

**DIPLOMACY IN THE GAMES OF POWER.
DIPLOMACY OF POWER – POWER OF DIPLOMACY
I. DIPLOMACY OF POWER**

Silviu NEGUȚ*
Andreea GAGEA**

Abstract: Diplomacy, one of the oldest areas of knowledge and human action, is an instrument for promoting and implementing the foreign policy of states. It is associated with the combined efforts of States to settle disputes and conflicts between them, to defend and promote their interests by means of negotiations and to maintain and develop peaceful relations. Diplomacy is addressed to the external world, the international space, and the diplomat is the power's representative (from the lowest to the highest power) in the international game. In this game, states behave as actors who play their role, larger or smaller, depending on the economic, military and political power and also depending on the geostrategy which one applies, at one time, in order to achieve their proposed objectives. Apart from the general considerations regarding diplomacy (with its corollary of *international treaties*), in this study is approached the *multilateral diplomacy* and, particularly, the *diplomacy of power*, respectively, the diplomacy waged from position of force by the prominent powers in a particular historical period, especially, by great powers. In this sense, are presented significant examples, from the message sent to Meliens by the Athenians in Antiquity till the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact from the mid-twentieth century.

Key words: diplomacy, power of diplomacy, diplomacy of power, multilateral diplomacy, international treaties

1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Diplomacy is one of the oldest areas of knowledge and, respectively, of human action. It emerged with the first states, millennia ago, first diplomats being the *envoys* (emissaries of some states or leaders who communicated or negotiated on behalf of those who sent them). In time, were individualized at least three dimensions:

- art of leading and practicing negotiations;
- branch of political science dealing with international relations;
- methods, means and activities in the field of international relations by which a state carries out its foreign policy objectives and targets.

* *Correspondence Address:* Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest, Faculty of International Business and Economics, 41 Dacia Av., District 1, 010404 Bucharest, Romania; e-mail: silviu.negut@gmail.com

** Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest; e-mail: andreeagagea@yahoo.com

In time, *power diplomacy* and *diplomacy of power* were individualized, although not infrequently associated. In this sense it is very significant the appreciation of one of NATO's first general secretary, Belgian Paul Henri Spaak (1957-1961), according to whom the most important military block on the Globe "is the center of the most significant diplomatic innovations (our emphasis) ever been tried"¹. Here is the most conclusive evidence of association between power and diplomacy.

The diplomat's official definition sounds, sober, as follows: "a state official representative in relations with other states, empowered to implement decisions and guidelines of his government on all matters considered to be content of interstate relations, to take action in developing these relations, to conclude treaties and conventions"². It always was and remains a noble profession, dreamt by many people, because as a French author assessed over one hundred years ago, the diplomat is "invested with the noblest, the most brilliant and enviable position to which could aspire an enlightened spirit and a chosen soul: that of representing abroad cultural and moral dignity, perennial interests and legitimate rights of his country"³. Although the diplomat of today disposes of many and complex support technics, can not be denied that, at least for the prominent one, the instruments eminently regard the intellect, as already noted, over thousand years ago, the Athenian orator Demosthenes "envoys have neither ships for war, nor heavy infantry, not even fortresses; their weapons are words and propitious moments. In case of important negotiations, those moments are fleeting and, once lost, can not be regained".

Diplomat's⁴ main attribute is *negotiation*, negotiations lead with the purpose of settling conventions in the broadest sense possible (political, economic, etc...).

"Over the centuries – assesses, with good reason, a great diplomat - diplomacy, as a specific discipline and a distinct profession has been associated to states` efforts to arrange disputes and conflicts between them, to defend and promote their interests by negotiations and maintain and develop peaceful relations"⁵. Furthermore, some reference papers defined it as "an art of carrying on negotiations in order to win without conflict (...), seeking to obtain maximum national advantage without using force and, preferably, without provoking resentment"⁶.

Although practiced since Antiquity, since then also dating the name (from Greek *diplōō* = doubling⁷), the bearer of such document (actually a doublet) acquired the name of a *diplomat*, and the activity carried on by him - *diplomacy*. Reconsidered as terminology in early Modern age in England (*diplomacy*, 1645)

¹ Apud Mircea Malița, „Diplomația. Școli și instituții”, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1970, p. 34.

² ***Dictionar politic, Editura Politică, 1975, p. 206.

³ Paul Pradier-Fodéré, *Cours de droit diplomatique*, Editions A. Durant, Paris, 1881, p. 45.

⁴ "Official representative of a State enjoying privileges and immunities in the country where he's fulfilling his mission, through countries in which he's passing, but not in his own country", *Mic Dictionar Enciclopedic*, revised and added second edition, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 2008, p. 365.

⁵ Mircea Malița, *op.cit.*, p. 31.

⁶ ***Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia, Merriam-Webster Incorporated, Springfield Publishing, Massachusetts, 2000, p. 471.

⁷ Describes the action of drawing up official papers or diplomas in two copies, one of whom was given to delegates (ambassadors or charges d'affaires from later today) as letter of authorization or recommendation, and one was kept in archives.

will be defined as close to the current perception in France: "*Diplomacy is the expression through which is designated, for a number of years past, the external relations` science, which is based on diplomas or written documents emanated by the sovereigns*"⁸. Although he was contemporary with one of the greatest diplomats of all time, famous Talleyrand (1754-1838), De Flassan forgets, or pretends to forget, that diplomacy also requires other things, which have been exercised with maximum effectiveness by his fellow countrymen.

Obviously, diplomacy is an instrument for promoting and implementing states` foreign policy. As stressed by many diplomats, among them Nicolae Titulescu, in the course of society`s history, countries` foreign policy problems and the means of achieving this, among which *diplomacy* (our emphasis) has an essential role, have always been occupying a place of a particular importance. Therefore, as part of the political superstructure and as state`s principal mean to promote and implement its foreign policy, diplomacy has evolved alongside with the society`s evolution. In the modern world, diplomacy is recognized as a system of knowledge and methods underlying the external activities of states, for the purpose of representing, protecting rights and interests, achieving its foreign policy, through the activity of the states` officials led by negotiations and peaceful means. Here are some definitions. The communist ones were very dry, without shades:

- "*The official activity of state`s authorities for external relations, and above all of diplomats, held through negotiations, correspondence and other peaceful means for achieving the goals and assignments of state`s foreign policy, for protecting the state`s rights and interests abroad. It is the most important method of carrying out the foreign policy of states*" (Mic dicționar diplomatic, 1967).
- "*The official activity of state conducted by specialized authorities (Ministry of Foreign Affaires and diplomatic missions) for achieving foreign policy`s goals and objectives*" (Dicționar politic, 1975).

Instead, the Western definitions were full of meanings:

- "*Art of conducting relationships for gain without conflict. It is the chief instrument of foreign policy. Its methods include secret negotiation by accredited envoys (though political leaders also negotiate) and international agreements and laws. Its use predates recorded history. The goal of diplomacy is to further the state`s interests as dictated by geography, history, and economics. Safeguarding the state`s independence, security, and integrity is of prime importance; preserving the widest possible freedom of action for the state is nearly as important. Beyond that, diplomacy seeks maximum national advantage without using force and preferably without causing resentment*" (Britannica Concise Encyclopedia, 1977).

Usually it is also pointed out that diplomacy is - or ought to be - the only alternative to conflict situations around the Globe.

Often, speeches about diplomacy referred to art. In the late nineteenth century, French Guillaume de Garden, author of a very substantial treaty, defined diplomacy as "*the science of states` relationships and, respectively, interests or the art of reconciling the people`s interests between them, in a*

⁸ De Flassan, *Histoire Générale et Raisonnée de la Diplomatie Française ou de la Politique de la France*, Paris, 1811.

*narrower sense, science or art of negotiation (our emphasis)*⁹. We can not deny that, as far as diplomacy uses special qualities of the individuals leading the negotiations, to the extent that it requires uncommon qualities of tact, measure, power of persuasion and to impress the interlocutor, diplomacy itself appears as an area near art. Diplomatic history is crammed with several names of domain` ministers that have excelled. Being categorized as true artists of negotiation, from Richelieu (1585-1642), Talleyrand (1754-1838) – who served under no less than four structures of power (Directorate, Consulate, Empire and Restoration) – and Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) to Nicolae Titulescu (1882-1941), Andrei Gromiko (1909-1989) and Henry Kissinger (n. 1923).

In the field of international relations, diplomacy provides four basic functions (sometimes grouped in three):

- function of representation, diplomatic missions representing, practically, government extension abroad; typically, this also includes negotiation;
- instrument for implementation and building state's foreign policy by highlighting the specific activity and achieving, in the best conditions, state's policy;
- function of promoting state's national interests;
- function of assembling and systematization of information, namely, assessing political, economic and social development of the country where the mission is accredited.

Diplomacy is addressed to the external world, international space, and the *diplomat is the power's representative in the international game*. In this game, states behave as actors who play their role, larger or smaller, depending on economic, military and political power and also depending on the geostrategy which one applies to at a certain time, in order to achieve objectives of national and international importance. Therefore, true diplomat occupies a privileged position: an observer, negotiator and facilitator in international relations.

Hans Joachim Morgenthau (1904-1980), considered as the most influential American theorist and scholar in the field of international policy, after the Second World War, maintains that: *"in its widest sense, covering the full range of foreign policy, diplomacy has four tasks: 1) it must define its goals in the world of power, real or potential, available for pursuing these objectives; 2) it must evaluate the objectives of other nations and the real and potential power available in pursuing these objectives; 3) it must determine to what extent these different objectives are compatible with each other; 4) it must use appropriate means in pursuing them"*. And still sententious: *"The failure in fulfilling any of those tasks could jeopardize the foreign policy and, with it, the world peace"*¹⁰.

Carrying out a long time based on common rules, the domain obtains a *Convention regarding Diplomatic Relations* (Vienna, 1961), which *"governs the rights and obligations of diplomats and, especially, the obligation to respect the sovereignty and independence of the state of residence"*¹¹.

⁹ Apud Mircea Malița, *op.cit.*, p. 32.

¹⁰ Hans J. Morgenthau, edition revised by Kenneth W. Thompson and W. David Clinton, *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Editura POLIROM, Iași, 2007, p. 551.

¹¹****Mic Dicționar Diplomatic Român*, Editura Politică, București, 1967, p. 126.

2. INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

International treaties/international agreements are the visible expression of diplomatic approaches, although there are many cases in which they have remained long time secret or hiding some provisions affecting third parties, and would not be given well in the international environment, such as the Ribbentrop-Molotov Treaty/Pact from 1939.

International treaty is defined as "*understanding reached between two (bilateral treaty) or more (multilateral treaty) states, through which are created, modified or extinguished rights and obligations, or are established rules of conduct that must be respected between their relations (e.g. peace treaty, trade treaty)*"¹². In terms of international law, usually, respective agreements/treaties must be ratified by governments or parliaments of those countries, but in this case there are also notable exceptions.

International treaties occupy a central place in geopolitics, as it "*emphasizes in a certain way the evolution in relations between various types of political forces that were in disagreement or even conflict, or have to take into account the actions of third powers*"¹³. Although the common language equates international agreement and international treaties, in fact the last one is a special agreement, "*more solemn and taken for granted among states, especially when it comes to establishing new boundaries or recognizing and guarantying hitherto disputed borders*"¹⁴. Therefore, any violation of a treaty is considered to be a serious prejudice to international law.

Between international treaties a special place is occupied by *peace treaties*, agreements in which the belligerent parties agree on ending a war. But history shows us that many times it was not the case of *understanding*, but *imposing* of some conditions (not infrequently very heavy ones) by the *winner / winners* to the opposite camp (beat/defeated). In this matter very relevant is the Peace Treaty of Paris, on February 10, 1947, concluded with the former allies of Nazi Germany, including Romania. Romania turned arms against Germany, after the act of August 23, 1944, and contributed, according to findings of many analysts, in shorting the war by about 200 days (army's losses amounted at almost 170.000 deaths, wounded and missing). However, Romania is obligated to pay the Soviet Union as war compensation, the amount of 300 million American dollars in assets and is fixed as a boundary with it, ones existing on January 1, 1941, thus sanctioning the occupation of Bessarabia, land Herța and Northern Bukovina by the USSR on June, 1940, following in fact the Molotov-Ribbentrop Treaty¹⁵. However, at the opposite side, France, for example, which had a pro-German government during the war ("The Vichy Government"), had a completely different status, although only towards the end of the great conflagration took another position, thanks to general Charles de Gaulle.

3. MULTILATERAL DIPLOMACY

In the twentieth century, international policy issues acquire a global importance, political, social and economic transformations has also

¹² ****Mic Dicționar Enciclopedic*, op.cit., p.1407.

¹³ Yves Lacoste, *Dictionnaire de Géopolitique*, Flammarion, Paris, 1995, p. 43.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ See references such as *** *Enciclopedia de istorie a României* (coord. Ioan Scurtu), Editura Meronia, București, 2003; *** *Istoria României în date* (coord. Dinu C. Giurescu), Editura Enciclopedică, București, 2003 ș.a.

repercussions on diplomacy, on its methods, nature and its content. The essential element, as a direct consequence of the First World War, was that the issue of peace, international security and disarmament, and also resolving conflicts that arise between states, become matters of general interest affecting and concerning the whole international community.

Multilateral diplomacy arose in the twentieth century, as a consequence of the creation of, firstly the League of Nations (1919), then the United Nations Organization (1945), followed by other international organizations at regional or world-wide level, covering not only the cooperation in the political field, but also economic, cultural, scientific, etc... Unlike bilateral diplomacy, conducted through contacts and negotiations between two countries, this implies a certain permanent conference' status between representatives of many nations. United Nations' General Assembly, for instance, focuses representatives (ambassadors) of all member countries (193 in numbers) of the highest and largest world wide forum. This raises the idea of *open diplomacy*, through collective discussions, often public, opposite to the classical *secret diplomacy*.

But, United Nations, the international organization which proclaimed itself as the most democratic in the world, taking responsibility for ensuring peace and security on the Globe, granted, from the beginning, privileges to a restricted group of states: "*It was agreed that the role and responsibility of great powers to be materialized in the existence and functions of the UN Security Council, in which the great powers held the position of permanent member (...) The distinct and privileged position of great power was concretized, inter alia, in granting to the permanent Security Council's members the right to veto, allowing their active participation in taking the most important decisions in matters of security and world peace*"¹⁶. The practice shows us that in the main international organization, UN, including the Security Council, has already been expressed the opposition Est (Communist block)-West (Capitalist block), not infrequently the Eastern countries and the developing countries (Non-Alignment Movement) could be found on the same side of the barricade, in opposition with the Western countries. Nevertheless, it isn't less true that the UN, with some regional security organizations (such as, the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of American States, etc.), contributed to ending conflicts, monitoring cease-fire, demobilization of insurgent forces, conducting free elections, etc. in many places around the Globe (Mozambique, Angola, Rwanda, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, etc.).

The question is whether now, at the beginning of the third millennium, it is possible an international consensus about the threats to security and world peace, which is the main objective of multilateral diplomacy. A possible answer is that of a Romanian diplomat with long experience: "*There are, of course, common interests of states in terms of security generated by the common threats turned against this security, at regional level, by groups of countries and even worldwide. Common interests, common threats are liable to determine a common awareness that, in succession, to urge on common behaviors and, ultimately, on joint actions (...). But, many aspects of contemporary realities – economic, political, geopolitical – are likely to diminish the force of arguments mentioned above; and these aspects too regard interests. More precise, in my opinion there are three faults that differentiate, even divide states. The first regards the degree of*

¹⁶Constantin Vlad, *Diplomația secolului XX*, Fundația Europeană Titulescu, București, 2006, p. 202.

*development of these countries, with its' effect on the balance of forces at international level; the second concerns the differences related to civilization; the third refers to the manner in which states and groups of states report themselves to global, legal and political order, substantiated on United Nations Charter. These faults, distinct, yet intersected, which can have combined effects, reduces drastically the consensus' potentialities of the contemporary world*¹⁷.

4. DIPLOMACY OF POWER¹⁸

From ancient times to nowadays, human history is strewn with various ways of expressing the diplomatic function. Although, there is a very clear convergence regarding the way in which powers and, especially, the great powers exercised it. Basically, as a rule, from the position of force. And we have enough examples, from the episode recounted by Thucydides on Athenian envoy's message sent to Meliens as far as Russia's recognition of the independence of two Georgian provinces, South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

Powers/great powers practiced, in fact, a diplomacy of force, of power politics and non-observance of the dialogue partner. Here are, below, a few examples in this sense.

☞ *Athenians-Meliens*. In its' maximum ascension period, Athens, the most powerful Greek fortress, when settled a new goal (winning a piece of land) was accustomed to send an envoy¹⁹ to persuade governors from that land to submit willingly. The message of Athenian's envoy sent to Meliens (inhabitants of the island of Melos, Cyclades Archipelago), two and a half millennia ago, is more than enlightening on the balance of forces: "*Both, we and you, know that in the affairs of people justice problem occurs only if the necessity` pressure is equal on both sides and that the strong one squeeze all he can and the weak one deliver what needed*"²⁰. So, no chance for the less powerful, the position of strength being more than evident. We rejoin the principle's essence, but otherwise expressed, over more than two thousand years, in the quintessence of famous Cardinal Richelieu's (Prime Minister of France) *raison d'etat* (state interest). It will say that "*in matters of state, who has the power also has the right, but who is low weighted tries not to be guilty in the eyes of most of the world*".

☞ *Treaty of Tordesillas*. In this case the phenomenon is more complex, but also the idea of power prevails, plus the diplomatic ability of Pope Alexander VI. This treaty is a consequence of (re)discovery of America by Christopher Columbus (October 12, 1492), Genoan in the service of Spain, which drew the response of Portugal, a neighboring country with which Spain has never had good relations. The balance of power between the two countries was, overall, favorable to Spain, only that it, at this certain time, was weakened due to the fight against the Moors, ended in the same year by conquering Granada, the last Arab fortress in the Iberian Peninsula. Sensing the danger to his native

¹⁷ *Idem*, p. 757-758.

¹⁸ Its' opposite, the *power of diplomacy*, will be addressed in the next issue of the journal.

¹⁹ According to dictionaries, the official person designated to lead negotiations on behalf of a country, a sovereign, etc. In this case, the carrier of a *diplôd*.

²⁰ The story is told by the great Greek historian Thucydides (460-396 BC), in his paper "*History of the Peloponnesian war*", which depicts the fight for supremacy in the Greek world between Sparta and Athens, in the second half of the fifth century BC.

homeland, Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503, born in 1431, as Rodrigo Borgia, at Játiva, near Valencia), convinced the sovereigns of the two countries to sign the Treaty of Tordesillas (a small village in Northern Spain, near Valladolid), on 7 June, 1494, which, practically, established the definitive dividing line for conquerors in the New World: at 370 leagues (about 2055 km) west of Cape Verde Islands, compared to only 100 leagues according to papal bulls of 1493. Thus, was avoided a war between the two Iberian countries, which would impede over the other reason which lies at the basis of its` initiative – the indigenes` evangelization from the newly discovered territories, mission which he assumes as sovereign pontiff.

☞ *Treaty of San Stefano, revised after the Congress of Berlin.* Russian-Romanian-Turkish War (1877-1878) was ended by the Russo-Turkish Peace Treaty of San Stefano (now Yeşilköy, district of Istanbul, on the European shore of the Marmara Sea), on February 19 (March 3), 1878. By treaty, the Ottoman Empire recognized the independence of Romania, together with that of Serbia and Montenegro, and also the autonomy of Bulgaria (subject of creating a “Greater Bulgaria”, incorporating all the slave states in the Balkans). In addition, it also reverts to Russia the Northern part of Armenia. However, Dobrogea, Danube Delta and the Snake Island are ceded, by the Ottoman Empire, to Russia which reserves its` right to change them “with the part of Bessarabia alienated in 1856”. So, an understanding between the two powers over the heads of the others, mainly Romania, who played an important role in the final victory. In that spirit is significant the response and the circular note addressed to Romanian diplomatic agents (March 30/April 11, 1878), by Mihail Kogălniceanu, Romania`s foreign minister, which emphasizes, unequivocal, clear and focused, the Romanian government`s protest against the Treaty, which “*ended without the participation of Romanian diplomacy`s representatives, disposing of us and without us and against us, government and nation declared it without any value for Romania*”²¹.

Following the prompt and harsh reaction of Western powers, which felt harmed in their pride, takes place the Congress of Berlin (June 1-13, 1878), revising the Treaty of San Stefano. From the diplomatic game of the great powers (the Western powers, Russia, Ottoman Empire, the last, obviously, ailing and too little influent), Romania being again excluded as official participation for the same reason as at San Stefano, will result in some rearrangement and corrections. Congress recognizes Romania's independence and its` right over Dobrogea, Danube Delta and the Serpent Island, on condition to Romania`s acceptance of the incorporation of Southern Bessarabia (Bolgrad counties, Cahul and Ismail), who had returned to Moldova by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, which ended the Crimean War, Bessarabia (the territory between the Prut and Nistru) was annexed by Russia after the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-1812, which ended with the Peace Treaty of Bucharest in 1812. The Romanian government has protested, referring to the Romanian-Russian Convention on April 4/16, 1877 (signed by Mihail Kogălniceanu and, respectively, baron Stuart), which stipulated that in exchange for incentives offered by Romania, the Russian government agreed to maintain and to defend the political rights of the Romanian state. But the Russian imperial government representative gave a

²¹ *** *Istoria României în date, op.cit.*, p. 243.

response that illustrates, once again, what we wanted to emphasize that is to say diplomacy of force, diplomacy of power, respectively, the fact that “security” referred only to possible claims of the Ottoman Empire towards Romania²².

☞ *The relation Romanian Lands-Ottoman Empire.* The subject highlights the relationship between states, very important being the attribute *sovereign* (sovereign state) because only between such states agreements could conclude based on an equal footing. But, prominent powers do not accept such treatment. The appropriate case, among others, is that of the Romanian Lands, which had no pashalic state with Ottoman Porte. It is significant in this sense the letter, from 1531, of the famous Ottoman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent addressed to the Polish King Sigismund I in regard to the Moldavian voivode Petru Rareș, saddling: “I also learned that so-called voivode sent to you an ambassador, who is he to dare to have the courage to send an ambassador to you? He and the Wallachia’s voivode²³ are tributaries and slaves of mine, hence we gave severe orders that they no longer dare in future to send ambassadors to anyone; also, no ambassador should go to them; if anyone has any business with them, one must address our strongest Porte”²⁴. However, as Mircea Malița notice, “our country’s history fully illustrates the idea that defending the right to do diplomacy, which the Romanian rulers have never completely given up, was a component part of the struggle for defending a separate status of autonomy and independence from the Ottoman Empire”²⁵.

☞ *Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact.* Although seem inconceivable signing a treaty between two ideological opponents (Nazism-Communism), the content was typical for similar treaties, called non-aggression: the two states pledged not to attack each other or to support a third power which could attack one of them etc.. In reality, the treaty signed in Moscow on August 23, 1939, by the two foreign ministers (Joachim von *Ribbentrop* and Vyacheslav *Molotov*), hence the agreement’s name (even if they were the emanation of their supreme leaders, Hitler and Stalin), was a treaty of dividing the spheres of influence in Central and Eastern Europe, based on the position of force, under the *secret protocol*, aiming primarily Poland, the Baltics and Romania (Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina). After the occupation and division of Poland (Germany beginning in September 1, 1939, and the Soviet Union from September 17), according to the agreement, was signed a second secret Additional Protocol. Here’s the explanation given by the official Soviet interpreter present at the event: “According to the previous understanding, in the Soviet sphere of influence entered Estonia and Latvia. This time, the list was completed with Lithuania. Meanwhile, Lublin and Warsaw` regions entered in German’s interest sphere so for that were made the necessary changes to establish the boundary limit”²⁶.

Naturally, the question is how was it possible the signing of this pact. There are many explanations and speculations, summarized very well by historian Jan Palmowski: “Taking note of German expansionism after the

²² According to several sources, including *Istoria României în date, op.cit.*, p. 241-243.

²³ At that time was Vlad Înecatul (1530-1532), a relative of Petru Rareș.

²⁴ Hurmuzaki, *Documents*, Supl. II, 1, p. 26.

²⁵ Mircea Malița, *op.cit.*, p. 35.

²⁶ Valentin Berejkov, *În umbra lui Stalin*, Editura Lider, București, 1994, p. 61.

*Anschluss, Stalin hoped to avoid a confrontation with Nazi Germany. Instead, the pact guarantees Hitler free hand to conquer Poland. In the event of an intervention from Britain and France, the pact allowed Germany to avoid a war on two fronts*²⁷.

Paradoxically, even with the implementation of the “Barbarossa” Plan (invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany on June 22, 1941), the treaty became null and void in terms of international law, the Soviet Union and later, the Russian Federation, never denounced it, its’ effects being evident until today, especially in regard to Romania.

This pact is one of the most representative examples of diplomacy of power based on force: each of the two great powers has negotiated, through their own diplomats, their interests at the expense of others, violating the rules of international law.

☞ *Churchill-Stalin “Pact”*²⁸. Although it knew no written juristic form, as the Ribbentrop-Molotov Treaty (on August 23, 1939), the “negotiation” between the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the Soviet leader Stalin, on October 9, 1944, in Moscow, has a similar meaning. The problem is that of the famous “scrap of paper”, which was so much discussed for decades. The two (this being the first and also the last meeting not attended by President Roosevelt), have addressed the issue of the “future” for Balkans` states and Eastern Europe, including Romania, acting clearly over their heads. The initial proposal was that, after the war, their influence’s weights in Romania and Greece, the main countries in focus, were to be similar, but reversed: Romania - 90% Soviet Union and Greece - 90% United Kingdom (including the U.S.); in other countries, the share was identical (50%) for Hungary and Yugoslavia, and greater for Russia in the case of Bulgaria (75%). However, at the end of “negotiation” (continued by the foreign ministers of the two great powers, Anthony Eden and Vyacheslav Molotov), Romania entered 100% in the Soviet sphere and Greece also stepped entirely into the British and American sphere; as is known, at the end of war the other countries in attention too entered 100% into the Soviet sphere.

REFERENCES

- BEREJKOV, V., (1994), *În umbra lui Stalin*, Editura Lider, București;
 DE FLASSAN, (1811), *Histoire Générale et Raisonnée de la Diplomatie Française ou de la Politique de la France*, Paris;
 DE LA CARRIÈRE, G.C., (1998), *La diplomatie économique, le diplomate et le marché*, Economica, Paris ; <http://geoscopies.net/geoscopie/themes/t371car.php>;
 KISSINGER, H., (1998), *Diplomația*, Editura BIC ALL, București ;
 LACOSTE, Y., (1995), *Dictionnaire de Géopolitique*, Flammarion, Paris ;
 MALIȚA, M., (1969), *Diplomatul în istorie*, în vol. *Diplomați iluștri*, Editura Politică, București;
 MALIȚA, M., (1970), *Diplomația. Școli și instituții*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1970;
 MAZILU, D., (2008), *Diplomația europeană*, Editura Lumina Lex, București;
 MORGENTHAU, H.J., (2007), edition revised by Kenneth W. Thompson and W. David Clinton, *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Editura POLIROM, Iași;

²⁷ Jan Palmowski, *Dicționar de istorie universală contemporană. De la 1900 până azi*, Editua All, București, 2007, vol. I, p. 406.

²⁸ See, more broadly, Silviu Neguț, *Geopolitica. Universul puterii*, Editura Meteor Press, București, 2009, p. 200-204.

- NEGUȚ, S., (2009), *Geopolitica. Universul puterii*, Editura Meteor Press, București;
- PALMOWSKI, J., (1997), *The Oxford Dictionary of Contemporary World History. From 1900 to the present day*, Oxford University Press, vol. I;
- VLAD, C., (2006), *Diplomația secolului XX*, Fundația Europeană Titulescu, București;
- ***(1967), *Mic Dicționar Diplomatic Român*, Editura Politică, București;
- ***(1975), *Dicționar Politic*, Editura Politică, București;
- ***(2003), *Istoria României în date* (coord. Dinu C. Giurescu), Editura Enciclopedică, București;
- ***(2003), *Enciclopedia de istorie a României* (coord. Ioan Scurtu), Editura Meronia, București;
- ***(2007), *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Encyclopedia*, Merriam-Webster Incorporated, Springfield, Massachusetts;
- ***(2008), *Mic Dicționar Enciclopedic*, ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, Editura Enciclopedică, București.

Submitted:
March 18, 2010

Revised:
April 23, 2010

Accepted:
May 27, 2010

Published online:
May 31, 2010