

Sovereignty and Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Moldova

Gorincioi Grigore

University "1 Decembrie 1918" Alba-Iulia
grigore.gorincioi@mail.ru

ABSTRACT: The sovereignty, independence, and integrity of territory are the core values of the functioning and development of any state. These elements are directly linked with security assurance. The millenary history of Moldova people and its continuous statehood within the ethnic region of its national making makes it a sovereign and an independent state. The Republic of Moldova gains this popularity or independence after so many struggles; the struggle for language, parliament, and the social and economic rights of Moldova people. The Declaration of Independence Republic of Moldova instantly and clearly declares Moldovan sovereignty on top of the territory of Transnistria as this is a component of the historical and cultural region of the Republic of Moldova. Although, the Declaration of Moldova Independence is itself used as an altercation opposing Moldovan sovereignty over Transnistria. In order to build up the unitary concept, 'Romanianism' in Moldova became an ethnic nationalism, which became a warning for the existing state recognition; thus, the young started undermining the political positions that the country took in that period. The Republic of Moldova fights against Russia for political restraints. They fight for the predominance of private properties, economy, and market reforms. The will of the Republic of Moldova people would mean that they can decide their present and future, and in this regard, Romania supports the strengthening of its sovereignty. The basic notion of PF (Popular Front) understood the return of Soviet concepts as a political, slavish conformism, which is essentially the main reason for the economic and cultural doldrums.

KEYWORDS: Sovereignty, Romanians, Republic of Moldova, Independence, Soviet Union

Introduction

Culture, history, and collective memory represent the space where a system of competition between different national, social, economic, and socio-political segments is formed. This competition is reflected in the fight for the preservation of cultural, national policy, and historical identity sovereignty. In this respect, the main task of the cultural policy is to preserve and protect the state's cultural sovereignty. Cultural sovereignty includes the rights of citizens, the right of the country, and the people. They must be guided by the norms and values that are unchanged throughout history. The acceptance or disapproval of external samples, rules, and stereotypes that threaten the ethics, cultural and historical identity of the society; the right of the state to prevent and counter-attacks on moral and social values are different from the cultural models.

Sovereignty is somewhat the identification of unique values, which, over time, take the forms of independence. The right of the country to decide upon the meaning of its development, in the light of its culture, is one of the main pillars underpinning a state. The aspiration of people for independence also generates another type of mass movement, such as separatism. This ideology creates a policy of detachment from the territory of a sovereign state. The main purpose and idea are the formation of a new state that seeks autonomy and self-determination. In this case, separatism conflicts with the principle of border inviolability and territorial integrity. It often generates conflicts among groups with different cultural features.

It is well known that all those who join a revolutionary movement are driven by the temptation and prospect of rapid changes in their lives. Revolutionary movements are the instruments of change. However, it realizes that religious and nationalist movements can also be a source of social change. Apparently, for a significant and rapid change, the population needs to show some enthusiasm or some kind of mass excitement. This passion may have different sources, from the desire for rapid enrichment, revanchism, or it may be the result of the movement itself. When personal success can no longer be a driving force, new sources of enthusiasm are needed to change the way of life of an inert society. Religious, revolutionary, and national movements generate this enthusiasm by shaping new perspectives and opportunities

aiming at community change. A mass movement takes shape only when the current power and government is discredited. This discredit is not just the result of mistakes and corruption among politicians and those with good financial standing. Firstly, it is the result of the work done by the people of the world, which includes priests, singers, prophets, writers, painters, teachers, and the dissatisfied students. In a society where the people of the world don't show their hatred, contempt and do not criticize the social and political situation, no matter how poisoned and corrupt it is, it will persist until self-destruction falls into place. The desire for glory shapes a revolution, and freedom is just a reason.

Body

The process of separating the Republic of Moldova from the Soviet Union was painful and dual. Some people wanted to remain in the Union; others wanted to unite with Romania. Finally, Moldova was left alone and undecided between these two extremes. One of the most critical factors that shaped the situation of Moldova in the last years within the Union was the policy of Romanisation, led by the Popular Front and a political group that at that time represented a social-political phase with a powerful influence (Enache and Cimpoiușu 2000, 47). Unlike other political formations that were established on the wave of Soviet restructuring, PF (Popular Front) was not limited only to reforms in the linguistic, cultural, and economic fields. The ultimate goal was to build a union with the Motherland (Scurtu 1998, 1). In other republics, even the least nationalist ones, they have spread a negative reaction among the citizens. However, in the context of the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, any kind of demand was subjected to criticism because of the acute sensitivity of the population at that time. PF managed to reach power, but their proposals and initiatives divided them into several camps. Soon, in the territory of the new Republic, two new territorial units appeared: Gagauzia and Transnistria. PF representatives, to some extent, ignored the lack of support from the population, accelerating the process of Romanisation. As a result, the sum of their actions created a self-proclaimed republic: Transnistria and Gagauzia with a special status within the country. In the end, even the Union with Romania was not accomplished.

The Popular Front was established in 1989 based on democratic movements that were consolidated earlier. In 1990, writers received 20 mandates in the USSR parliament, precisely due to the prestige they had in society then and now (Solomon and Zub 2001, 252). The dissolution of the Soviet Union and national movements created conditions for Bessarabian writers to join an Artists' Association (Solomon and Zub 2001, 250). Intellectuality constituted that social stratum that created favorable conditions for the Union in 1918 to establish, and it also led the liberation movement and the creation of the new state between Prut and Dniester (Solomon and Zub 2001, 88). A true national movement never existed in this area, except for two movements, during 1917 – 1918 and, respectively: 1988 – 1989 (Turcanu 1994, 94). The writers' association, privileged from a financial point of view, during the communist period was assigned the role to prepare the ground for realizing the movement of the Romanian ideal on the territory between Dniester and Prut. Among the writers, the Popular Front of Moldova was born. Due to the activity of this political circle (Solomon and Zub 2001, 251-252), newspapers such as 'Literature and Art' and 'Voice' appeared. The formation was led by Ion Hadarca who was a poet, translator, and politician from the Republic of Moldova, a member of parliament between 1990 and 1998, and from 2009 to 2014, founder and first president of the Popular Front of Moldova (1998-1992), President of the Reformers Party of Moldova. At first, the organization defended the interests of various ethnic groups in the country. At some conferences, even some representatives of the 'Gagauz Halki' movement could be noted. The national tendencies of PF could be seen shortly, by occupying important positions in the state leadership. After one of the most important characters, Mircea Druc, who was a politician from the Republic of Moldova, served as chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova from May 25, 1990 - May 28, 1991. He also took over the position of the prime minister of the Moldovan SSR, after which the process of introducing the Romanian language, and the Romanian culture started taking shape. Mircea Druc was the initiator of the 'March to Gagauzia' (October 25-30, 1990). It was a march of the group of Moldovan volunteer nationalists under the leadership of Mircea Druc in the densely populated area of Gagauzia and the south of the Republic of Moldova, intending to reduce the Autonomous

Republic of Gagauz. At the Second Congress of the PF, organized in June 1990, the leadership stated clearly and openly the desire to unite with Romania, thus demanding 'the liquidation of all the consequences of the act of June 28, 1940 (Solomon and Zub 2001, 242), the change in the name of the Republic to the Romanian Republic of Moldova and the introduction of the Romanian ethnonym in the identity cards of citizens (Solomon and Zub 2001, 76). Although in the parliament, the PF did not have the majority of votes, they reached a common agreement with the communists to obtain a key function. This function was given to a politician Mircea Snegur who was the first president of the Republic of Moldova (1990–1997).

The Moscow political circle knew that the Popular Front would support the candidacy of Snegur, who was a well-trained and loyal man to the Eastern partners (Turcanu 1994, 136). One point that should not be missed, when discussing this person, is his entry on the political horizon of the Republic of Moldova, which was made in support of the claim of national movements (Solomon and Zub 2001, 82).

Issues related to strengthening the status of Moldovan language and its return to Latin script have been discussed in literary circles and organizations since the late 1980s. In the autumn of 1988, the 'Letter of the 66' (Radio Chisinau 2013) was published, containing rigorous research and analysis, scientifically argued, highlighting the need to return to Latin script. The unionist currently draws attention, first of all, of the public opinion from outside, and also of Romanians from Bessarabia to the fact that the Romanian spirit and character of the population is still alive. The Popular Front relied on the fact that borders liberalization will intensify travels and cultural relations between the population of the Republic of Moldova and Romania. Iurie Rosca (born on October 31, 1961, in Telenesti, Moldovan SSR) is a politician from the Republic of Moldova. For several years, he served as the President of the Christian Democratic People's Party of the Republic of Moldova. He was Deputy President of the Parliament of the Moldova Republic between 1998 and 2001 and 2005-2009; and Deputy Prime Minister of the Moldova Republic (June - September 2009). He said in an interview for *Tara* newspaper: 'I am sure there will be opposing forces, there will be problems with Transnistria, but the current Republic of Moldova will unite with the country quickly, maybe in half a year, or a year ...' (*Tara* 1991, 1).

Sometimes hope awakened by an ideology acts as an explosive and sometimes teaches discipline provides patience. The first situation supposedly refers to the fact that hope will be realized shortly, the second - when hope will be realized in an indefinite time. Protests, revolutions, and any other social movement, in the first stage of development, promise the first type of hope. Followers of the movement are thus more receptive to the action since the mirage of success is close. Later, when the movement has power, the emphasis is on long-term hope - which becomes a very seductive desire and longing. A mass movement cannot exist without distortion of reality.

In August 1989, the Moldovan SSR Supreme Council was preparing to adopt a decree on the functioning of languages on the territory between Dniester and Prut. The package of laws provided for the Moldovan language to be the state language and the Russian language was granted inter-ethnic status. Besides, it was required to confirm its linguistic identity and to return to the Latin script. To support and initiate this project, the PF organized the rally entitled 'Great National Assembly', attended by hundreds of thousands of people. The main request being the declaration of the Romanian language, state language, and its transition to the Latin script. The PF has transformed into a movement of great magnitude under the pressure of the Grand National Assembly (Enache and Cimpoiesu 2000, 48). Relying on the fact that the conscience of the national unity, generated by many years of separation, will receive a note of calm and security (Simon 1991, 1), Chisinau's leadership did not give importance to minorities on the territory of the new state. Only those from the Transnistrian region protested against this law. Tiraspol appealed to the Moldovan Supreme Council to proclaim the Russian language as the second state language. Another requirement imposed by Tiraspol leadership was the preparation of a referendum on the state language. After two weeks of accepting the draft in parliament, the pro-Russian government, seeing that Chisinau does not make concessions, resorted to strikes. A preventive strike was organized on August 16, attended by about 30 thousand people (<https://bit.ly/2NQX6OX>). They demanded the annulment of the decree on the functioning of languages in the state. The request was rejected, and the Moldovenism supporters resorted to large-scale actions. The new strike, which began on August 21, extended beyond Transnistria, and many companies in Chisinau took part in this movement.

The participants repeatedly called for a referendum on language. However, on August 31, the package of laws was approved and applied by Chisinau leadership. Opponents decided to continue the strike. The protest was joined by the Civil Aviation Administration of Moldova and the Moldovan Railway Service. This mass movement was halted only at the end of September.

Moldova declared its sovereignty on June 23, 1990. At this time, the process of replacing state symbols was already started. In 1990, the blue-yellow-red tricolor, which was identical to the Romanian one, was accepted as a national symbol. Later, a new coat of arms was chosen, the basic elements of which copied the Romanian one. Imitation is one of the most important factors of the Union. In 1991, shortly after the failure of putschists in Moscow, a state anthem was also chosen. The anthem of Moldova was the one of Romania 'Desteapta-te Romane [Wake up, Romanian]'. However, shortly after, Chisinau's leadership chose another anthem entitled 'Limba noastră [Our Language]' by Alexei Mateevici, which, however, does not specify the language (Solomon and Zub 2001, 17). Tiraspol decided not to recognize the tricolor as a state symbol. The councils of Bender and Ribnita towns followed the example of those on the left bank of the Dniester River. Against the backdrop of confrontations, Transnistria announced its independence from Moldova and remained in the Soviet Union. The decision was taken on September 2, 1990, at the Congress of Transnistrian Members of Parliament. A little earlier, on August 19, Gagauzia announced that it also plans to withdraw from Chisinau jurisdiction. The Supreme Council of Moldova revoked both decisions, but this action did not have the potential to stop or normalize the situation. The restructuring declared in the USSR started the processes of development and formation of nationalists and the ethnic movements in the Republic of Moldova that is *Moldova Suverana. Să lăsăm moștenire o Țară Liberă [Let's leave a Free Country legacy]*. The speech of Mr. Mircea Snegur, President of the Moldova Republic, delivered during the extraordinary sitting of the parliament on the occasion of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Moldova, August 27, 1991, No. 189 (17786), page 1.

In October 1990, the newly elected President of the Moldova Republic, Mircea Snegur, called on the population to create a volunteer corps to fight against separatism. At that time, Moldova didn't have its army yet. By the

end of October, thousands of volunteers, accompanied by the police, started a campaign in Gagauzia to stop the planned elections there. As a response, the locals formed their divisions. Also, two detachments arrived from Transnistria to support Gagauzians in the region. In the case of Gagauzia, armed attacks were avoided, but in early November, the situation in Transnistria worsened considerably. The Ministry of Internal Affairs sent in Transnistria specially prepared divisions to unlock the Dubasari bridge, which was guarded by the local police. In the clashes, three people were killed and 16 others injured. On May 22, 1991, while Mircea Snegur, who was newly elected President of the Moldova Republic by the parliament, attacked the Romanian anthem *Desteapta-te Romane* at during the Government meeting the same year (Enache and Cimpoiesu 2000, 48).

On August 27, 1991, the Republic of Moldova declared its independence. Romania was the first state to recognize the independence of the Moldova Republic, even after a few hours (Solomon and Zub 2001, 218). Recognizing the political independence of this territory, Romania, to some extent, has given up on the imperative of reunification (Turcanu 1994, 110). This statement can also be determined by the failure of the Moscow coup (putsch) (Tarii 1991, 1), which showed that tendencies to bring the old system back into the Russian communist elite still exist. The declaration of independence emphasizes that Transnistria has been populated from ancient times by Moldovans and it's an organic part of the historical and ethnic territory of Moldova (Tarii 1991, 1) and recognizes the entire Romanian nation's right to defend and guarantee this independence (Solomon and Zub 2001, 242) by all means. The US supported Moldova's independence, but not the idea of uniting with Romania (Natiunii 1996 p.3). Immediately after this event, Moldovan authorities tried to settle the score with Tiraspol authorities. On August 29, the President of the self-proclaimed Republic, Igor Smirnov, was arrested by the special services of the Moldovan authorities. Igor Smirnov was a Transnistrian politician of Russian origin, and he also served as President of the self-proclaimed Dniester Republic of Moldova between 1991-2011. In response, the protesters on the left bank of the Dniester organized mass protests and blocked the railway. At the same time, the formation of Transnistria as an independent state didn't stop. On September 2, local Members of Parliament approved the Constitution, Flag, and Coat of

Arms of the Republic. During this period, the Russian community between Dniester and Prut was supported by Moscow for the implementation of an anti-Unionist policy (Buga 2011, 115). In the end, the Republic of Moldova lost some positions and, consequently, the authorities released Smirnov. The blatant propaganda of the Romano phobia was somehow suspended after the Declaration of Independence of the Moldova Republic (Suverana 1992, 3). Following the 'Belajeva Agreement', the agreement declaring the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the establishment of CIS. It was signed at the state residence near Viskuli in the Białowieża forest on December 8, 1991, by the leaders of Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. Thus the independence of Moldova was recognized by Russia. Shortly, the President of Moldova signs the accession agreement to the 'Community of Independent States – CIS'. The idea of independence was realized quite quickly, but somewhat by chance and independent of the joy of the indigenous population. The most inveterate defenders of independence are those who do not like unionism (Turcanu 1994, 104). With the accession of the Moldova Republic to the CIS, the course of Moldovan politics changed radically. Of course, controversies and discussions around these events are still going on today, but with the acquisition of independence. Thus, considering Moldovan ideology as a political idea triumphed. The PF tried to create favorable conditions for unification, but, given the geopolitical context of that period, carrying out this action was impossible. Mircea Snegur, in an interview with the *Ziarul de Garda*, stated:

'During the years, when I was the head of the political class leading the Republic of Moldova, I thought that everything was done to bring Romania closer, in the context of the opening of borders, simplification of crossing these borders, the establishment of joint economic enterprises (many of them have been created), movement of capital, and the establishment of branches of the Romanian Commercial Bank, etc. People believe that all the necessary conditions for unification had been created. Those who wanted this had no impediment in developing relations between Romania and the Republic of Moldova, including spiritual ones, so that we could return to the Romanian spiritual space: people, history, traditions, etc. Is this little? Why was the Union not realized? It is an extremely complicated question. The first objective reason would be the mentality of the 1940 - 1991 generation,

educated during the Soviet colossus. This mentality cannot be reoriented in a single decade. The fact that we had the right time to do it, but we didn't, is an invention. There were no such conditions. If the unification had been approached at that time, it would have been supported only by 5% –7% of the population of the Republic of Moldova' (<http://www.zdg.md/63/decembrie/>. Accessed on 29.08.2018).

Mircea Ionescu - Quintus, who was a Romanian politician, former President of the National Liberal Party between 1993-2001, a senator in the legislatures 1996-2000 and 2004-2008, elected in Prahova county on the lists of the NLP party. Mircea Ionescu-Quintus also held the position of Minister of Justice in the Stolojan Government, the first multi-party government after 1989, at a meeting of the Interparliamentary Commission in Suceava town stated:

'Respecting the will of the people of the Moldova Republic would mean that they can decide their future, and supports Romania in all ways for the strengthening of sovereignty' (Enache and Cimpoiesu 2000, 224). The ideology of PF understood the return to Soviet concepts as a political, slavish conformism, which is essentially the main reason for the economic and cultural stagnation that was Literature si Arta, *Solitară și neglijată*, "Bătălia Pentru demnitate [*Lonely and neglected, 'The battle for dignity'*]", December 18, 2003, No.51 (3043), page 3 summarizing the above, we conclude that this cultural struggle occurred between 'Romanianism' and 'Moldovanism.' The ideologies in question are even today at the center of political debates in the Republic of Moldova. The proclamation of sovereignty and independence has primarily depended on the evolution of these two currents in Moldovan society. People can voluntarily believe only the things they already know. Familiarization with Russian culture and, not in the least, with the 'equality' preached by the Communist party, played a decisive role along with other political, social, and economic factors.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of independent states in place of the former Soviet republics inevitably created favorable conditions for the development of their history for each nation. In some cases, historical concepts of nation-state type were revived and restructured. Treating the genesis problem of their states differently, the historians of communist countries agree on one point: the emergence of these states on the map of

Europe is a natural event, and they have the right to self-determination. Of all post-Soviet countries, only the Republic of Moldova is based on a two-way nationalism and, in some cases, diametrically opposed in the historical interpretation, which forms completely different tendencies in defining this nation. Often, the evidence and arguments, which are in favor of 'Moldovanism', are extracted from the same historical sources that complement and form the pro-Romanian current, but at the same time differ by some fundamental nuances. If 'Romanianism' can be characterized as ethnocultural nationalism, 'Moldovenism' has evolved as a civic nationalism that legitimizes the past and the future of the Moldovan state.

Trying to revitalize the unionist concept, 'Romanianism' in Moldova became an ethnic nationalism, which became a threat to the existing state identity, thus the young undermining the political positions that the country took during that period. In 1991, the leadership of the Republic of Moldova tried to organize a referendum on independence, which aimed to pronounce a categorical 'no' against the Union with Romania (Turcanu 1994, 97). The unionist character of this movement was insignificant, the politicians didn't dare to demand the liquidation in fact of consequences of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and to re-enforce the Act of the Unification of the Democratic Moldova Republics with Romania on March 27, 1918 (Solomon and Zub 2001, 242). The policy carried out by the Popular Front at times became aggressive and directed towards the Union with Romania produced a division of the Moldovan society. Some historians believe that the PF, by adopting such tactics, inadvertently created armed mobilization on the territory of Transnistria, which directly aimed at stopping the political current, reborn in the Republic of Moldova (www.actr.org/JER/issue4/7.htm). On the eve of the 1989 parliamentary elections, Sfatul Tarii discussed and intended to implement a kind of fantasy-diversionist project that had to make Moldova's transition to the market economy in just one and a half year. This shows that the executive is made up of incompetent and irresponsible people. Mircea Snegur was well aware of this situation but didn't try to change the perception of those who made the PF (Turcanu 1994, 139-140).

To some extent, the Transnistrian identity is not based on an ethnic or common national identity. The Transnistrian conflict was, instead, a reactive nationalism, which was a direct reaction to the diminution of the

Unionist current. It was the fear of Romanianism, not the desire to create their state with the help of 'external friends,' which contributed to the success of this separatist movement. Transnistria has a special status due to the high industrial development compared to the rest of the country, and on average, the standard of living is higher in this region. Many of those who came here are ethnic Ukrainians, Russians and other ethnic groups from the former Soviet Union. This atmosphere has created an absolute comfort and standard for the established social model. The danger of losing this status with the breakup of the Soviet Union contributed to the Union between the Transnistrians. Nevertheless, the attitude and politics of the Transnistrian leadership denote the fact that they did not try to build a Transnistrian identity based on a constructive discourse, but, instead, they are against everything that is Romanian in the Moldova Republic. Not surprisingly, the attempts of the Transnistrian educational system are a tendency to create their history that is based on a symbiosis between Soviet Moldova and the officialization of 'Transnistrian leadership'.

Although the 'Transnistrian identity' is a very weak one, thus the methods by which independence and sovereignty were proclaimed created separatist forces, which caused the Moldovan politicians to reformulate the political vector. After the first year of independence, the Pan-Romanian lost its position towards Moldovenism. We must point out that Moldovenism, after the 1990s, contrasted with that of the communist period. After the 1990s without a pro-Romanian political force after, the Moldovan leadership began to consolidate the concept of the Moldovan state that was and is still based on the declaration of sovereignty and independence. To restore and strengthen these ideological boundaries, they began a genuine crusade against 'Romanianism'. Mircea Snegur didn't doubt that Romania would be the first country in the world to recognize Moldova's independence (Suverana 1991, 1). The situation created, thus forcing the political class to eliminate cultural and economic barriers, which stood in the way of self-determination. The patriotic slogan 'We are at home' (Snegur 1991, 1), which represented the Great National Assembly (August 27, 1991), actually meant that self-determination that we specified earlier Druta—a member of the Romanian Academy—in his famous opening speech of the congress: *Our home - Republic of Moldova*, emphasized: 'In the long and troubled history of our nation, we

have a unique chance to build a home in Moldova (Sleahitichi and Deshis 2007, 25)'.

'Romanianism' has had unquestionable successes at the linguistic and ethnic levels. The Bessarabian intelligentsia, arming itself with this ideology and made the maximum contribution to mobilizing the progressive forces of the population (Novitkii 1990, 5). 'Moldovanism' lives through the prism of the national state police. It defends the right of Moldovans to their identity, with a specificity that is a different form of that on the right of Prut. Approaching the territory between the Dniester and Prut from the perspective of 'Romanianism', we understand that the new state is in a 'transitional period' (Ghimpu 1998, 1) that began with the breakup of the Soviet Union and should end with the act of unification. In turn, 'Moldovanism' supports the thesis that the emergence of the Republic of Moldova is the experience accumulated during the history that has created a unique characteristic of the local society and has development prospects as an independent state. People think that it would be absurd to decide that the current tendency of Moldovans to have their state is only the result of the communist conception. The historical memory of the population in this region of Europe makes them identify as a 'border' identity that lies between the West and the East.

Having shared cultural qualities with both Romania and the people of the former Soviet States, it was concluded that the 1990 revolution, which was under the flag of Romania, became a concern for its state, in which 'Moldovanism' triumphed as a cultural concept. The hypertrophy of folklore dominated the revolution between Dniester and Prut. Mostly in the books and information that characterize the historical course of Romania and Bessarabia, they interpret the produced errors as a consequence of the European conjunctions (Dulgheru 1998, 2). Even now, in Eastern Europe, there is a danger of limited nationalism and ideological intolerance that some people confuse with the principality. An important topic is that the western countries who have completed their unification of the territories relatively later have managed to get drunk with this national feeling. Some of them even understood that it is not an easier way of degradation than through the prism of national and ethnic grandeur. Therefore, I want to emphasize that Unionism and Romanianism in the Republic of Moldova is a natural feeling, being a necessary piece for the historical experience of a state.

Summarizing the above, in the current stage of the development of the Moldovan state, neither 'Moldovanism' nor 'Romanianism' are eligible as national state ideas, even though they played a fundamental role in proclaiming sovereignty and independence. The very weak influence that 'Romanianism' has today as compared to 'Moldovanism' since this ideology is highly dogmatized. Its representatives avoided looking at it critically, and this dogmatization framed it in certain boundaries that didn't allow it to adapt to the new social realities. From this point of view, 'Moldovanism' appears as a concept that is much easier to shape in the context of the society of the Moldova Republic, because it involves all citizens, regardless of their ethnic origin.

The dilemma of revolution between Dniester and Prut oscillated between dictatorship and restoration. A feeling created by mass protests and movements is that these phenomena replace hope. This state has incredible influence, especially in societies where the idea of progress haunts. The dictatorship is a continuation of the nonsense of revolution, conservation, and forced affirmation of the immediate post-revolutionary achievements. The dictatorship is a permanent revolution, and it is also considered as the ideal of the professional revolutionaries. Restoration is a return to the tragedy of reality. It is a withdrawal from the revolution and a paroxysm of the return to the old symbols, traditions, and customs. The restoration does not even follow the actual return to the regime and the old order.

When the population is ready for a mass movement, only a convinced (fanatic) man can arouse true passion in people. Mass dissatisfaction with the system is the result of the work done by the people of the word; without a politician convinced of a particular ideology, the revolution remains just meaningless, and it is easy to stop the rebellion. The revolution was fuelled by great ideals that promise significant changes, and the restoration promises stability, calm, and careful movement. When joining a mass movement, people lose their freedom and find new freedom where, many times, it is ruthless, cruel, and without any remorse. To some extent, it gives the right to 'shame', which, for many people, is an 'irresistible temptation.' Hate and contempt, like love and admiration for a particular ideology, is not only an instrument of division but also unity. The Republic of Moldova still lives under the threat of the antipode - the separatists. All mass movements are interrelated. A movement can change into a religious one or a national one. If the central aim

is to change or stop the movement, this problem can be solved by changing it to another ideological direction. Exactly this happened with the ideological character of protests in the Republic of Moldova. The restoration, like the revolution, has its 'moderates' and 'ultra-extremists'. The moderates want to change the logic of the democratic state and the market economy in such a way as to provide much possible time and space to expand the area and extend the term 'equal opportunities for all.' The moderates are the ones who led the revolutionary cavalry to regroup their political and social positions. They wanted to preserve everything that had been achieved both in spiritual reform and in economic reform. They struggle to give up on only those that are fragile, premature, or foreign, useless in a post-revolutionary life.

Ultra-extremists of the restoration, as antipodes of the unionist knights, seek their revenge, demand the renunciation of any reforms, demand the return to the zero version. Naturally, moderates are attacked on both sides, since they are 'traitors to the national ideal' - named by the right. 'Traitors of the interests of the working people' named by the left. Between these two extremes, the parliamentary majority in the Moldova Republic is forced to handle and balance conflict situations. For this reason, in public opinion, it appears as a passive force that is devoid of energy and unity and lacks courage and power for radical decisions. It appears as an eyewitness and not as a fighter. The taste for the radicalism of public opinion comes from the revolution, from its risk of living the romantic dream and from the fever of small ambitions. The total exchange of a system or its transformation begins with the people of the world, followed by convinced people and finalized by practical people. This logic also persists in the events of the Moldova Republic that I have mentioned above.

Conclusion

The Republic of Moldova is an independent, sovereign, unitary, entangled, and a democratic state. National sovereignty lies within the people of the Moldova Republic who shall implement the rules directly or by its selected representative bodies. They are free to decide their present and future course of action without any kind of external pressures.

References

- Buga, I. 2011. *Basarabia Română la cumpăna de milenii [Romanian Bessarabia at the millennia crossroads]*, Anthology 1988-2010, Chisinau: Litera.
- Druta, I. *Cuvântarea Președintelui Republicii Moldova, dl. Mircea Snegur, la Marea Adunare Națională din 27 august 1991 [The speech of the President of the Republic of Moldova, Mr. Mircea Snegur, at the Great National Assembly of August 27, 1991]*, No. 189. (17786).
- Dulgheru, V. 1998. *Impactul Rusiei asupra românilor [Impact of Russia on Romanians]*, Literature and Art, No. 50 (2782), page 2.
- Enache, M., Cimpoeșu, D. and Berindei, D. 2000. *Misiune diplomatică în Republica Moldova, 1993-1997 [Diplomatic mission in the Republic of Moldova, 1993-1997]*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Ghimpu, G. 1998. *Independență sau tranziție? [Independence or Transition?]*, Literature and Art, No. 35 (2767), page 1.
- Glasul Natiunii, May 22 1996, *Odiseea Basarabiei Românești [Odyssey of Romanian Bessarabia]*, No. 18 (209), page 3.
- Moldova Suverana, August 27, 1991, *Independența Moldovei este o realitate [Independence of the Republic of Moldova is real]*, No. 178 (17787), p. 1.
- Novitkii, M. 1990. *Moldova Socialista, Internaționalul prin național [International through national]*, No. 7-8 (17316 – 17317), page 5.
- Radio Chisinau. 2013. *Letter of the 66'*. Accessed on 26.08.2018. <https://radiochisinau.md/---scrisoarea-celor-66---adevarul---9558.html>.
- Scurtu, I. 1998. *Basarabie dragă – încotro, [Dear Bessarabia – Where are you headed?]*, Literature and Art, no. 34 (2766), p. 1.
- Sfatul Tarii, August 28, 1991, *Proclamarea independenței Republicii Moldova [Proclamation of Independence of the Republic of Moldova]*, No. 151-152, page 1.
- Simon, S. *24 de Ore, Liniștea pe de o parte și de alta a prutului [24 Hours, Silence on both sides of Prut]*, August 30, 1991, No. 392, page 1.
- Solomon, F., & Zub, A. 2001. *Basarabia. Dilemele identității [Bessarabia. Identity dilemmas]*. Iași. Biblioteca Fundației Academice” AD Xenopol.
- Sleahtitichi, M., Deshis, C. 2007. *Literatura română din Basarabia în postcomunism, [Open Circle - Romanian Literature in Bessarabia during Post-Communism]*. Iasi: Timpul Publishing House.
- Țara [Country Magazine] 1991. *Unirea va avea loc mai repede decât ne închipuim [Union will be achieved sooner than we can imagine]*, August 28, 1991, No. 39(57).
- Turcanu, I. 1994. *Basarabia din nou în fața unei opțiuni istorice [Bessarabia in front of a new historical choice]*. Chisinau: Universitas Publishing House.