

New Europe College Yearbook 2008-2009



EVELINE CIOFLEC
ȘTEFAN COLCERIU
CHRISTIAN FERENCZ-FLATZ
NICOLAE GHEORGHÎĂ
ALEXANDRU GICA
ADRIAN MURARU
ALEXANDRU SIMON
ANCA ȘINCAN
ATTILA SZIGETI
ADELA TOPLEAN

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



ALEXANDRU GICA

Born in 1969, in Bucharest

Ph.D., University of Bucharest (2001)

Thesis: *Analytical Methods in Number Theory*

Associate Professor, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Bucharest

Research scholarship: Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada,
1998

Participation to international conferences in Canada, Germany, Romania,
the United Kingdom

Co-author of three books on Number Theory

Member of the Aromanian Cultural Society (SCA) covering a broad range of
activities: book editor, conference organizer, author of papers on history,
journalist, translator into Aromanian

THE RECENT HISTORY OF THE AROMANIANS FROM ROMANIA

The request of an Aromanian association for the recognition of the Aromanian as a national minority in 2005 was really surprising. This request generated a kind of “war” in the Aromanian world. It was again a surprise, because many people are thinking that Aromanians are a monolithic structure.

Generally, the authors who wrote about the Aromanians noticed the difficulty to distinguish them from their neighbors. One reason, according to Irina Nicolau, is that they developed a kind of strategy of ethnic dissimulation. A different opinion, not necessary divergent, is suggested by Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca. He considers Aromanians the *Homo balcanicus* prototype because of their ties and affinities with all the Balkan populations along the history (and this is why it is difficult to distinguish them from their neighbors). Thede Kahl describes the Aromanians as a “minority that behaves like a majority”, which explains the misunderstanding concerning their identification.

Almost all scholars agree that Aromanians have a hidden identity. The visibility of the Aromanians acquired by the afore-mentioned 2005 request is in contrast with their hidden way of life.

The aim of this study is to explain the strong connection between the settlement of the Aromanians in Romania starting with 1925, and the request for the recognition, made four years ago. We will analyze also how some Aromanians joined the Iron Guard, but only in connection with the aim of the study. All these three events will be revealed through different documents, some of them recently published. The study ends with some conclusions regarding this subject.

I think it would be appropriate to close this introductory passage with an opinion of the great scholar Max Demeter Peyfuss (see Peyfuss 1994: 122) regarding the problem of how the historians can help in the debated issue: “if the Aromanians from Romania are an ethnical/national minority or not”. Peyfuss concludes that “beside his own conscience, there is no scientific way to establish someone’s nationality”.

Dreaming for a country: How the Aromanian colonization in Romania took place

"It was the returning way to their homeland, from which they were pulled out since immemorial time by a step-motherly fate" (Muși 1935, 2005: 94).¹

This is the motivation that is usually put into the light when one has to explain the reason why Aromanians came to Romania starting with 1925. In the following, we investigate this cliché in order to see if the main reason of the colonization of the Aromanians in Romania was patriotically motivated. We discover that the economical pressure endured by Aromanians in Greece, was the main reason for their emigration. Even the nationalistic historians are considering the economical motivation strong enough, but not stronger than the patriotic one.

The war between Greece and Turkey (1919-1922) ended with the Lausanne Conference (January 20th 1923) that made possible the following population exchange: 380,000 Turks left Greece for Turkey and 1,100,000 Greeks moved from Turkey to Greece. We also have to add to this number another 100,000 Greeks who came to Greece from Russia and Bulgaria. Therefore, the population of Greece increased with approximately 820,000 people (according to Clogg 2006: 112).² These people were mainly settled in the region of Macedonia, where many Aromanians lived. According to Clogg (2006: 116), the census carried out in 1928 in Greece showed that almost half of the population of Macedonia was composed of refugees. The economical pressure on the Aromanian shepherds was huge due to the new issue that emerged: the pasture lands rented from the Turks for sheep rising were not available anymore. Tanașoca (2001: 163-164) describes the process as follows:

"The Turkish-Greek War that ended with the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923 entailed the resettlement in Greek Macedonia of over one million Greeks from Asia Minor.

This act was a truly finishing stroke for Macedonian Aromanianism. Aromanian shepherding was destroyed by the parceling of the large pastures so that all the newcomers could receive a piece of land. The latter were protected in the practice of the liberal professions and in trade through a process perceived as a threat by Aromanians who suddenly faced competition."

Beginning with 1923, some Aromanians from Greece started to ask permission from the Romanian authorities to emigrate in Romania. An Aromanian Congress was held in Veria (Greece) on November 30th 1924 and the participants arrived to the conclusion that it was very difficult to live in Greece because of the pastureland issue.

A Committee was created in Bucharest on January 3rd 1925 in order to lobby the Romanian authorities in their favor to accept the emigration of the Aromanians in Romania. The Romanian Government decided on June 13th 1925 (Journal No. 1698) to colonize Southern Dobruja.³ The available land had to be distributed like this: half to the Aromanians and half to the Romanians, only that in the end the Aromanians received approximately one third of the available land and the Romanians two thirds of it.

What did the Aromanians ask as conditions for their emigration? They asked at least 15 hectares for each family, free transportation from their places to Romania, long-term credits for building houses and the intervention of the Romanian authorities to the Greek Government, to compensate the Aromanians for the goods they had left in Greece. What did they get? Every family received 15 hectares on the border region and 10 hectares inside the region of the Southern Dobruja.

There is a debate about the number of the Aromanians who came to Romania during this process (lasting from 1925 to 1943). Many scholars asserted that after 1932 only a few Aromanians emigrated to Romania. Probably they were around 30,000 (approximately 6,000 families).⁴ Although the emigration process began in Greece, the first group of Aromanians coming in Romania was from Albania: Bațu family came on July 20th 1925 and other 70 families came from Pleasa (Albania)⁵ on August 1925.

Surprisingly enough, almost half of the Aromanians who arrived in Romania during that period were from Bulgaria and not from Greece, as we might expect.⁶ The fact that Romania earned Southern Dobruja from Bulgaria was the reason that worsened to a great degree the relation between the two countries. Therefore, the pressure endured by the Aromanians from Bulgaria was bigger than the pressure applied by the other Balkan states.

The most important (and reliable) sources describing the emigration process are: Hagigogu S.⁷ (1927, 2005), Muși V.⁸ (1935, 2005) and Noe C.⁹ (1938, 2005), all the three of them being involved in these events.¹⁰

Although they had been close friends, some disagreements between them are revealed by their writings. After the process of emigration began, another Congress was held in Veria on December 27th, 1925.

The Congress appointed Hagigogu as their representative towards the Romanian authorities. Muși (1935, 2005: 114) described this Congress as useless and suggested that mean reasons were behind this meeting, without saying which these mean reasons were. This kind of attitude expressed the rivalry between the Aromanians who were charged with coordinating the colonization process. Concerning the dimension of emigration, for Hagigogu (1927, 2005: 19), as he mentioned, it was a disagreement between him, on one side, and Celea, Muși and Noe, on the other side.

Hagigogu supported the idea of a huge emigration. The other side supported only a restricted colonization. Hagigogu justified his option with economical reasons. The other side sustained its position because the Romanian authorities did not support the emigration as they expected and did not keep their promises concerning the colonization. These points of view generated a discussion on January 1926 and the Muși-Noe-Celea's side won. A communique was released, which stated that it was established that the number of colonized families would be no more than 1,500 in two years. It was the most important disagreement within the Aromanian Committee who promoted the colonization.

The Aromanians who had been living in Romania strongly opposed this emigration. On one side, there were the older Aromanians who left Macedonia when they were young. They were saying that the "fight" must go on and that the Romanian State should support the Aromanians (who at that time lived in the Balkan states) by the old methods (schools, banks, priests and a bishopric). On the other side, there were the young Aromanians born in Romania who were against the colonization process because they thought that Romania needs the Aromanians from the Balkan states for a future enlargement.¹¹

Another type of opposition came from the Aromanian journals in Romania: for example, the journal *Macedonia*, published by Naum Nance raised the idea of a future federalist state named "Macedonia"¹² (following the example of Switzerland). Having this as a purpose, it was natural that Nance supported the idea that the Aromanians should remain in their homelands (for this information see Dobrogeanu I., 1994: 23). The following text was written in the journal *Peninsula Balcanică*:

"Did you realize? Do you know what an emigration is? Do you know what to leave forever your homeland means? Your homeland is the place where your parents were born in, the place you have your own houses in. Going to another land is the same as going into the unknown. Do you know

that the land in Romania was given to the peasants and to all those who struggled in war? Do you know that the land is very expensive?¹³ There is no more land and no more pastures to be distributed. Did you think well of this decision you are about to make? Do those families have enough money to settle down and live? Are you sure that arriving there, you will not curse the hour when you left?"¹⁴

The paragraph quoted above is to be found in an article entitled "Around the emigration's stream" and signed by the author with the penname of Turnus. Noe said that the author put these words in the mouth of a politician, only to disguise his ideas. Noe was also thinking that "Turnus" was the penname of Apostol Hagigogu, the director of the journal. Sterie Hagigogu and Apostol Hagigogu were first cousins. If Noe's information is accurate, we are discovering here two cousins with very different ideas.

Founded in 1879, the Macedo-Romanian Cultural Society is the oldest Aromanian Society. While at first the Society showed no enthusiasm for the emigration action, in 1925 it decided to encourage the colonization process.

The Representative of Romania to Athens and some teachers in the Romanian schools in the Balkans (see Noe C. 1938, 2005: 43) unexpectedly opposed the colonization.

During the colonization process, Aromanians complained with regard to the behavior of the Romanian authorities. On their turn, the Romanian authorities complained about the behavior of the Aromanian leaders. We can see this in Drăghicescu A., Petre M. (2004: 432; document no. 145, dated May 27th 1927). The document is a report of the Minister of Instruction addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs regarding the harsh situation of the Macedo-Romanians in Greece who lost the pastures to the Greek Refugees of Asia Minor.

In this report one can find accusations against unnamed Aromanian leaders saying that they had malicious goals and second thoughts when describing Romania as the "Promised Land". The document also describes the case of two Aromanians (Dimitrie Cațara and Costa Gheorghită) who came to Romania to prospect the conditions offered. They saw what the real situation was and they decided to return to Greece. The Minister of Instruction asked the Minister of Foreign Affairs to help the aforementioned Aromanians to return to Greece (the problem was that they already had signed a paper in order to leave Greece for Romania).

Regarding the situation of the Macedo-Romanians of Yugoslavia, Greece and Bulgaria, we found proposals for the future concerning the

Aromanian Question in a document (Drăghicescu A., Petre M. 2004: 454-475; document no. 153) which consists of excerpts of the report presented by the inspectors I. Max Popovici¹⁵ and Victor Brabețeanu.¹⁶ They wrote this report after a trip they made in 1929 to the afore-mentioned countries.

The report also comprises the accusation against two Aromanian leaders (G. Celea and D. Kehaia) that they described Romania as the "Promised Land" (p. 459). At page 466 we find the recommendation that such unofficial persons be removed from the emigration process. At the same page, there is a quotation of Langa Rășcanu, the Romanian Minister to Athens, who asked for prudence and patience regarding the colonization in Romania. He also warned against pushing Aromanians from Greece to emigrate to Romania.¹⁷

The Popovici and Brabețeanu report includes a strange accusation against Kehaia by Brabețeanu – strange because Brabețeanu assisted Kehaia in his mission to help Aromanians emigrate from Greece to Romania (see details in Noe C. 1938, 2005: 56-59).

A very interesting remark (p. 459) is that the Aromanians who came to Romania belonged to both sides: to those who thought that the Aromanians are Romanians and to those who thought that the Aromanians are Greeks. This questions the thesis that only "those Aromanian who were still keen on their Romanity decided to emigrate to Romania." (Tanașoca Ș. N. 2001: 164).

In the conclusive chapter, Popovici and Brabețeanu recommended an economical approach to the Aromanian Issue and also the giving up of the nationalistic approach. They imagined a future commercial expansion of Romania with the Aromanians from Balkans playing a major role. According to this goal, it was desirable that the wealthy Aromanians (and those with a good situation) remain in their native places.

For the poorest of them (and those who sold their goods and expected to come to Romania), the Romanian Government had the duty to bring them to Romania. Popovici and Brabețeanu counted 2,000 families in Greece, 500 in Bulgaria and 200 in Yugoslavia that were in this situation (in 1929). They estimated a period of 10-15 years for this action and demanded proper plans to fulfill the colonization.

A very interesting document¹⁸ (Heinen A. 2006: 184, note 48) sheds some light on the 1929 mission of Popovici and Brabețeanu:

"...with this travel, the Romanian Government aims to organize better the emigration of Aromanians ('Cutso-Vlachs' in the text) in Romania, untidy until now, but also to slow down this process. [...] The experiences of the

Romanian Government with the Cutso-Vlachs weren't good. Generally, they kept their violent Macedonian habits, wearing often weapons and troubling the Romanian authorities."

The same type of remarks is found in a memoir written at Silistra (Durostor County) in 1925 and signed by 33 intellectuals. The memoir warns the Romanian authorities about the mistake of bringing the Aromanians to Romania.

"The Macedo-Romanians, born and grown in Southern Balkans, having Balkan habits, not knowing the Romanian language, with a different character, if we are comparing them with the Romanians from Romania, are not able to develop here any activity to correspond to Romanian national interests. [...] The Aromanians, living so many centuries under the Turks, Greeks and Bulgarians, are nervous, hostile and vengeful."¹⁹

There were many of quarrels between the Aromanians who wanted to emigrate and the Aromanians who decided to remain in their native places. For example, in a document (Drăghicescu A., Petre M. 2006: 227-228; document no. 76), an incident is related which ends with a trial between the Aromanians who wanted to emigrate and those who decided to remain in Doleani (a village near Veria in Greece); the first side "won".

The author of the document²⁰ noticed that the Aromanians who wanted to emigrate preferred to give their houses to the Greek Refugees (for almost nothing) instead of Aromanians who wanted to remain in Doleani. This was a result of their will to convince the whole community to leave Doleani and to go to Romania.

Two attempts of the Aromanians who emigrated to Romania to return to their native places are mentioned in the documents. Both of them took place in 1926, the first in August when 84 poor families from Durostor County decided to return to Greece. These families were encouraged by I. Ghibănescu, the County President,²¹ who promised them free transport for their return. Noe C. (1938, 2005: 70) describes the event and its psychological mechanism:

"The disappointed colonizers started to regret the decision to come to Romania. The native places with high mountains, green hills and clear waters, seem to them like paradise now. It is human nature to forget the troubles from the past and to focus only on the present problems. Therefore,

some colonizers started to think about returning home, mainly those who were not involved in the national movement.”

The returning attempt failed since colonizers, with a nationalistic past, organized a meeting and stopped the returning action. The second attempt took place on November 8th of the same year, when 120 Aromanian families left their villages and gathered in Silistra for returning to their native places. This time it was the Romanian Government which stopped the action and tried after that to improve the life of the colonizers.

An unpleasant event (with consequences further on, as we will see) took place in the spring of 1927: 100 Aromanian families expected more than two months in the harbor of Salonika to receive the approval of coming to Romania. Finally, they arrived to Constanța, on July 17th 1927, only after they had signed a paper in which they declared that they didn't come to Romania as colonizers, but as simple citizens. This meant that they would not receive land and assistance of any kind (see Muși V. 1935, 2005: 128).

We will end this chapter with three testimonials. The first one is a popular song which describes the emigration to Romania:

“Armânl’i ditu Vâryârii
Nchisirâ ti tu-Armânii,
Ta ș-l’ea locu di vâsilii,
Ta ș-bâneadzâ isihii.”²²

The song suggests that having and receiving land were the purposes of this emigration. The ambiguous expression “*Ta ș-l’ea locu di vâsilii*” could also mean that, in this way, they will create their own country.

“Our old men are saying that life in Greece was better. They were free; they had 500-1000 sheep...”

This testimony is from 1970 and belongs to an Aromanian from Romania.²³ We feel the regret of this man for the native place of his parents. This regret was born, probably, by the lack of freedom and the lack of property in Romania during the communist regime.

“There were some people who said that in Romania the dogs walk with pretzels on their tails. They left the mountains; they left everything for a better life. This was lying propaganda. I regret that I came to Romania”.²⁴

This testimony is from 2003. It belongs to an 82 years old man, Vasile Bardu,²⁵ from M. Kogălniceanu (Constanța County). Interesting enough, when asked about “what Aromanians are in fact?” he answered “Aromanians? Romanians. This is what they are.”

The Aromanians and the Iron Guard

“Every Aromanian is a legionnaire.”

First we will try to outline a short history for the events which led some Aromanians to join the Iron Guard. The second aim is to see the connection between the emigration process and the adhesion of some Aromanians to the Legion. The third goal of this chapter is to question the cliché that “every Aromanian was a legionnaire”. We will also discuss the problem of the violence of some Aromanians involved in the Legionary Movement.

“All those grown in the national fights from Macedonia, we had in mind the image of a spotless Great Romania (as you can only see from distance). Once arrived in the country, we felt disappointed.”²⁶

We can find an interesting (and subjective) description of the reasons why many Aromanians joined the Iron Guard in Papanace C., 1999 (especially the chapter “The Macedo-Romanians in the Legionary Movement”, pp. 66-103; this chapter was originally a conference held in 1960 to commemorate 30 years from the moment when the first Aromanian joined the Iron Guard). We will sketch only the main events.

The above quotation is from Papanace and suggests that the disappointment felt by many Aromanians was the first step in their future commitment. It was a difference between what the students from the Romanian schools from Macedonia learned about Romania and what they found when they arrived in the “Promised Land”. Papanace arrived to Romania in 1925 at the age of 21. He and his colleagues started to attend the Romanian universities and got involved in supporting the Aromanian colonizers who arrived in Romania beginning with the summer of 1925. At first they refused to join any political party.

In the spring of 1927, a delegation of students was for ten days in Sothern Dobruja to show its support for the Aromanian colonizers who settled in the area for the last two years. The delegation was led by Tudose

Popescu (a close friend of Corneliu Codreanu and one of the leaders of the student movement from 1922), Constantin Papanace (at that time Vice-President of the "Association of the Macedo-Romanians students") and Iancu Caranica (secretary of the afore-mentioned association). A meeting against I. Ghibănescu, the County-President of Durostor, was organized in Siliștra. Another meeting against Ghibănescu organized by students was held in Bucharest. In June 1927 Popescu and Papanace were jailed in Jilava prison for two weeks (see Papanace C. 1997: 191-203).

The adhesion of the first Aromanian group to the Legionary Movement took place in the summer of 1930 and it was directly connected with the problem of the Aromanian colonizer in Southern Dobruja. The most common form of property of the land during the Ottoman regime was *mirie*: this was a property of the state which was rented to the people. The problem of land property was not settled during the period when the Southern Dobruja was under the Bulgarian rule (1878-1913).

On April 1st 1914, the Romanian state passed the "Law for organizing the New Dobruja (Southern Dobruja)". Some changes to the law were made on April 22th 1924. The main change was that a people who possessed a *mirie* property could own an absolute property only by giving one third of the land to the state (and remaining an absolute owner of the other two thirds) or by paying the value of one third of his land with the maximal price of the market. This is how the Romanian state acquired land for the colonization.

On June 30th 1930, the Romanian Parliament voted a change to the afore-mentioned law. This change was perceived by the Aromanians as a violation of their rights. This feeling was strengthened by the fact that the person who proposed this change of the law, Constantin Angelescu, was the Deputy for Caliacra County (and also a State-Secretary in the Ministry for Internal Affairs).

Angelescu was deputy of the National Peasant Party (PNȚ), which was in power at that moment. The National Peasant Party had a strategy to acquire the support of the Bulgarians from Southern Dobruja. The feeling was that the Bulgarians could get back "the third" (of the land) which had been given to the state. In this way the colonizers were in danger to lose their land.

As a result, on July 21th 1930, the half-Aromanian student George Beza attempted to the life of C. Angelescu. The attempt failed, Angelescu being only wounded. Beza had leaflets of the Legionary Movement with him. As a consequence, the Police put Corneliu Codreanu in prison, considering

him the moral author of the attempt. He denied any connection with Beza's attempt. He was released. Some articles appeared in the press the next day announced that Codreanu rejected Beza's attempt. Codreanu asserted that he would support Beza and defend him in court. Codreanu was put again in jail.

During these events, a group of seven Aromanians signed a leaflet asserting that Beza's attempt was justified. They were put in prison, too. On July 24th 1930, while being transported to the Văcărești jail, they met C. Codreanu. They spent together forty days in prison. The Aromanian group was composed by Constantin Papanace, Iancu Caranica, Grigore Pihu, Anton Ciumetti, Gheorghe Ghițea, Stere Ficăta, and Mamali. After these events they joined the Iron Guard. According to Papanace (1997: 177), Codreanu was impressed by the behavior of those seven Aromanians in jail and said:

“Your moral health is from the source. In the mountains you kept all the treasures of your race. Once, my people were like you. Nowadays they are adulterated in a lot of parts. I would like to heal our people, to have legionnaires like you.”

In his book (*Pentru legionari*, Editura Gordian, Timișoara, 1994, p. 438), Codreanu speaks about the problem of the adhesion of many Aromanians to his movement:

“The Macedonians approach us by brave, healthy youngsters who are clean like tears, nevertheless, we think that it is not a good thing that the mass of Macedonians from Quadrilateral join the Legion, since we do not want to expose them to too much oppression. But all the [Aromanian] students joined us”.

We have to mention here three conclusions:

- 1) The disappointment was part of the mental process which ended with the adhesion of some Aromanians to the Legionary Movement. This disappointment was connected with the bad management of the colonization process performed by the Romanian authorities.
- 2) Many Aromanians thought that their ethical sense was similar to the ethical sense promoted by the Legion. Many leaders of the Legion thought also that the Aromanians could be a prototype for the “new man” they were looking for.
- 3) The adhesion was important in the world of the Aromanian students.

Next, we will debate the problem of the Aromanian violence. Let us remember that, for some people, the image of the Aromanian was that they are “nervous, hostilely and revengefully”. The same idea was expressed by Emil Cioran in 1972.

“The Guards of the Dead were mainly uprooted Macedonians; generally, in this Movement the periphery was well represented.”²⁷

In what follows we will analyze the violence of the Aromanians who joined the Iron Guard. We mentioned above Beza’s unsuccessful attempt on Angelescu’s life. Beza was put in jail for one year. After the trial, he was released in July 1931. George Beza (1907-1995) joined the Iron Guard. He acquired the title of “commander” of the Legion, but nevertheless he was excluded from the organization (see Heinen A. 2006: 254). He cooperated for a while with Mihail Stelescu (excluded from the Iron Guard on September 25th 1934) in editing the journal *Cruciada Românilului*, in which they criticized the Legion. In April 1936 he was put (together with Stelescu) on the list of those who had to be punished for their betrayal (Heinen A. 2006: 278).

Beza joined PNȚ and had an important role during the Second World War (a monument was built in Jerusalem, to honor Beza). His wife, Vasilichia Beza, wrote a book about their life (Beza V. 1993). In this book she spoke about her husband’s career without mentioning his legionnaire past.

On December 29th 1933, the Prime Minister of Romania, I. G. Duca, was killed by a group of three legionnaires. Two of them were Aromanians: Doru Belimace and Iancu Caranica. In fact, Nicolae Constantinescu, the third member of the group, was the one who killed Duca. All the three assumed responsibility for this murder. In the night of December 29/30th 1933, the Aromanian Sterie Ciumetti, cashier of the Legion, was killed by the Police (for not telling where Codreanu was; this was the version of the legionnaires). Belimace, Caranica and Constantinescu were convicted to life in prison. They were killed on November 30th 1938 together with Codreanu.

We mentioned in the section concerning the emigration of the Aromanians in Romania the case of the 100 Aromanian families expecting to emigrate that spent more than two months in the Salonika harbor in 1927. Iancu Caranica together with C. Papanace asked for an audience with I. G. Duca, at that moment the Minister for Internal Affairs, in their quest to

solve the problem. Duca sent them to a subaltern. Instead, they preferred to pay a visit to the Prime Minister, I. Brătianu, who, according to Papanace (see Papanace C. 1999: 119-124), immediately solved the problem. But Muși maintains that things were rather different (see Muși V.: 1935, 2005: 128). Papanace suggested that the event from Salonika in 1927 and Duca's opinion against the colonization of the Aromanians (1925) played an important role in the tragedy which took place in December 1933.

On July 16th 1936, Mihail Stelescu was killed by ten of his former colleagues. One of these ten men was an Aromanian, Ion Carătănase, who was the leader of the group. According to Bordeiu (p. 20, note 18), Carătănase was born in 1909, in Hârșova, Constanța County, and he received the grade of Legionary Commander on July 4th 1934. He was killed on November 30th 1938.

On September 21th 1939, the Prime Minister Armand Călinescu was killed by a group of nine Iron Guard members. One of them, Ovidiu Isaia, was Aromanian. All nine were killed in the same day.

64 people were killed by the legionnaires in November 1940. Not one of the murderers was Aromanian. Instead, five of the victims were Aromanians: Cola Bileca, Mita Bileca, Marius Bațu, Costa Culețu and Spiru Dumitrescu.

If we count the number of Aromanians involved in these Iron Guard crimes, we observe that they were four: Belimace, Caranica, Carătănase, and Isaia. Therefore, it is very difficult to assert that the Aromanians were the killers of the Legionary Movement. But, at the same time, we can not deny the potential violence among Aromanians.

In my opinion, the image of the violent Aromanians emerges not from the violence of the Aromanians involved in the Iron Guard but rather from the violence in Southern Dobruja, which were related to the violence of the Bulgarian *comitadjii*.

Meanwhile, I should also mention that many Aromanian legionnaires were involved in the anticommunist resistance (see documents in Cojoc M., 2004; we can find very interesting oral histories in Conovici M, Iliescu S., Silivestru O., 2008 and in Mișa-Caragheorghe S.). The most important figures were Nicolae and Dumitru Fudulea, Nicolae Ciolacu, and Gogu Puiu. Many of them were imprisoned during the communist regime. Some of the Aromanian legionnaires, who succeeded to escape from Romania, were involved in the so-called "third Aromanian rebirth".

We are now questioning the cliché that "every Aromanian was a legionnaire". We first have to use the 1938 census, which recorded

108,404²⁸ Romanians in Southern Dobruja, about 29% of the population (let us mention that in 1912 there were 6,602 Romanians in Southern Dobruja, representing 2.3% of the population). If we consider that there were at most 30,000 Aromanians in Southern Dobruja in 1938, we reach the conclusion that the Aromanians were at most 8% of the population of the Southern Dobruja in 1938.

In the election of December 1937, the party which represented the Iron Guard, "Totul pentru Țară (All for the Country)", obtained 15.58% of the votes at the level of whole Romania (for these data see Bordeiu P.D. 2003: 351-352 and Heinen A. 2006: 466-467). In Caliacra they obtained²⁹ 9.86% of the votes and in Durostor 8.80%. This means that the legionnaires obtained in Southern Dobruja half of their national score.

Supposing that all the Aromanians were legionnaires, the only possibility was (taking into account that the Aromanians were at that moment at most 8% percent of the population of Southern Dobruja) that the "Totul pentru Țară" party did not get any vote from the more than 78,000 Romanians of the region.

In fact, there were many Aromanians who were liberals. They had two reasons for that: the first one was that many Aromanians were skilled merchants and traders and it was natural for them to support a liberal party; the second reason was that the National Liberal Party (PNL), led by Ionel Brătianu, decided the settlement of the Aromanians in Southern Dobruja.

I am very indebted to the historian researcher Raluca Tomi, who showed me an interesting document (CNSAS, the operative Archives, Gheorghe Brătianu file, file No. 10176, volume no. 2, leaf 14), which is an informative note from February 17th 1935:

"The PNL-Gh. Brătianu leaders, V. Papacostea³⁰ and C. Giurescu, presented to Gheorghe Brătianu an action plan for gathering the Macedonian colonizers in the ranks of the party. This plan has the following points:

- 1) To make a "Macedonian section" inside the youth organization of the party, having as a duty only to make propaganda in Dobruja.
- 2) To edit in Bazargic a newspaper in the Aromanian dialect, in order to acquire influence over the Macedo-Romanian Cultural Society.
- 3) The Study Department of the party has to analyze the Macedo-Romanian problems.
- 4) The adoption of a policy for the emigration of the Macedo-Romanians to Romania."³¹

If we look again at what Bordeiu (2003: 351-352) and Heinen (2006: 466-467) wrote, we notice that the PNL-Gh.Brătianu obtained 3.89% of the votes at the national level. In Caliacra County they obtained 1.55% and in Durostor County they obtained 8.68%. The percentage obtained in Durostor was amazing. It was 2.23 times greater than the national score.

We have to note that approximately 3,500 Aromanian families were settled in Durostor County and 2,500 were settled in Caliacra County (it is also to mention that the density of the population was greater in Durostor than in Caliacra). We can conclude that the Iron Guard had more sympathy inside the Aromanians in Caliacra County and that the PNL-Gh.Brătianu had more support among the Aromanians in Durostor County.

In connection with the third point of the above-mentioned document, let us observe that Vasile Muși was in 1935 a member of the PNL-Gh.Brătianu party³² (after he had been a member of the PNȚ). The very important study of Muși *Un deceniu de colonizare în Dobrogea-Nouă 1925-1935* could be seen as a part of this plan.

We notice that in Muși (1935, 2005) Gheorghe Brătianu is mentioned in two places: at page 129 we find the description of Gheorghe Brătianu's visit to Southern Dobruja on August 1927. There are two quotations from Gheorghe Brătianu in which he praised the qualities of the Aromanians and promised support for them.

The second place where Muși mentions Brătianu is at the very end of the book (p. 171). The book ends with a quotation from Gheorghe Brătianu. He praised once again the skills of the Aromanians for trade and considered that the Aromanians should be brought to Romania in order to become the economical elite of the country.

The great quarrel.

What is the status of the Aromanians in Romania?

Generally, the opinion is that the reopening of the Aromanian issue was a result of the activity of some Aromanians who had left Romania during the communist regime. For example, we can find in Tanașoca (2001: 164) the following opinion on this subject:

“The reopening of the Aromanian issue was recently initiated by certain groups of extremely active Aromanian émigrés in Western Europe. For the time being, it is too early to venture an opinion as to these attempts.

However, it is noticeable that the goal of these efforts is different from the earlier efforts. These partisans insist upon the separateness of Aromanians in regard to the Romanian state and its citizens. To them, Aromanians are ethnically different from Romanians, and they view the Aromanian dialect as a separate language.

These points of view, however, are not innovations derived from accurate study. Rather, they are dictated by political opportunism. In major national issues, such distractions can only be detrimental. At any rate, they are out of place."

We will try first to provide an outline of the evolution of the third Aromanian rebirth. Somehow unexpected, the idea of the segregation of the Aromanians from the Romanians appeared earlier than people thought. In Romania "*Alexandru D. Xenopol [...] adopted an extreme point of view whereby he questioned – with certain contradiction and second thoughts – the whole hypothesis concerning the Romanianity of the Vlach people and their language. He was tempted to identify them as an ethnic group, and their language, as Romance language, not as Romanian.*" (see Tanașoca N. Ș. 2001: 102). The second thoughts, mentioned by Tanașoca above, refers probably to the fact that Xenopol was trying to oppose some arguments against those (especially Rösler) who questioned the fact that Romanians are autochthones north of Danube (for this question see Boia L. 2005: 192-194). In Xenopol (1998: 173) we find this opinion:

"Daco-Romanians and Macedo-Romanians are two different people by their origin. They resemble very much since they are a mix of the same elements."

Even if we put aside Xenopol's opinion, we will find that it was not "groups of extremely active Aromanian émigrés in Western Europe" which had given birth to the idea of segregation between Aromanians and Romanians.

We have to speak now about Tașcu Ionescu, an Aromanian who lived in Sofia and who was born in Gopeș (a region that belongs now to the Republic of Macedonia). We will use documents no. 27, no. 188, and no. 311 from Drăghicescu A. and Petre M. (2006). Document no. 188 is a "report of the Romanian Embassy in Sofia to the minister of Foreign Affairs, Grigore Gafencu, containing comments on a memorandum of Tașcu Ionescu [...] who requested that the Aromanians should be acknowledged as a distinct nation, and the Aromanian dialect should be implemented

in the schools financed by the Romanian state in the Balkan Peninsula". In this document (pp. 384-385) we find the following phrase:

"M. Ionescu, the one who disputes the ethnical identity between the Romanians and Aromanians, criticizes the policy of the Romanian state regarding the Aromanian issue and the policy of the Macedo-Romanian Cultural Society. He also criticizes the trend of "imposing" to the Aromanians to learn in "Romanian dialect" and to encourage their settlement in Romania."

In the same document, dated March 28th 1940, we find that Taşcu Ionescu supported the old idea of a future federalist autonomous state "Macedonia" under the Italian protection (or, if not possible, of an Aromanian canton).

Document no. 311 (pp. 601-605) is a "Memorandum drawn up by Taşcu Ionescu [...] regarding the situation of the Aromanians in the Balkan Peninsula. He proposed the creation of a Macedo-Romania (Aromania) with a church head subordinated to the Romanian Patriarchy, placed under the protection of the League of Nations". This Memorandum (dated August 26th 1945) is addressed to the leaders of the Great Britain, USA, USSR, France, Italy and Romania. He asked the same thing as he asked in 1940 but, for obvious reasons, he proposed for the future state Aromania to be under the protection of the League of Nations. He also requested that the Aromanians should participate to the Peace Conference and Salonika should be a *porto franco*.

Document no 27 (pp. 160-161), is an earlier one, from January 20th, 1926, and it is a "report of the Romanian Legation in Sofia to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, I. G. Duca, regarding the conflict between a part of the Aromanian community and priest Stelian Iliescu of the Romanian church in Sofia. Parts of the members of the community requested the sermon be conducted in the dialect, a Macedonian priest, compliance with the old calendar, the obtaining of profits from the use of the church land". Taşcu Ionescu is mentioned as a member of the above group which was fighting against the priest. He even started to collect signatures for a complaint against the priest, a complaint which had to be sent to the Romanian Government.

After Taşcu Ionescu, it was Constantin Papanace (1904-1985) who suggested another approach for the Aromanian issue. Although he was a Romanian nationalist and although he thought that the Aromanians are Romanians, he was a political realist. After the Second World War, he went to live to Italy. He realized two things: the first one was that the

communist regime in Romania will give up the support to the Aromanians. The second one was that the plan of a future United Europe (imagined in 1949 in Western Europe) will be the best solution to obtain rights for the Aromanians, especially for those from Greece. The Aromanian group in Greece is the largest one in the Balkans and it had the opportunity of not being under a communist regime (Greece was the only Balkan state in this situation).

“In any situation that you will be in, you have to find your way guided by the Aromanian perspective.”³³

Papanace sent two memoirs to the United Nations: one in 1951 and the other in 1952 (the second one can be found in Brezeanu S., Zbucnea G., pp. 357-359, document no. 167). He asked for a UN inquiry regarding the situation of the Aromanian minority in the Balkans. He asked for the Aromanian people the right to have their own schools and churches, as well as the right of administrative autonomy in the regions where they are a majority.

On May 10th 1954, he attended the fourth Congress of the Federal Union of European Nationalities (FUEN) held in Rome, where he gave a talk about the Aromanian issue. He recounted his demands in the memoranda he had submitted in 1951 and 1952 to the UN.

In 1975 the Helsinki Treaty was signed by the member states of Commission on Security and Co-operation in Europe (today the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, OSCE). The Treaty included, among other things, a commitment that the Human Rights will be respected in those states who signed the document. This was the starting point of the third Aromanian rebirth.

In 1978, Vasile Barba (1918-2007) wrote an article in the journal *Noi Tracii* (no. 2, 1978), published by the controversial Iosif Constantin Drăgan in Italy. At that moment Barba (who was born in Greece) lived in Romania. The paper was titled “The Aromanians: A forgotten national minority which claims its rights”. In this paper, Barba demands the recognition of the Aromanians as a distinct national minority in the states where they lived. Also he demands for the Aromanians the right to education in their mother tongue, to religious services in Aromanian language in their churches, support for their cultural associations, newspapers, magazines, radio and television programmes in Aromanian. This was the plan followed by Barba during his life.

In 1981 he was at the UN headquarters in New York (with a group of Aromanians from all the parts of the world). He submitted a memoir with the above demands.

In a book appeared in Romania in 1982 (Barba C., Barba. V, 1982), Barba published many Aromanian texts with their translation in German. Strangely enough, one of the texts (pp. 82-83), which is a sort of letter sent by an old man to his nephew, is not translated into German. All the political demands we mentioned above appeared in this text written only in Aromanian language. In the same book there is a picture of the Aromanian group in front of the UN headquarters in 1981.

It is strange that all these actions took place while Barba lived in communist Romania. In 1983, when he retired, he left Romania for West Germany. What was the attitude of the communist authorities? We cannot answer. We can only say that they allowed Barba's activities (which contradicted the official communist policy not to interfere with the internal affairs of another state). Did the authorities agree with his demands? Did they want only to prospect for a future action? It is possible that the communist authorities allowed Barba to go to West Germany for not involving the Romanian state by his actions concerning the Aromanian issue.

On October 1980, the Association of the Aromanians from France (AFA), sent a memoir to CSCE Conference in Madrid. The name of the memoir was "Une nation européenne sans droits nationaux". The President of AFA, Iancu Perifan, sent a text which is very similar with Barba's paper of 1978.

On January 1st 1981, after Greece joined the EEC (the European Economic Community), the first Aromanian associations appeared in Greece.

After he left Romania, Barba created in West Germany the Union for the Aromanian Language and Culture (ULCA). This society organized five Aromanian Congresses in 1985, 1988, 1993, 1996 and 1999. The first one was held in Mannheim and the others in Freiburg.

Starting with 1984, he published the Aromanian review *Zborlu a Nostru* (Our Word). In order to make the printing easier, he operated some changes in the "traditional" alphabet. This was the starting point for a long quarrel, "the alphabet quarrel". He was accused that, by changing the alphabet, he wanted to separate the Aromanians from the Romanians. His alphabet was named "the barbarian alphabet". It was a mockery which used the name Barba and the word "barbarian". Let us mention that the some impolite

mockery was used against Tiberiu Cunia, the most important Aromanian publisher ever: his alphabet was named "cuneiform".

Barba was tenacious in following his plan. By his efforts, on May 30th 1994, a proposal concerning the Aromanians was presented to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. The proposal was presented by a group led by the Italian M. Ferrarini (for this text see Brezeanu S., Zbucnea G., document no. 176, pp. 368-369). Besides Barba's demands mentioned in his 1978 paper, the group asked for a report concerning the Aromanian issue. The Committee on Culture and Education appointed Luis Maria de Puig as rapporteur. A preliminary form of the report can be found in Brezeanu and Zbucnea (document no. 181, pp. 374-376).

On June 24th 1997, the report (Document 7728) was presented to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe for debate (18th Sitting). In the same day, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe voted *Recommendation 1333 (1997) on the Aromanian culture and language*, the most important achievement for the Aromanians ever. Point 8 (i and ii) of the document states the following:

"The Assembly recommends that the Committee of Ministers:

i) encourage Balkan states which comprise Aromanian communities to sign, ratify and implement the European Charter of regional or Minority languages and invite them to support the Aromanians, particularly in the following fields:

- a) education in their mother tongue;
- b) religious services in Aromanian in their churches;
- c) newspapers, magazines and radio and television programmes in Aromanian;
- d) support for their cultural associations;

ii) invite the other member states to support the Aromanian language, for instance by creating university professorships in the subject and disseminating the most interesting products of Aromanian culture throughout Europe by means of translations, anthologies, courses, exhibitions and theatrical productions."³⁴

It is noteworthy that the above document did not request recognition of the Aromanians as a distinct national minority. L. M. de Puig assumed this fact and said that he wanted to avoid all the political implications, to put his report in a cultural perspective.

A violent debate followed in Romania. Some wanted to see whether the Recommendation also applied to Romania or not.³⁵ Another point of debate was related to the concession made by de Puig and Barba regarding the canceling of the minority issue from the recommendation.

A very good analysis of the Aromanians in Romania after 1989 can be found in Trifon N., 2007. We will try to outline the process which reached its climax on April 16th 2005, when the Aromanian Community in Romania (CAR) asked for recognition as a national minority.

The first one who spoke openly in Romania about the recognition of the Aromanians in Romania as a national minority was Dumitru Piceava (born in 1941, in Romania), director of the Aromanian review *Bana Armânească*. The review is written entirely in Aromanian language. Its first issue appeared in 1996.

In Romania, before 1996, only one voice was heard: the voice of those who asserted the traditional thesis that the Aromanians are Romanians. This "voice" also spoke about the other thesis and warned of the danger of "segregation".

In his Ph.D. thesis, Thede Kahl (Kahl T. 1999: 128-132) published the results of his research during the years 1996-1998 concerning the Aromanians. For the Aromanians in Romania, the results were: 41% of them considered themselves as an ethnical minority and 59% thought the opposite; 66% of them considered themselves as a linguistic minority and 34% thought the opposite; 5% of them felt discriminated, 85% considered that they are not discriminated and 10% did not answer to this question; 29% of them considered Aromanian as a separate language, 69% considered Aromanian as the dialect of the Romanian language and 2% considered Aromanian as a mixed idiom. Since the number of those who were interviewed was small,³⁶ we can not say very much about this data beyond the fact that the results are quite interesting.

On April 16th 2005, the Aromanian Community in Romania (CAR) asked for the recognition of the Aromanians as a national minority. This decision was taken by vote. There were 524 people at this meeting. With one exception (an abstention), all the participants voted for recognition.

CAR was created in 1991. It was reactivated³⁷ in 2003-2004. The President of CAR is Costică Canacheu (born in 1958), a very well-known politician³⁸ in Romania. Today the Association has approximately 7,000 members (in 2003, CAR had 3,300 members). The same position (that Aromanians should be recognized as national minority) is shared by the League of the Aromanians of Romania (LAR). The Macedo-Romanian

Cultural Society (the oldest Aromanian organization in Romania) encourages the traditional opinion that the Aromanians are Romanians with some specific features which must be preserved. The same position is shared by “Picurarlu de la Pind” (Shepherd of the Pindus) society. In a press release on June 6th 2005, the Romanian Academy strongly criticized the request of CAR:

“We have in front of us a diversion which springs from the mercantile interests of some groups inside and outside the country, a diversion which ignores the true history of this branch of the Eastern Romanity and of the Aromanian dialect... [...] The Aromanians from Romania came to this country by their will, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries, since they considered themselves Romanians. They came for having a country of their own, for not being any more the subject of injustices in the place where they were born and where they were autochthones. [...] Admitting an Aromanian minority in Romania will be the greatest absurdity in the contemporary history of the Aromanians.”

In turn, the other side did not resist accusing the opponents. The accusations are almost the same: the “others” have interests, the “others” want to keep their good positions in the Romanian society, the “others” broke the links with the community and, therefore, they are traitors. We can notice that neither side showed restraint in its approach. It is quite likely that an outside observer would think the Aromanians are indeed violent.

A serene debate about this subject did not take place. Some people tried to explain which the motivations of this unexpected event were. For example, there were some attempts to highlight the cleavages: old/young, elite/ordinary Aromanians, *fărșerot*/*grămustean* (Aromanian sub-groups: Farșarotsi hail from southern Albania, while Gramushteani come from the area of Mt. Grammos). The portrait of the Aromanian who wants to be considered different in Romania according to these cleavages is the following: he is young, or he is an ordinary Aromanian, or he is *grămustean*. As for the portrait of the Aromanians who considered themselves as Romanians, this could be the following: he is old, or he has a good position in the Romanian society (or he is even part of the elite), or he is *fărșerot*. While there may be an element of truth in these facile stereotypes, we should be cautious about taking this type of approach too seriously.

Conclusions

This article ends with some conclusions by means of which I explain the great “quarrel” which took place in the last years.

Most Aromanians had powerful economic motivations when they decided to settle in Romania.

A heterogeneous and mixed Aromanian population came to Romania. One of the Aromanians considered themselves Romanians; others considered themselves being different from the Romanians. Generally, today, most Aromanians continue the self-identification tradition of their families.

Nevertheless, the settlement in Romania led to some changes. For example, those who suffered in the War or in prisons together with their families become closer to the Romanian identity. On the other side, there were a lot of Aromanians who were disappointed by different reasons. They felt that the settlement in Romania was poorly managed by the Romanian authorities. They felt that their ancestors took a wrong decision when they came to Romania (especially those from Greece who had not lived under a communist regime).

Also it is clear that the settlement in Romania was based on an illusion (for some Aromanians): the Romanian answer to the Aromanian question. On the other side, the Romanian state gave to the Aromanians who settled in Southern Dobruja the opportunity to live together. The fact that in a small region different Aromanian groups had to live together strengthened their Aromanian identity. For this reason, the Aromanians of both sides should be grateful to the Romanian state.

A very important role in this “quarrel” was played by the competition which exists in the Aromanian world. This competition can be very well described by an Aromanian proverb: “two Aromanians, two chiefs”. This quarrel may be also understood as a competition between two teams, each team willing to find the best solution for the survival of the Aromanians. In this way, they are recovering now the lost solidarity.

Probably the Aromanians should accept that there are more than one answer to their identity issue: a plural model of auto-identification is also possible.

NOTES

- ¹ When we quote Muși V., 1935, 2005, p.94 we refer to the republished version HAGIGOGU, S, MUȘI, V, NOE, C, 2005. The same is the case for Noe C., 1938, 2005 and Hagigogu S., 1927, 2005.
- ² We have to mention that from most of the Romanian sources, it follows that the population of Greece increased with approximately 1,000,000 people (this number results from the 1,500,000 Greeks who came to Greece and from the 500,000 Turks who left Greece).
- ³ This region was obtained by Romania from Bulgaria in 1913, after the Second Balkan War. The region consists of two counties: Durostor and Caliacra.
- ⁴ Noe C. (1938, 2005: 73) says that there were 4,946 Aromanian families in Southern Dobruja in 1932. Muși V. (1935, 2005: 168) asserts that in 1932 there were 6,553 Aromanian families in Southern Dobruja in 1932.
- ⁵ We can find in CUȘA, N, 1996 and in LASCU, S, 2002 data about the emigration process (in Coosa's book we can find the names of the Romanians who emigrated to Romania).
- ⁶ According to Saramandu N., 2007, p. XXVI, in 1968 in Constanța and Tulcea counties there were 29,400 Aromanians. 15,100 of them have their roots in Bulgaria, 11,530 of them in Greece, 1,720 of them in Albania and 1,050 of them in R. Macedonia. In this "census" did not count the Aromanians who do not live in Dobruja. Saramandu estimates that nowadays, there are 60,000-70,000 Aromanians in Romania. From the above mentioned 29,400 Aromanians, 17,700 were "grămosteni", 10,200 were "fărșeroși", 1,300 were "pindeni" and 200 were "moscopoleni" (these are Aromanian sub-groups). The 2002 census recorded 25,053 Aromanians and 1,334 Macedo-Romanians.
- ⁷ Sterie Hagigogu lived between 1888 and 1957. He was a member of a very important family from Veria, Greece. He arrived in Romania before the emigration process. He had liberal likings.
- ⁸ Muși was born in 1895 in Pleasa, Albania and died in 1969 in the USA.
- ⁹ Noe lived between 1883 and 1939. He was a Meglenit (and president of the "Meglenia Society").
- ¹⁰ Gheorghe Celea was the fourth member of what we can call the "kernel of the action" which ended with this emigration process.
- ¹¹ For this description see Hagigogu, S., 1927, 2005: 15.
- ¹² This idea was not new. Some Aromanians supported this idea in the years of the Balkan Wars.
- ¹³ At that moment it was supposed that the Aromanians would pay for the land they would receive. But, in the end the emigrated Aromanians received the land for free.
- ¹⁴ For this text see Noe C., 1938, 2005: 42. The original text appeared in *Peninsula Balcanică*, no. 8, January 1925.

- 15 Max Popovici was inspector general in the Ministry of Agriculture.
 16 Brabețeanu worked for a while at the Romanian Legation (Embassy).
 17 Noe explains that this behavior can be explained by the fact the emigration
 process was a blame for Rășcanu since one of the reason of the emigration
 was that the Aromanians of Greece were subject of many injustices.
 18 The document is a political report of the German Consul in Galați.
 19 Noe (1938, 2005: 69) explains that the memoir was a result of the quarrels
 between these people with some Aromanian intellectuals who already lived
 in Romania.
 20 Stere Papatanaș, the director of the Romanian school in Doleani.
 21 We have to note that a few days later, Ghibănescu got a box on the ears
 from Hențescu, a Romanian lawyer from Silistra. After a few months, on May
 30th 1927, Captain Al. Popescu attempted to Ghibănescu's life. Fortunately,
 Ghibănescu was not killed.
 22 This is a part of a song recorded in Caraiani N., Saramandu N., 1982, p. 360.
 The song was recorded in 1966 in Bucharest. The informer was Gheorghe
 Lila, a 59 years old man, born in Bachița, Bulgaria.
 23 Damu Nicolae, a 36 years old man from Stejaru, Tulcea County. This
 testimony can be found in Saramandu N., 2007, p. 99.
 24 Țîrcomnicu E., 2004, p. 190.
 25 He was born in Papadia, Greece.
 26 Papanace C., 1999, p. 70.
 27 Cioran E., *Țara mea*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 1996, p. 32. This is part of an
 interview took by François Bondy to Emil Cioran in 1972.
 28 For this data see Lascu S., 2002, p. 45.
 29 These are the scores for the Deputy Assembly. Heinen indicates only the
 data for the Deputy Assembly. Bordeiu mentioned also the results for the
 Senate. In Caliacra "Totul pentru Țară" obtained 8.78% and in Durostor
 they had no candidates.
 30 The well-known Professor Victor Papacostea was Aromanian and member
 of the Romanian Parliament.
 31 Since we consider this document very important, we will give here the
 original version of the document entitled *Notă informativă din 17 februarie*
1935: "Fruntașii georgiști V. Papacostea și C. Giurescu au înfățișat lui
 Gheorghe Brătianu un plan de acțiune pentru atragerea coloniștilor
 macedoneni în partid. Acest plan cuprinde următoarele puncte:
 1) O "secțiune macedoneană" în sânul organizației tineretului georgist,
 însărcinată exclusive cu propaganda în Dobrogea.
 2) Pentru dobândirea influenței asupra "Societății de cultură macedo-
 română", se va edita un ziar în dialectal aromân la Bazargic.
 3) Cercul de studii al partidului va lua în studiu problemele macedo-române.
 4) Adoptarea unei politici de imigrație a românilor macedoneni în țară."

- ³² See Papanace C., *Fără Căpitan*, Editura Elisavars, Bucharest, 1997: 150.
- ³³ See Papanace C., 1999: 100. It is the first urge from a list of 26 urges for the Aromanians.
- ³⁴ The whole text of the recommendation can be found in *Zborlu a Nostru*, No. 56, 1997, pp. 17-19.
- ³⁵ Let us notice that Hans Heinrich Hansen, the President of FUEN, came to Bucharest on May 24th 2009 invited by CAR. He promised that FUEN will support CAR in its action for obtaining the recognition of the Aromanians as a national minority in Romania.
- ³⁶ There were 26 people interviewed from Romania; 6 from Constanța, 6 from M. Kogălniceanu, 5 from Ovidiu, 2 from Techirghiol, 5 from Cobadin and 2 from Ceamurlia S.
- ³⁷ It is interesting to notice that this association is organized following the old *fara* and *fălcare* structures. For an analysis of what *fălcare* means nowadays, see for example Iosif Sîrbu C., 2004.
- ³⁸ He is member of the Liberal Democrat Party (PDL).

REFERENCES

- BARBA, C, BARBA, V, *Das Süddonau-latein heute*, Piatra Neamț, 1982.
- BERCIU-DRĂGHICESCU, A, PETRE, M, *Școli și biserici românești din Peninsula Balcanică. Documente. (Romanian Churches and schools in Balkan Documents.)* Bucharest, 2004(first volume), 2006 (second volume).
- BEZA, V, *Între două lumi*, Editura Fundației Culturale Române, Bucharest, 1993
- BOIA, L, *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 2005 (fourth edition)
- BREZEANU, S, ZBUCHEA, G, (ed.), *Românii de la Sud de Dunăre. Documente, Arhivele Naționale ale României*, Bucharest, 1997
- BORDEIU, P. D., *Mișcarea Legionară în Dobrogea între 1933-1941*, Editura Ex Ponto, Constantza, 2003
- CARAGIU MARIOȚEANU, M, *Aromânii și Aromâna în Conștiința Contemporană*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2006
- CARAIANI, N, SARAMANDU, N, *Folclor aromân grămostean*, Editura Minerva, Bucharest, 1982
- *** *Carte de iubire pentru Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu/Carti di vreami trâ Matilda* (ed. GICA, A), Editura Sammarina, Bucharest, 2002
- CLOGG, R, *Scurtă istorie a Greciei (A Concise History of Greece)*, Polirom, Iassy, 2006
- COJOC, M, *Rezistența armată din Dobrogea*, Institutul Național pentru Studiul Totalitarismului, Bucharest, 2004
- CONOVICI, M, ILIESCU, S, SILIVESTRU, O, Țara, *Legiunea, Căpitanul. Mișcarea Legionară în documente de istorie orală*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 2008
- CUȘA, N, *Aromânii (Macedonenii) în România*, Editura Muntenia, 1996
- DJUVARA, N, (ed.) *Les Aroumains*, Paris, 1989. (Romanian translation, Bucharest, 1996)
- DOBROGEANU, I, "Statul nostru și politica de întărire a românismului în Dobrogea de Sud.", *România de la Mare*, No. 3-4, 1994, pp. 19-29
- HAGIGOGU, S, *Emigrarea Aromânilor și Colonizarea Cadrilaterului*, Tip. Române Unite, Bucharest, 1927
- HAGIGOGU, S., NOE, C., MUȘI, V (ed. ȚÎRCOMNICU, E.), *Colonizarea Macedoromânilor în Cadrilater*, Editura Etnologică, Bucharest, 2005
- HEINEN, A, *Legiunea Arhanghelul Mihai*, Humanitas, Bucharest, 2006 (second edition)
- IOSIF SÎRBU, C, "La fălcare, un modèle d'organisation communautaire dans les Balkans et sa dynamique", *New Europe College Yearbook 2003-2004*, pp.273-314
- KAHL, T, *Ethnizität und räumliche Verteilung der Aromunen in Südosteuropa*, Institut für Geographie der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Münster, 1999
- KAHL, T, *Istoria aromânilor*, Editura Tritonic, Bucharest, 2006

- LASCU, S, "Împroprietăirea românilor balcanici în Cadrilater (Restoring Property Rights to Balkan Romanians of Southern Dobruja)", *Dosarele Istoriei*, No. 65, 2002, pp. 28-40, Bucharest
- LASCU, S, "Înfrăptuiri românești în Cadrilater (Romanian Achievements in Southern Dobruja)", *Dosarele Istoriei*, No. 65, 2002, pp. 44-48, Bucharest
- MIȘA-CARAGHEORGHE, S, *Eroi și martiri dobrogeni anticomuniști*, Crater (without year and place of publication)
- MUȘI, V, *Un deceniu de colonizare în Dobrogea-Nouă 1925-1935*, Societatea de Cultură Macedo-Română, 1935
- NICOLAU, I, "Les caméléons des Balkans", "En quête d'identité", *Civilisations*, No. 42, 1993, pp. 175-178, Bruxelles
- NOE, C, "Colonizarea Cadrilaterului", *Revista Sociologie Românească*, an III, No. 4-6, 1938, Bucharest
- PAPANACE, C, *Evocări*, Editura Fundației Buna Vestire, 1997
- PAPANACE, C, *Mișcarea Legionară și Macedo-Românii*, Editura Elisavaras, 1999
- PEYFUSS, M. D., *Chestiunea aromânească*, Editura Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 1994
- PEYFUSS, M. D., "Aromunen in Rumänien", *Österreichische Osthefte*, No. 26, 1984, pp. 313-319, Vienna
- SARAMANDU, N, *Aromâna vorbită în Dobrogea (The Aromanian spoken in Dobruja)*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2007
- TANAȘOCA, N. Ș., "Aperçus of the history of Balkan Romanity", *Politics and Culture in Southeastern Europe* (ed. THEODORESCU, R, and BARROWS, L. C.), Bucharest, 2001
- TRIFON, N, *Les Aroumains, un peuple qui s'en va*, Acratie, Paris, 2005
- TRIFON, N, "Les Aroumains en Roumanie depuis 1990. Comment se passer d'une (belle-)mère patrie devenue encombrante", *Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest*, vol. 38, No.4, pp. 173-199
- ȚÎRCOMNICU, E, *Identitate românească sud-dunăreană. Aromânii din Dobrogea.*, Editura Etnologică, Bucharest, 2004
- XENOPOL, A.D., *Teoria lui Rösler. Studii asupra stăruinței românilor în Dacia Traiană*, Editura Albatros, Bucharest, 1998