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Abstract

After mass protests in January-February 2014 and the replacement of its central authority, Ukraine reverted to its intention to sign the agreement on association with the EU. The success of the agreement’s practical implementation relies on Ukraine’s friendly relations with all EU member states. However, among all European states, Ukraine’s relations with Romania are the most complex and contradictory. This article attempts to designate direction for making mutually advantageous decisions on existing contradictions. It is based on research into Ukraine’s relations with Romania and considers Romania’s relations with other states.

Introduction

Romania is a relatively young country. Its history is one of separated lands that, at various times, have been under the control of other states. The fundamentals of the modern Romanian language were formed under the influence of Roman culture in the ancient era. The Orthodox faith was brought from Kievan Rus’, and from the second half of the nineteenth century the kings of Romania were representatives of the German dynastic branch. According to language and culture, Romanians tend toward Latin countries; according to faith – toward the East Slavic nations; according to monarchical traditions (although they are not expressed enough) – toward Germany. During the last 150 years Romania aspired to collect territories with Romanian populations. In many respects, these aspirations, as well as certain problems of economic development, determine disagreements between Romania and Ukraine today. Ukraine intends to sign the

*Viktor Pavlenko – Deputy Director, Head of Defence Policy Division, Defence Policy and Strategic Planning Department, Ministry of Defence of Ukraine (Email: vipmod@ukr.net)
Sergey Sveshnikov – PhD, Leading Research Fellow, National Defence University of Ukraine (Email: sveshnikovsv@yandex.ru)
Victor Bocharnikov – PhD, Chief Research Fellow, National Defence University of Ukraine (Email: bocharnikovvp@yandex.ru)
agreement on association with EU so as to come closer to EU standards in policy, economic and other spheres, to encourage economic development, and also for its own safety. However, without resolving disagreements with its neighbouring European states, in particular Romania, implementing the agreement successfully will be problematic. Therefore, finding mutually advantageous compromises between Ukraine and Romania is vital. This can be based on research into political, economic, military and other relations.

Today, analysts are predominantly paying attention to bilateral relations; however, an analysis of Romania’s relations with the third states is also important for the completeness and all-inclusiveness of that research. Firstly, any state has no absolute sovereignty and is compelled to take into account the interests of other states. In other words, the third states have direct influences, which are sometimes strong enough to influence Romania’s position. Secondly, research into Romania’s relations with the third states is interesting for the purpose of studying analogies of disagreement and resolution and for understanding general trends in relations development. Moreover, it is necessary to take Romania’s internal circumstances into account in order to understand its motivations for taking certain positions during problems in relations. However, in scientific and analytical publications such a research context has not yet been used.

The research is based on conceptual model that explains the term ‘interstate relations’ (see Figure 1). This model reflects interactions between two states. The states each have interests, which are the main stimulators of their actions. The most important interests are connected with basic needs for the states’ existence; for example, the need for energy resources. The interests of the states are made concrete in separate problems of relations. Each problem of relations has several options (variants) for resolution. The state determines the conformity of its own interests to each of the variants and chooses that one that as much as possible corresponds to these interests.

However, the state cannot always choose the best variant because it should take into account its own internal circumstances as well as interests of third states. Internal circumstances consist of political, economic and other resource restrictions, and characterise the mental and historical experience of the state and the nation. For example, a ‘social resource’ can be considered an internal circumstance. In the case of resource insufficiency the state cannot choose the best variant because that state does not have the resources to implement it. In addition, the interests of the third states may be considered as restrictions, as they compel the state not to select the best variant for itself so as to not damage relations with other states. The thick arrow in the figure designates the forced shift in variants chosen by the state.
To achieve its own interests in a solution to a problem, the state forms intentions and carries out corresponding actions, which give rise to relations with regard to this problem. If the two states have chosen different variants of resolution, their relations become contradictory. The states can act in two ways to resolve these contradictions: to eliminate each other (with the help of war), or to negotiate and achieve a compromise. A compromise can be found by coming to a consensus about the common principles of resolving the disagreement and about corresponding compromises in relation to different problems.

![Conceptual research model](image)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual research model

We used this conceptual model as the basis of the formation of Ukraine’s military doctrine\(^1\) and to model risks in international relations.\(^2\) According to this model we shall further consider the mental and historical preconditions that are a basis for the formation of Romania’s long-term interests and its positions concerning the resolution of modern problems of relations. Informal political concepts, which are being discussed by experts, are such preconditions. Next, we shall consider the actual problems in Romania’s foreign policy relations, the position of the third states and the internal circumstances that can influence the
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resolution of contradictions. We have chosen to examine the problems of relations that are considered most frequently in analytical materials, statements of politicians and the mass media.

1. Political concept of ‘Greater Romania’ (‘Romania Mare’)

The concept of Greater Romania has been formed gradually over the last 150 years. The concept first appeared in an orthodox environment during the rise of the national liberation movement in south-eastern Europe with support from the Russian Empire and Russian Orthodoxy.\(^3\) It presupposed a consolidation of all territories inhabited by orthodox Romanians. Russia was interested in strengthening the influence of the Russian Orthodox Church as opposed to the influence of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, which were related to Catholic Austria. However, after Romania obtained independence the Orthodox context was replaced by an ethnic one. In other words the concept of Greater Romania was transformed into collection of territories inhabited by ethnic Romanians. Some researchers consider the concept as a reflection of Romanian nationalism.\(^4\)

Strictly speaking, Greater Romania can hardly be called a geopolitical concept because it does not define its civilisation sources, political principles, allies and policy instruments. However, some comprehension of the concept is possible thanks to the views and analysis of Romanian politicians and the press concerning the ownership of territories, evaluation of historical events and ethnic identity. Today we can consider the concept of Greater Romania on two levels: the ethnic identity of Moldovans, and the historical assessment of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.

1.1. Ethnic identity of Moldovans

According to the official position of Romania, Moldova is the ‘second Romanian state’: Moldovans are Romanians and the Moldovan language is the Romanian language. Therefore, Moldova should approach Romania in order for the two states to be united. The ethnic identity of the populations of Moldova and
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\(^3\) Дугин А., Основы геополитики. Великая Румыния [The foundations of geopolitics, Greater Romania], <http://society.polbu.ru/dugin_geopolitics/ch132_i.html>, 10 11 2013.

Romania, and the Romanian citizenship of a significant part of Moldova’s citizens, should form a basis for rapprochement between the two states. Romania has similar policies with respect to other states.\(^5\) It has reacted immediately to Ukraine’s cancellation of the law on regional languages and has demanded protection for the rights of national minorities.\(^6\) Such actions can be considered as an intention to create the preconditions for the requirements to protect the rights of Romanians, strengthen Romania’s influence in some territories of neighbouring states and stimulate aspirations of Romanians who live abroad concerning a uniting with the alma mater.

1.2. Historical assessment of the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact

In June 1991 the Romanian Parliament adopted a declaration on the consequences of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, which authorised the annexation of Bessarabia and North Bukovina in 1940.\(^7\) Denial of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact makes it necessary to revise the borders that are established according to this pact. With regard to Ukraine this would lead to the transfer of North Bukovina and South Bessarabia to Romania. However, according to international law, the effect of the pact ended automatically after Germany attacked the USSR, and the modern borders in Eastern Europe were established after 1945, when the pact was no longer in force. Therefore, cancelling the pact cannot affect the current borders.

It is necessary to emphasise that Romanian political science also develops other political concepts; for example, the concept of ‘noopolitics’ – the politics of merging geopolitical spaces.\(^8\) Noopolitics supposes a strengthening of cooperation between Romania and Bessarabia, Romania and Ukraine. However, the concept also proclaims the necessity of identity protection of Romanians who live abroad.
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2. Problematic issues in Romania’s foreign relationships

The implementation of the concept of Greater Romania, directly or indirectly, can be traced in Romanian foreign relations reflected in the media. From Ukraine’s perspective, the most serious problem of relations is the possibility of territorial claims from Romania. From Romania’s perspective, the following problems\(^9\) have top priority.

- The European integration of Moldova, support for the Romanian identity of Moldovans, and relations with the Romanian minority in Ukraine and Serbia.
- Settlement of the ‘frozen’ conflicts.
- Energy security.

Romania has a large community of ethnic Hungarians, who also aspire to self-determination. In a twist of fate, Hungary’s attitude to this minority is analogous to Romania’s attitude to its own ethnic minorities abroad. Relations with Hungary cause great anxiety for Romania and, therefore, have interest for research. Moreover, because of disagreements with other members of the EU, Romania is not fully satisfied with its own membership of the EU. These disagreements are compelling Romania to look for support from other influential states, in particular the USA. The exclusive attention paid by the USA to Romania is influenced by Romania’s great geopolitical importance in the Black Sea region.

2.1. Territorial issues with Ukraine

Implicit territorial issues between Romania and Ukraine emerged almost immediately after the collapse of the USSR and the Romanian Parliament’s adoption of the declaration concerning the consequences of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. Although officially Romania has not put forward territorial claims to Ukraine (except for ownership of the Black Sea shelf), its actions permit us to assume the presence of territorial claims. These actions affect several areas.
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\(^9\) Соаре В., Центральная Азия в целом, и Казахстан в частности, являются ключевыми факторами для ЕС в области энергоресурсов [Central Asia as a whole, and Kazakhstan in particular, are key factors for the EU in the sphere of energy resources], <http://www.iimp.kz/bullets/bullet15/005.html>, 10 11 2013.
2.1.1. Ukraine’s economic activity in the Danube Delta

The economic activity of Ukraine in the Danube Delta is based on Ukraine’s desire to redirect to itself a part of the freight flow (through the Chilia River) that passes from Western Europe through the Romanian part of the Danube Delta along the Sulina and George rivers. The fact that Ukraine has provided Moldova with access to the Danube and the Black Sea, and the construction of the port by Moldova in the village of Giurgiulești, caused the decline of the Ukrainian port of Reni (in 2010 this port processed only 10–15% of its designed capacity) and the economic decline of the region south of Odessa. It has the potential to increase discontent among the Ukrainian population in the Danube region (approximately 140,000 inhabitants) and the internal instability of the border areas. Thus, the construction of ship canal by Ukraine in the Danube’s Chilia riverbed is reasonably considered to be an effective instrument for economic development and strengthening of sovereignty over border areas. The canal is a part of the Main–Rhine–Danube–Black Sea 7th international transport corridor, with total length of 2,415 km and transit potential of about 20 million tons of cargo annually. According to economists’ assessments, $1 of investment in the development of the waterways attracts $25 of private investment in the industry of the riverine areas. To the present day, the Ukrainian tariffs are 40% lower than the Romanian tariffs. According to expert assessments, Romania lost about 50% of its transit charges after the Ukrainian canal opened.

Earlier, Romania hampered the construction of the ship canal. In 2004 the Romanian Border Service motor boat blocked the passage of the Ukrainian Danube Shipping Company’s Volga cruise passenger liner, which had tourists from Germany on board. The boat anchored in the middle of the ship canal. Probably, the Romanian side thought that this would scare carriers by creating instability in the area of the Ukrainian canal. In 2010 Romania controlled the flow of water through its own dams in such way that it caused the siltation of the Ukrainian ship canal, resulting in the canal depth being reduced to 3.3 metres. In addition, Romania unilaterally, without the consent of Ukraine, decided to widen part of the Chilia River. Romania imposed higher tariffs for empty vessels that entered the Danube through the Ukrainian canal, and exited, loaded, through the deeper
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Sulina river.\textsuperscript{11} Today territorial contradictions between Romania and Ukraine can be seen in the Romanian attempt to move the international border behind the Ukrainian island of Maikan, even though, according to international treaties, this island belongs to Ukraine. If Romania is successful in this attempt, a part of the Ukrainian canal will be Romano-Ukrainian and Romania will have the potential to completely block the Ukrainian canal.

\textbf{2.1.2. European integration of Ukraine}

Romania showed no interest in Ukraine’s accession to the EU. In June 2011 the president of Romania, after consultations in Britain, announced\textsuperscript{12} that he considered the possible enlargement of the EU by 2018 to include only eight countries: those of the Western Balkans, as well as Moldova and Turkey. Obviously, there is no Ukraine on this list.

\textbf{2.1.3. Granting Romanian citizenship to residents of Ukraine’s border areas}

Granting Romanian citizenship to Ukraine’s border residents is an effective tool to strengthen the Romanian identity and create a positive attitude toward joining the EU throughout Romania. This undermines Ukraine’s sovereignty in the border areas. The effectiveness of this instrument would increase many times if the border area of Ukraine was in economic depression. Granting Romanian citizenship to residents of North Bukovina, who traditionally seek work abroad and seek to live in the EU, has caused particular concern in Ukraine. Romania’s accession to the Schengen Zone, which is planned for the near future, will considerably increase the attractiveness of the Romanian citizenship because for Ukrainian citizens it will mean it is easier to cross the border and to migrate within the EU. In 2011, according to various estimates, more than 30,000 passports were issued to citizens of Ukraine by the Romanian diplomatic missions. According to the Ukrainian legislation dual citizenship directly contradicts the Constitution of Ukraine. In addition, foreign diplomatic missions, according to Article 41 of the...

\textsuperscript{11} Media International Group, \textit{Бухарест подставил Киев подножку} [Bucharest has tripped Kiev up], <http://mignews.com.ua/ru/articles/38529.html>, 10 11 2013.

\textsuperscript{12} Last World News, \textit{President of Romania does not see Ukraine in EU next seven years}, <http://news.sevrugin.com/node/18851>, 10 11 2013.
Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations in 1961,\(^\text{13}\) must comply with the constitution and laws of the host country.

Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine publicly demonstrated fears concerning the mass distribution of the Romanian and Hungarian citizenship for citizens of Ukraine. According to a declaration by M. Tomenko, Vice-President of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine,\(^\text{14}\) organisations being financed from abroad used financial incentives to encourage citizens of Ukraine to state their nationality as that of one the neighbouring states at the time of the 2012 population census. In the middle of 2011 the Odessa Regional Advice [council] asked the Cabinet of Ukraine to deploy in the regional city of Bolgrad a battalion of internal forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine in connection with ‘deterioration of the criminal situation in the Odessa area, and also in connection with existing geopolitical contradictions in the south of the area’\(^\text{15}\).

Ukraine’s official position as expressed by the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine was to develop relationships on the issue in a ‘soft’ way: the organisation of citizens local border traffic; de-politicisation of the problem of protection of minorities in both countries; and joint monitoring of the problem of protecting minorities.

### 2.1.4. Russia’s military presence in Crimea

Taking into account geopolitical concepts concerning the Black Sea region, Crimea is one of the most important anchor points. Therefore, basing the Russian Black Sea Fleet and other troops there provides control over the entire north-western part of the Black Sea. The combat potential of the Black Sea Fleet considerably exceeds the combat potential of the naval forces of Romania. The strengthening of Romania does not correspond with Russian interests. Therefore, Romania considers the Russian Black Sea Fleet as a counterbalance to its own naval forces and is concerned about Russia’s presence in Crimea.\(^\text{16}\)
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\(^{14}\) Комментарии, Януковича просят разобраться с угрозой со стороны Румынии и Венгрии [Deputies ask Yanukovich to investigate with threat from Romania and Hungary], <http://politics.comments.ua/2011/03/21/240226/yanukovicha-prosyt-razobratsya.html>, 10 11 2013.

\(^{15}\) Восточный корреспондент, Одесса просит разместить войска в Бессарабии [Odessa asks for troops to be placed in Bessarabia], <http://www.eastkorr.net/power/odessa-prosit-razmestit-voiska-v-bessarabii>, 10 11 2013.

\(^{16}\) Popescu O., *Fortele rusesti din Transnistria ii deranjeaza doar pe cei care ar vrea sa vada acolo soldati romani - prim-vicepresedintele Dumei* [‘Russian troops in Transnistria only irritate those who would like
2.1.5. Informal opinions of the political elite

The informal opinions of the political elite represent a special interest in the research into problems, because informal opinions often contain what politicians cannot say officially. These opinions can bring about changes in state policy and act as an experimental probe to assess the possible response of the international community. In this context the opinions of the radical opposition media are interesting, because they are often used for the same purpose. Of course, we should be cautious about relying on such thoughts, but to ignore these opinions would be a mistake.

Concerning territorial claims the most typical thought was expressed by C. Tudor, Romanian Member of the European Parliament:17 ‘Keep in mind that in Romania there are political forces that can support the legitimate aspirations of Russia to return Crimea in exchange for Russia’s recognition of the illegal division of Romania in 1940 into Moldova and Romania.’ C. Tudor believes that Ukraine ‘got the best piece of all the republics of the former USSR’. The ‘Ziua Veche’ edition is expressed in a slightly different way:18 ‘Ukraine, if it still exists, will have the border on the south with the Crimea, the Tatarian independent state, or possibly with Turkey.’

Thus, we can see one idea concerning Ukraine: Ukraine is to be divided. There are reasons to believe that Romania could be interested in the Ukraine’s division as a state, if Romania’s territorial and regional interests are satisfied. From Romania’s point of view, this idea seems to be quite rational. Of course, there are some complications with using of military force against Ukraine. Firstly, there is the possibility of military support from Russia. Secondly, the EU does not want a military conflict on its borders. And thirdly, Ukraine would never agree to the annexation of its own territories and on any suitable occasion would try to get them back, which would cause permanent conflict. The division of Ukraine would avoid these complications. According to a media reports, Romania illegally
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17 НА REGNUM, Европарламентарий от Румынии: Украина – искусственное государство, своровавшее чужие территории [The Europarlamentarian from Romania: Ukraine – the artificial state that has stolen the territories of others], <http://www.regnum.ru/news/1242576.html>, 10 11 2013.

18 НА REGNUM, Румыния воссоединится вопреки КГБистским динозаврам, их хохляцким наемникам и манкуртам в Кишиневе: обзор СМИ Румынии [Romania will reunite, contrary to KGB dinosaurs, their Ukrainian mercenaries and mankurts in Kishinev: review of the Romanian mass media], <http://regnum.ru/news/fd-abroad/romania/1430634.html#ixzz1XGFxWOgQ>, 10 11 2013.
supplied weapons to rebels in the former Yugoslavia;\textsuperscript{19} i.e., the Romanian secret services have some experience in escalating internal instability and arming illegal formations in other states.

Certainly, Romania would fail to implement this scenario on its own and without the support of leading world powers. However, Romania could be a mediator or initiator of events. The described scenario is the result of a hypothetical combination of extremely negative conditions and circumstances, which is why its possibility may be controversial. However, the scenario has not been rejected by experts in geopolitics of the USA, EU, and Russian Federation.\textsuperscript{20, 21, 22}

\textbf{2.2. The problem of rapprochement of Romania with Moldova, and settlement of the Transnistrian conflict}

The problem of Romania’s rapprochement with Moldova is inseparably linked to the settlement of the Transnistrian conflict, as Transnistria is an integral part of Moldova so it is difficult to talk about changing the ‘state’ status of the Republic of Moldova without restoring its political sovereignty over the territory of Transnistria. The source of the Transnistrian conflict is the Parliament of Moldova’s adoption of the Law on the Moldovan language and the Declaration of Independence, which nullify the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and declare the USSR law ‘on the establishment of the Union of the Moldovian SSR’ invalid, as well as cancelling ‘the division of the national territory Acts of 1775 and 1812.’ De jure, the Declaration of Independence cancels Transnistria as a part of the Republic of Moldova and also cancels the Moldovan-Ukrainian and Moldovan-Romanian modern borders.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{19} Moldnews, Румынию обвиняют в незаконных поставках оружия бывшим республикам Югославии, ведших войну за независимость с Белградом [Romania is accused of supplying illegal arms to the former republic of Yugoslavia, which has waged war with Belgrad for independence], <http://moldnews.md/rus/news/42945>, 10 11 2013.

\textsuperscript{20} Каратницки А., Раздел Украины. Как это видят в США [The Division of Ukraine. How it is seen in the USA], <http://www.ua-pravda.com/argumenti-i-fakti/razdel-ukraini.-kak-eto-vidyat-v-ssha.html>, 10 11 2013.


\textsuperscript{22} ИА REGNUM, “Украина распадется на три части, а Россия с Германией перекроит карту Европы: итальянский журнал” ['Ukraine will disintegrate into three parts, and Russia with Germany will remake the map of Europe'], <http://www.regnum.ru/news/1200177.html>, 10 11 2013.

While analysing the problem we should also take into account that: Moldovans do not recognise the Romanian identity; Moldovans and Romanians are orthodox and pertain to competing confessions; Transnistrians do not recognise themselves as either Moldovans or Romanians; and the large part of the Moldovan political elite are oriented toward Romania. In addition, we should take into account the possible consequences of unification, the chief of which is the possibility of strengthening Romania and raising its resoluteness to use force, which could encourage Romania to activate policies toward the east. Territorial claims to Bulgaria and claims to some Ukrainian islands in the Danube Delta can be considered examples of this, as they appeared almost immediately after the partition of Ukrainian-Romanian territorial waters according to the decision of the International Court.

2.2.1. Romania’s position

In September 2011, after his visit to the USA, the president of Romania, T. Băsescu, gave a detailed interview on Romanian politics. In particular, he declared that: Romania is not striving for the annexation of Moldova, but wants its accession to the EU; in 1941 Romania crossed the Prut legally, but illegally crossed the Dniester; and Moldova was, and still is, Romanian land. This position has an obvious paradox: on the one hand, Romania supports the territorial integrity of Moldova; on the other hand, it refuses to sign the border treaty with Moldova. According to the Romanian president, that would mean recognition of the legitimacy of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. However, the president’s opinion is not supported by everyone in Romania. Many Romanian opposition publications consider Transnistria ‘a stone around the neck of Bessarabia’ due to significant corruption, the incompatible mentality of the people and the great influence of Russia, which can use Transnistria as a tool to counter Romania. Romanian media, in a veiled form, have discussed the independence of Transnistria.

25 Băsescu T, Republica Moldova a fost si este pamant romanesc ['The Republic of Moldova has been and remains the Romanian land'], <http://www.adevarul.ro/la_masa_adevarului/Traian_Basescu-presedintele_romaniei--Republica_Moldova_a_fost_si_este_pamant_romanesc_0_554945145.html>, 10 11 2013.
Romania promotes the approximation of Moldova through cultural exchange aimed at educating young people in the spirit of pan-Romania. Romanian citizenship is the most important instrument for bringing about Moldova’s incorporation. Just before Romania’s accession to the EU, the Romanian president urged government agencies to accelerate the process of issuing Romanian passports to Moldovan residents. After accusations of organising riots in Chisinau in 2009, the Romanian president issued a decree on rapidly granting Romanian citizenship to residents of Moldova who had lived in Romania before 1940, including the third generations of their descendants. The decree accelerated the process of obtaining citizenship and does not require knowledge of the Romanian language from new citizens. Thus, residents of Transnistria are recognised by citizens of Moldova. With regard to settlement of the Transnistrian conflict, Romania considers that there is a need to replace Russian troops with international civil peacekeepers, while expanding the EU’s involvement in settlement of the conflict.

2.2.2. Moldova’s position

Moldova’s position is determined mainly by the ratio of internal political forces. The Communist Party supports the Moldovenism concept. Other parties support unity with Romania. Concerning the Transnistrian problem, Moldova adheres to the principle of territorial integrity and supports the removal of Russian troops from Transnistria.

2.2.3. Russian Federation’s position

The position of the Russian Federation is fully characterised by the words of General A. Lebed, the former commander of the 14th Army: ‘When Russia loses Transnistria, it will lose influence in the region.’ Judging from Russia’s actions concerning Moldova and Transnistria, Russia’s main interest is to maintain the independence, neutrality and demilitarisation of Moldova. Russia supports Moldova’s territorial integrity; i.e., the reunification of Transnistria and a special autonomous status, details of which should be clarified in negotiations with Moldova. In 2003 Russia put forward the initiative to settle the Transnistrian conflict and


issued the Kozak memorandum\textsuperscript{29} (Special Representative of the President of the Russian Federation). The memorandum was signed by the president of Moldova, but it was not implemented due to the disagreement of Moldova concerning Russia’s military presence and the disagreement of Transnistria concerning the loss of independence. However, recently, Moldova showed signs of consenting to abandon Transnistria in exchange for EU membership. In particular, in late 2011 the leader of one of the parliamentary parties announced that ‘Transnistria is the obstacle to Moldova’s European integration’.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{2.2.4. The EU’s position}

In general it can be assumed that the EU’s main interest is to ensure the stability of neighbouring states while preserving an influence on their foreign policies. The main features of the EU’s policy on the problem are determined by the principle of the territorial integrity of Moldova and a negative attitude toward the deployment of Russian troops in Transnistria, as well as any attempt to extend the Russian military presence. The EU considers association with Moldova in a positive light, but does not consider the possibility of Moldova’s accession in the near future. This position disables the complete unification of Moldova with Romania. The main instrument of the EU is advisory and financial assistance to support reform in Moldova in the areas of interest to the EU: infrastructure and the environment. Today, EU policy is beginning to cover Transnistria. In particular, the EU demands that Romania and Moldova provide grants to Transnistria, is considering Transnistria in financial plans for Moldova and is implementing a programme of small grants in Transnistria. We can see various attempts to activate policy toward Transnistria and create a Russia-EU committee on foreign policy and security;\textsuperscript{31} however, the answers to most questions remain undecided.

\textsuperscript{29} Ольвия-пресс, Проект Меморандума ‘Об основных принципах государственного устройства объединенного государства’ [Project of the Memorandum ‘About the main principles of a state system of the incorporated state’], <http://www.olvia.idknet.com/ol107-11-03.htm>, 10 11 2013.

\textsuperscript{30} Новая Молдавия, Гимпу отпускает Приднестровье [Ghimpu releases Transnistria], <http://www.moldovanova.md/ru/events/show/452>, 10 11 2013.

2.3. The problem of self-determination of ethnic Hungarians in Romania

It is not only Romania that aspires to unite territories with ethnically kindred populations; Hungary also aspires to it. The Hungarian question is actively being discussed in Romania. According to the media messages in recent years, there has been no election campaign without discussion about the threat of the separation of Transylvania by Hungarians. Today, about 1.5 million Hungarians live in Romania, which amounts to about 6.6% of the total population. The main section of the Hungarian minorities live in Transylvania and are called ‘Sekui’.

2.3.1. Position of Romanian Hungarians

In September 2009 in the town of Odorheyul Sekuyesk, the Congress of the Sekui region’s local authority representatives proclaimed the establishment of Sekui’s autonomy. In March 2010, in the town of Saint George, the second congress of mayors and councillors of the Sekui region assembled. The main decision of the congress was to grant the Hungarian language an official status at a regional level. Romanian Hungarians have several political parties, which compete with one another. The Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania was a member of the coalition of government parties. It supports the creation of autonomy, with the town of Targu Muresh being the capital and the Hungarian regional language being recognised. The People’s Party of Hungarians of Transylvania, headed by the famous pastor L. Tokesha (one of the initiators of the overthrow of M. Chaushesku) operates without paying attention to the official authorities of Romania. With support from Hungary the Party’s leader created a representative office in the Sekui region. Thanks to this, various districts of Transylvania will have access to European funds. The Romanian authorities do not recognise this office.

2.3.2. Hungary’s position

Romanian Hungarians are being supported by their mother country – Hungary. Some Hungarian politicians discuss the revision of the Trianon Treaty’s provisions

32 Венгрия и Молдова активизируют деятельность, направленную на возвращение своих исторических территорий, [Hungary and Moldova stir up activity directed at returning the historical territories], <enews.md/news/view/14061/>, 11 06 2014.
concerning Transylvania; the most active are the representatives of the Yobbyk Radical Party. The World Federation of Hungarians also supports the revision of Trianon. In 2011 Hungary passed a law granting dual Hungarian citizenship to members of the Diaspora. According to some assessments, thousands of Romanian citizens submitted documents to obtain Hungarian citizenship. Officially Hungary has no territorial claims to Romania.

Recently Hungarian pressure has increased. The Prime Minister of Hungary, V. Orbán, said: ‘the Hungarian government to interfere in the administrative reorganisation of Romania has not yet arrived’. In other words, it is possible to assume that Hungary does not agree with the loss of Transylvania and, under favourable conditions, can still lay claim to it.

2.3.3. Romania’s position

Formerly, Romania ignored the problem and did not pay attention to it. Romania did not often respond to harsh comments from Hungarian officials. Romania categorically rejects the main demand of ethnic Hungarians – the formation of territorial autonomy – but is ready to make concessions, primarily in the humanitarian sphere. In Spring 2012, under pressure from the Democratic Union of Hungarians, the Romanian Government established a faculty in a medical university in the town of Tirgu Muresh where students are trained only in Hungarian. Following that, the Romanian Parliament expressed a lack of trust in the government. In September 2012 the Romanian Parliament rejected a bill to grant autonomy to the Sekui region. Romanian Hungarians then illegally began to hang Sekui flags on the state institutions. These events caused diplomatic scandal in early 2013. According to the publication Der Spiegel, relations between Hungary and Romania have been transformed into a state of cold war.

2.4. Supply and transit of energy

Diversification of energy supplies is one of Romania’s foreign policy priorities. Today, the major Romanian energy fields are almost exhausted. The decision of the International Court on the division of the Black Sea shelf with Ukraine provides some capabilities in relation to increasing domestic production in Romania. However, Romania’s domestic energy resources are insufficient and therefore it is vital for the state to import them. On the other hand, Romania is on the transit route of Russian, Central Asian and Trans-Caucasian energy and this is the cause of its interest in participating in transit projects.

2.4.1. Supply and transit of Russian energy

Oil supplies. Romania produces about 4 million tons of oil per year and consumes 13 million tons per year. Transit of Russian oil via the Black Sea has traditionally been carried out by tankers from the ports of Russia and Ukraine through the Bosphorus Strait to Europe. Today Russia is trying to focus transit through the port of Novorossiysk, which the Caspian Pipeline Consortium pipeline from Kazakhstan passes through. The companies Rompetrol (fully owned by the Kazakh state company KazMunayGas) and Lukoil supply oil to Romania. In Romania, Rompetrol owns an oil refinery and two petrochemical plants, as well as more than 1,000 automatic petrol station in neighbouring European countries. In 2009 this company put into operation a modern oil terminal in the port of N’vodari (Romania) with a maximum capacity of 25 million tons per year. In 2010 the company’s supplies amounted 4 million tons. Lukoil owns a refinery in Ploiesti and supplies up to 2.5 million tons to Romania annually. Taking into account the apparent discrepancy between the capacity of the terminal in N’vodari and the volume of domestic oil consumption in Romania, we can confidently assume that Romania has a great interest in the transit routes of Russian and Caspian oil to Europe.

Gas supplies. Russian gas is being supplied to Romania via the Ukrainian pipeline in amounts of more than 2 billion cubic metres per year. Domestic consumption of gas is about 8 billion cubic metres per year. Russian gas is transported through Romania to Turkey, Macedonia, Bulgaria and Greece in amounts of 12 to 15 billion cubic metres per year.

Russian energy transit through the Black Sea beyond the region’s borders is limited by the physical capacity of the Bosphorus. To bypass the Bosphorus the
interested countries continue to promote many projects for bypass routes, in which Bulgaria is the main competitor for Romania’s.

In 2007 Kazakhstan and Romania proposed the initiative to lay a Constanta (Romania) – Trieste (Italy) pipeline together with Russia. The states recognised the effectiveness of the project. The project is attractive for Romania due to incomplete oil loading of the terminal in N’vodari. Among the projects concerning the expansion of the Russian gas transit pipeline the project known as South Stream is the most considerable. The project begins on Russia’s Black Sea coast, passes along the Black Sea seabed to Varna (Bulgaria) and could continue to Romania and Hungary. Russia has begun to build the overland part of the pipeline, but the project is not a priority for the EU.

2.4.2. Supply and transit of Central Asian and Trans-Caucasian energy

The main obstacle to transit through the Caspian Sea is the uncertainty of its legal status. Additional costs are required for trans-shipment of energy by sea. To lay pipelines along the southern edge of the Caspian Sea is almost impossible because of political disagreements between Iran, the EU and the USA. That is why transit through the port of Novorossiysk remains the only viable method.

Oil supplies. The supply of oil from Azerbaijan to the Black Sea area is complicated due to the partial loading of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline. Azerbaijan is expected to load most of the oil that goes into this pipeline after the Shah Deniz field reaches full production capacity. Fully loading the pipeline is of interest to American, French, Italian and Turkish companies – members of the consortium of producers. There is also an upgraded Baku-Supsa pipeline. However, only small quantities of oil are transited through this pipeline.

Gas supplies. Gas supplies from Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are now less promising due to the uncertainty of the legal status of the Caspian Sea. Azerbaijani gas will be transported through Turkey through the Trans-Anatolian gas pipeline, which is being built by the Turkish-Azerbaijani consortium, and to Bulgaria and Romania through the Nabucco-West pipeline. The project is due to be completed in 2018. When this project is complete, Romania can refuse to use Russian gas that has passed through Ukraine.
2.5. Romania’s integration problems within the EU frameworks

In 2007, Romania and Bulgaria joined the EU after long and difficult reforms determined by the EU. Today Western media sometimes expresses the opinion that the decision to allow Romania and Bulgaria to join was premature.\(^{38}\) Most frequently, Romania is accused of high levels of corruption (see, for an example, an article from 2012 in *The Economist* \(^{39}\)). Some media reports talk about the high crime rate that Romania exports to more prosperous EU countries and about the strong influence of the USA on Romanian politics. Romania certainly considers EU membership a positive step. However, there are some issues in which Romanians feel resentful.

Romania is in the top ten states that make major contributions to the European budget, along with Germany, France and the Netherlands. However, Germany, France and the Netherlands give back an excess of domestic production, but Romania’s deficit is increasing, which is gradually increasing the risk of underdevelopment. There is also a difficult situation in agriculture. Under the accession conditions Romania has opened its borders to import agricultural goods, but has received only 20% of the subsidies determined for the founding EU countries. In an emotional statement, V. Voeganyan, former Minister of Economy and Finance of Romania, said:\(^{40}\) ‘Hungry Romania in the EU is sitting with the rest at the table, but does not touch the food.’ The depth of degradation in agriculture follows from the fact that today Romania is interested in importing cheap fruit and grapes from Moldova (domestic production covers only 40% of demand).

On the one hand, Romania’s dissatisfaction with the conditions of union with the EU is compelling the state to search for support from the USA. On the other hand, the difficult economic situation is forcing Romania to search for resolutions to its internal problems with the help of an active foreign policy and strengthening its influence in region.


2.6. Romania’s relations with the USA

As mentioned previously, the attitude of the USA to Romania is determined mainly by the geopolitical context.

In 1997 the Project for the New American Century think tank (its members were George W. Bush, R. Cheney, D. Rumsfeld and P. Wolfowitz) identified the position and importance of the Black Sea in American politics. This group, together with the USA Committee on NATO association, presented a geopolitical perspective to the USA Senate’s Committee on Foreign Affairs: ‘The Black Sea was a black hole in the history of Europe. Today this region has the greatest strategic interest for the United States and Europe. Nowadays, the EU imports about 50% of consumer energy, by 2020 it will import more than 70 %. This increase of import can be carried out only via the Black Sea.’

The main obstacle to allow access for warships to the Black Sea is the Montreux Convention of 1936, the participants of which are Australia, Bulgaria, the United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, Cyprus, Romania, Russia, Turkey and France. Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova as the countries that emerged in consequence of the collapse of the Soviet Union do not participate in the Convention due to the unwillingness of Russia and Turkey to expand the number of signatories. It is typical that after the 2008 war in South Ossetia, Turkey banned the passage of the USA’s fleet of ships, referring to the Montreux Treaty.

The USA considers Romania the friendliest state supporting the USA’s aspirations to change the convention. The Romanian president, T. Băsescu, has offered the ‘Black Sea is Russia’s Lake’ doctrine, the main idea of which was expressed by the Prime Minister of Romania in 1939: ‘it’s the door that trapped Romania’s fingers’.

Moreover, Romania has agreed to deploy elements of the USA’s missile defence system in its own territory. According to the mass media, Romania considers this
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deployment a guarantee of non-aggression from Russia, an opportunity to receive financial support and an opportunity to be involved in future economic projects in the region, primarily concerning energy. It is possible that Romania also hopes to receive support from the USA in relation to a wider range of international issues, including a joining together with Moldova and controversial issues with Ukraine.  

**Conclusion**

Ukraine’s diplomatic politics are not active concerning problems in relations with Romania. The two states’ ministers for foreign affairs last met in May 2011 after a six-year break. However, problems of these mutual relations are very serious. They claim constant attention and a continuous search for resolutions. It is necessary to understand that if we do not find any resolutions, others will find them for us. Active efforts, first of all diplomatic, are necessary.

From Ukraine’s point of view, the most serious problem is the possibility of territorial claims from Romania. Protecting the rights of ethnic Romanians may become a pretext for intervention in internal affairs and for aggression, by analogy with the situation in Crimea and in the south-east of Ukraine. Romania demands observance of the rights of ethnic Romanians in Ukraine and gives Romanian citizenship to ethnic Romanians who are citizens of Ukraine. These actions quite correspond to the political concept of Greater Romania. Some Romanian politicians consider that there is an opportunity for the division of Ukraine, which reflects the mood in some sections of society.

On the other hand, Romania’s relations with other members of the EU do not always develop positively. Therefore, Romania is looking for support from the USA. Romania is actively developing political and military-technical cooperation with the USA. It has agreed to deploy elements of the USA’s missile defence system in its own territory and supports the USA in the problem of internationalising the Black Sea. The USA has high appreciation for Romania’s geopolitical location and wants a trustworthy ally in the Black Sea region. Therefore, Romania can hope to gain the political support of the USA to resolve its own problems. Romania also plans to refuse the Russian gas that would have reduced its dependence on the Ukrainian transit, thanks to gas from the Caucasian states. From Ukraine’s

---

point of view, these relations of Romania with the third states can be considered as potentially negative factors. Failure to resolve the problems of rights protection of Hungarians in Romania is a potentially positive factor, which Ukraine can use to begin active multilateral negotiations and search for a resolution.

For many years Ukraine has not been able to improve relations with Romania on a bilateral level. Hence, resolution of the problem resolution should be moved to a multilateral level. Signing the agreement on association with the EU is a good pretext for this. Ukraine can offer to Romania and Hungary to lead multilateral negotiations (under the aegis of the EU) on the implementation of EU standards for the rights protection of national minorities. These negotiations should be based on the understanding that Ukraine, Romania and Hungary have similar problems that are preventing the development of friendship between the states.

The problem of joint use of the transit potential of the Danube can be solved in the same way. Taking into account the difficult economic situation, Ukraine can hope for EU aid to organise negotiations with Romania about joint tariff regulation concerning the transportation of cargoes through the Danube Delta. A mutually advantageous resolution also would reduce tension in relations.

Ukraine should avoid using force to resolve the conflict in Transnistria. An armed attack on the Russian peace-making contingent will be regarded as aggression against the Russian Federation and will cause the necessity of the use of force from Russia’s side. Military transit from the Russian Federation in Transnistria is possible only through Ukraine. In this case, Ukraine can be involved in the conflict.