

## A. Rezumatul tezei de abilitare (în engleză)

My postdoctoral research took into account the construction of the political model in Romanian political thought, seen from a methodological, interdisciplinary and comparative perspective that follows the main features of the method described by historians and theorists of political thought. (Koselleck 1990, Skinner 2002, Runciman 2008, Rosanvallon 2010, Israel 2011, Todorova 2011, Kitromilides 2014, Urbinati 2014, della Porta 2013, Little 2014, Ezrahi 2015) etc. Moreover, the research on Romanian political thought experienced a significant change of direction and method in the last 25 years, due to the liberty of themes and directions of interpretation since 1989. Hence, several directions of research were taken into account as follows: study of the political modernity through the lenses of the conceptual history and intellectual history, study of the theory of democracy in its conceptual and historical dynamics, as well as the implications in the conceptual study of political representations of the main theories regarding the civic and national identity (Schnapper 2002, Sunstein 2006, Krief 2010).

Political science is generous in this respect because it offers a significant propensity for developing this interdisciplinary approach. Therefore I articulated my habilitation thesis in relation to the current state of my research, conducted following the methodology highlighted above (first section). The second section of my habilitation thesis is dedicated to the presentation of my present and my future research project, centred also on developing these fundamental methodological options applied to the study of the Romanian political thought. A third section is dedicated to the presentation of the references used in writing my thesis.

During the first years after my PhD, I published a first volume, which presents a part of my research (*La révolution mélancolique. Sur la construction et l'évolution du concept de démocratie dans la pensée politique roumaine moderne*, Editura Universității din București, 2011), focusing on the study of concepts linked to political modernity during the two first generations of intellectuals in the Romanian *Nouveau Régime*, that is after 1821, in the Romanian Principalities. The volume was a first proposal in reading and interpreting

Romanian political modernity, focused mainly on the reading of democracy as a concept in the writings of the first half of 19th century.

My research followed also the development in the Romanian academic field (alongside with many other significant names in the field, as: Barbu 2006, Stanomir 2004, Platon 2005, Marton, 2009, Preda 2011 etc.) of the process of apprehending the problematic relationship between the concept of democracy -- as cited and employed in the original texts - - and its future constructions and translation into a political model. The original starting point was the transition from the *Ancien Régime* to the *Nouveau Régime*, which has to be grasped not only from a historical point of view, but also from a conceptual and political perspective.

I also conducted my research mobilising a hypothesis more and more frequently used by scholars working in the history of western and south-eastern political thought (Kitromilides 2014), namely one that is using two main landmarks of the 19th century: revolution and democratic technology, as seen through the representation and mobilization techniques.

My second volume (*Difficiles modernités. Rythmes et régimes conceptuels de la démocratie dans la pensée politique roumaine au XIXe siècle*, Editura Universității din București, București, 2015), followed a more comprehensive and ample systematization of the current research and of the working fields already opened after my PhD, especially after my postdoctoral scholarship hosted by The New Europe College (2011-2012) and continued in the following years. From a methodological point of view (Todorov 2012, Ezrahi 2013), due to the scarcity of the theoretical texts of political thought in the period that I aimed I extended my research not only to letters, articles in journals etc., but also to other categories of sources, as literary texts with a high potential in designing the potential democratic imagination of the epoch and a political model.

As showed in my research so far, the topic of original antagonisms of Romanian political thought constitutes a possible explanation of the following paths taken by the political discourse and also by the institutional and political design of the modern State especially after the Constitution of 1866. For the first generation of the 19th century, the modernization is the "Other", it is therefore a spatial, a philosophical, and an institutional gap. For the generation of the 1848 Revolution, the quest begins by a spatial movement: student mobility, and continues with a conceptual appropriation and interpretation of the designated models. History as a fundamental way of incorporating national identity in the general framework was proclaimed a national duty for the intellectuals engaged in the

political process of democratisation and institutional reform. The past is epitomised, it becomes an ongoing source of political legitimacy and a national narrative. For the next generation, the challenge will be different: making peace between two types of relating with the precedent model: Modernisation means embracing the western democratic model or adapting it, transforming it in regard of a "national tradition".

Therefore, discussing Romanian democratic modernity means also reading and interpreting the different forms and shapes of the political "Other", in its variety of manifestations. Democracy is one of them, not only through the concept itself but also through the numerous inflexions and paths followed by Romanian political thought in a vivid relationship with its *champ d'expérience*.