15-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urban, G.R. (Ed.). (1979). *Communist Reformation: Nationalism, Internationalism and Change in the World Communist Movement*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Urry, J. (1996). How societies remember the past. În S. Macdonald și G. Fyfe (Eds.) *Theorising Museums* (pp. 45-65). Oxford: Sociological Review Monographs.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Verdery, K. (1991). *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu's Romania*. Berkely, Los Angeles și Oxford: University of California Press.
- Verdery, K. (1999). *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies. Reburial and Postsocialist Change*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (2003). Anthropology, Sociology, and Other Dubious Disciplines. *Current Anthropology*, 44(4), 453-465.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-Systems Analysis. An Introduction*. Durham și Londra: Duke University Press.
- Watts, A. (2000). *What is Zen*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Weber, E. (1976). *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, tradusă, editată și prefațată de H.H. Gerth și C. Wright Mills, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Londra: University of California Press.
- Weinberg, S. (2008). *Visul unei teorii finale*. București: Humanitas.

- Wertsch, J.V. (2004). Specific Narratives and Schematic Narrative Templates. În P. Seixas (Ed.). *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (pp. 49-62), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (2004). *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (2012). Deep Memory and Narrative Templates: Conservative Forces in Collective Memory. În A. Assmann și L. Shortt (Eds.). *Memory and Political Change* (pp. 173-185), Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wertsch, J.V. și Roediger III, H. L. (2008). Collective memory: Conceptual foundations and theoretical approaches. *Memory*, 16(3), 318-326.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore și Londra: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, R. (2005). Herder: On the Ethics of Nationalism. *Humanitas*, XVIII(1-2), 166-181.
- Whyte, W.F. (1943). *Street Corner Society. The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, E.O. (2003). *Sociobiologia*. București: Editura Trei.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2003). *Cercetări filozofice*. București: Humanitas.
- Wood, N. (1999). *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*. Oxford: Berg.
- Woodward, K.L. (1999) 2000 Years Of Jesus. *Newsweek Magazine*. 4 aprilie.
- Xenopol, A.D. (1997). *Teoria istoriei*. București: Editura Fundației Culturale Române.
- Zamfir, C. (2005). *Spre o paradigmă a gândirii sociologice*. Ediția a II-a. Iași: Polirom.
- Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(2), 214-239.
- Zerubavel, E. (1996). Social Memories: Steps to a Sociology of the Past. *Qualitative Sociology*, 19(3), 283-299.
- Zerubavel, E. (1997). *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zerubavel, E. (1998). Language and Memory: "Pre-Columbian" America and the Social Logic of Periodization. *Social Research*, 65(2), 315-330.
- Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zub, A. și Antohi, S. (2002). *Oglinzi retrovizoare. Istorie, memorie și morală în România*. Iași: Polirom.