

*Ecaterina Zatusovski*

## **Mass Media and Political Linguistics in the Period of Democratization of Society: Moldovan Lessons**

*When the Egyptian pharaoh did not want to release the Jews from captivity, Moses inflicted on the people of Egypt ten terrible plagues, one of which was pitch darkness. “And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days...” (Exodus, chapter 10, verse 22).*

**The time of pitch darkness**, or more precisely, C.A.I.R.O. darkness came for the eight private Russian speaking radio stations and two television channels on September 20, 2000 when the Court of Appeal agreed to the claim of the Club of Romanian and Western Educational Institutions Graduates (Clubul Absolvenților Instituțiilor din România și Occident, the name of which can be abbreviated as C.A.I.R.O., as the name of the Egyptian capital).

What the Club of the Graduates is, who are its members and what the club is busy with was little known at that time in Moldova. In contrast, the accused radio stations were well known to practically everybody since they retransmitted the programs of a number of popular Russian radio stations to Moldova. Their schedule also included locally produced programs (mostly short local news editions and advertising). C.A.I.R.O. demanded that the Coordination Council (a special license issuing and audio-visual mass media controlling body) should shut these radio stations down. The Russian language of broadcasting became the ground for this demand. C.A.I.R.O. argued that the 13<sup>th</sup> article of the radio and television law passed in 1995 prescribed that 65 percent of broadcasting was to be in the state language. On the same grounds withdrawing the license from the television channel TVC-21, which was broadcasting films mainly of foreign production and two fifteen-minutes local news programs, was proposed. Another claim made by C.A.I.R.O. was to require under the threat of revoking the license from the company SUN TV (which gives its subscribers the possibility to watch several dozens TV channels, including CNN in English) to retransmit for some reason two foreign channels – Discovery and Eurosport – in Romanian or in the language of origin. Later in the process of the court trial the plaintiff decided to exclude English. In the very beginning of the trial two other TV companies were summoned, however, during one of the sessions the Club withdrew its claim on the grounds that it “was unaware (?! – E.Z.) of some technical reasons of their broadcasting.”<sup>1</sup>

The pitch darkness also descended upon about one third of the four million inhabitants of the country, for about 35 percent of the republic's inhabitants – Ukrainians, Russians, Gagauzians, Bulgarians, Armenians, Jews – those, who are called the national minority, still use the Russian language to communicate with each other. This very part of the population makes up the major audience of the Russian speaking mass media. Yet, for the sake of justice, I have to note that “a huge number of Moldovans prefer interesting TV and radio-programs of the Russian channels to boring, politicized and incomprehensible Romanian ones.”<sup>2</sup>

Before going into detail of the conflict, we should to have a brief look at the past – distant and recent.

### **Cruel Jokes of History**

Moldova, the smallest former Soviet republic in terms of territory, situated between the Danube, Prut and Dneestr rivers, was subject to frequent invasions and changes throughout its history. One of the Moldovan chroniclers called it the “country on the way to all misfortunes.” The medieval principality of Moldavia, large parts of which are now incorporated into Romania and

Ukraine, was for much of its history under Austro-Hungarian or Lithuanian rule. In the course of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, it fell under Turkish sovereign, but was eventually annexed by Russia in 1812. After Russia's defeat in the Crimean War, part of Moldova's territory, southern Bessarabia, was lost to Romania, but Russia recovered it again at the Congress of Berlin in 1878. In 1918, Russia lost Bessarabia to Romania, and in 1924 the Soviet Union formed the Moldavian Autonomous Socialist Republic on the eastern side of the Dnestr (which was at the time populated mainly by ethnic Ukrainians) and refused to recognize Romania's claim to Bessarabia.

In 1940, after the signing of Molotov-Ribbentrop pact in 1939, the Soviet Union retook Bessarabia and merged most of its territory with the Moldavian ASR, but in 1941 it was re-annexed by Romania. Soviet control was re-established in August 1944. The present borders of Moldova were established in 1945, when a new Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic was formed and Romania formally ceded the area to the Soviet Union.

Such a stormy historical past could not have happened without leaving a trace. As it was written by the famous Moldovan academic Haralambie Corbu, "the population between Prut and Dnestr has had a full cup of the drama of this permanent perestroika, continuous shifts from one system of values to another... Conversion of the yesterday's enemies and occupants into saviors and liberators in one night, and vice versa – the yesterday's saviors and liberators into the bitterest enemies and wretched occupants – creates a destructive and disorienting psychological situation from the point of view of the creation and assertion of personal values and identity."<sup>3</sup>

The dramatic history of Moldova had the strongest and most painful influence on the language of the indigenous population. The functions and the sphere of use of the Romanian language had been diminishing over several decades until recent events, yielding to the "great and powerful" Russian. As an American researcher, Romanian by origin, Irina Livezeanu, writes, "although the imperial politics did not succeed in a full russification of Bessarabia, it made Romanian the language of the less educated countryside people, thus blocking a normal development of literature in the Romanian language."<sup>4</sup>

Is it surprising then that the ethnic Ukrainians and Russians, who immigrated to Moldova or were born there, do not speak Romanian, if even many Moldovans are not fluent in their mother tongue? And are only common people to be blamed for this ignorance if the entire policy of the USSR was aimed at the leveling of nationalities, at the creation of the new "nation" – soviet people?

During the period of Gorbachev's reforms and under the influence of the trend to decentralize the state power and make republics independent, Moldovan intellectuals organized the movement for the return of the national language to its place in the social life. The Moldovan language gained the status of the state language on the 31 of August 1989, after the harsh debates that had shaken the entire Moldovan society and the adaptation of the law on the functioning of languages in the republic.

In comparison to analogous legislation of some other ex-soviet republics, like, for instance, the Baltic ones, the Moldovan law is more loyal to those who inhabit the country, but do not speak its national language. Russian has the status of the international communication language.

At the same time, the law was under consideration at a very difficult socio-political point. The famous motto "Suitcase-train station-Russia" was born that very summer. The law was associated with the approaching unification with Romania and became one of the reasons of forced migration of the non-native population and formation of the separatist states in Transnistria and Gagauzia. There is a paradoxical fact: the law, which was called upon to solve one problem – historical injustice towards one language, one people – created a number of other problems, practically legalizing the division of the country's citizens into "natives" and "non-natives", thus aggravating everyday nationalism.

The last decade has changed the linguistic situation in the country, though, maybe not so drastically, as the radical national patriots would like it. The Director of the Institute of Linguistics

of the Moldovan Academy of Sciences Ion Barbuta said in one of his interviews the day before C.A.I.R.O. trial that “though the situation with the Romanian language functioning in Moldova is incomparable to that one before 1989, it still remains unsatisfying... This is not just because of the imperfection of the linguistic legislation. We should not think that by changing the law we will have an improved linguistic situation the next day.”<sup>5</sup>

In a situation when there is no state support and promotion of study of the national language, the majority of the Russian speaking population still is far from being fluent in Romanian. The only perspective, in which the enhancement of the national language functions are perceived, is a new violation of the already abused rights of the non-Romanian population.

The debate about the proper name of the language and the nationality is still ongoing amidst Moldovan academics, politicians and common people. Some prefer to call the language Moldovan and the nationality – Moldovan (as it is written in the Constitution), others – Romanian, though both groups speak the same language. “Of course, there is a difference between Moldovan and Romanian literary languages (the difference, deepened by the separatist policy of the 1812), yet, strictly from the point of view of linguistics, the dialect of Bessarabian Moldovans is not a separate language.”<sup>6</sup>

That is why the linguistic issue – being it Russian, Moldovan or Romanian language – is a political one in Moldova. Any incautious, not well enough thought steps or intentional actions and statements regarding the language interests of the population, immediately create a sharp reaction of the society and are able to ruin the fragile peace in this part of Europe. The C.A.I.R.O. case was not an exception.

### **Desert Storm.**

Before the court pronounced its judgment, the representatives of the sued audio-visual mass media had made an attempt to prove the illegitimacy and groundlessness of the advanced claims. The Chairman of the Parliamentary Commission on Education, Culture and Mass Media Gheorghe Duca commented that **the percentage ratio of broadcasting should only be applied to the locally produced programs, not to the retransmitted ones.** Yet, during the case hearing, this comment was unfortunately ignored. The legal representative of the plaintiff, also a member of C.A.I.R.O. Radu Pantaru declared that the interpretation of a law is outside the competence of one deputy, even the chairman of the commission. He claimed that the Parliament should express its opinion on the matter.<sup>7</sup> Russian speaking newspapers reacted quite inertly to the event by publishing only a couple of informational articles about the claims. Perhaps, it was the result of the habitual attacks on the Russian speaking mass media, or maybe they believed the court to be able to resolve the case.

Yet, when on the 28 of August the Audio-Visual Coordination Council withdrew licenses of the three radio stations for the period of three months before the court had announced its decision, the situation changed drastically.

Since all the newly disqualified mass media found the verdict illegitimate and groundless, they announced their intention to appeal it and demanded the President of the country, the Parliament, the Government and international organizations to comment on the case.

The Russian ambassador to Moldova Petr Petrovsky a week before the verdict was announced had sent an open letter to the Chairman of the Moldovan Parliament Dumitru Diakov stating that C.A.I.R.O. claim and the decision of the Coordination Council violated such international rights as The International Pact on Civil and Political Rights, the Framework Convention on the National Minorities Rights Protection, the Declaration of the Freedom of Expression and Information. As he mentioned, “it is stated in the Declaration that the member states of the European Union are striving to achieve the existence of a wide variety of independent and autonomous mass media, that allow for the reflection of a variety of ideas and opinions.”<sup>8</sup>

The High Commissioner of the OBSE in the issues of national minorities Max Van der Stool sent a letter to the Foreign Ministry of Moldova stressing that the right to choose the language of communication is among the major human rights, and Moldova should differentiate between the demands to the state and private mass media (“the state cannot regulate the use of language in private sphere”). He recommended the Parliament review the law on radio and television with special attention to the article 13.<sup>9</sup>

The Head of the OBSE mission to Moldova William Hill has organized a special press conference, where he clearly pronounced that Moldova had a very difficult history of interaction of various languages, and any limitation of use of any of these languages would lead to the confrontation and separation of the people. “Such a way can complicate the development in other areas, can become an impediment in conflict regulation... It is better to create the conditions for the development of the national language than to limit the right of the national minorities to use their languages.”<sup>10</sup> When commenting on the appearance in the right wing press of references to the legislation on mass media of several European countries, Hill said: “I would be surprised to find limitations on the distribution of private mass media in any language in the legislation of France or Belgium. Market defines everything.”

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of September journalists began to speak about the possibility of cancellation of the important visit of the Prime Minister Dumitru Bragis to Moscow due to the current situation. The Russian Minister of Press Mihail Lesin addressed the Duma with the interpellation of the expediency of the meeting between two prime ministers in such a situation. Russian deputies supported the Minister.<sup>11</sup>

It was only after this event that Moldovan parliamentary members decided to pay attention to the problem in discussion. After a week of hot debate on the 29 of September 2000 the Moldovan Parliament passed a law... on the interpretation of another law: explanation of the ill-fated 13<sup>th</sup> article. It is clearly stated now that the provision about the minimum of 65 percent of broadcasting in the national language only refers to locally produced programs.<sup>12</sup>

During all this time, and during the two weeks of the presidential promulgation of the law both Russian and Romanian speaking newspapers were recalling old offences and making new insults, exercising their wits and rudeness. Press representing the national-patriots was fulminating against the non-natives. Monsters, barbarians, boors in military shoes with tommy-guns, dirty drunkards who cannot drink vodka without “Russian Radio” – this is just an incomplete list of the features, which were bestowed upon those who simply wanted to listen to what **they** wanted. The left wing press was more politically correct, satisfying itself with caustic remarks and gibes addressed to more concrete persons – particular politicians and journalists, known for especial intolerance to everything non-Moldovan. Yet, both wings were listening to themselves only, remaining deaf to the arguments of the other side. Each of them had a very narrow view on the events. A more constructive perspective was proposed by the right wing publications (“Moldavskie Vedomosti”, “Novoe Vremea”). They offered attempts to analyze the causes of the situation, and were the first ones to raise the economic underlying basis of the case. They proposed to create compatible local projects, giving examples of Romanian-speaking radio station like “Contact” and “PRO FM” rather than to shut down the Russian stations.

Against this volcano-like background the article of the mayor of the capital city Serafim Urecheanu was a cooling one. He was the first official who did not hesitate (and was not afraid) to give a clear negative evaluation of the actions of the “Egyptians” (that is the name by which members of C.A.I.R.O. were known to their supporters and opponents by that time). “The young plaintiffs, as well as the experienced politicians, that are hiding behind their backs, are fully aware that the daily conversion of the 65 percent of retransmitting broadcasting is impossible, since this can only lead to shutting these stations down. But this is exactly the outcome they are trying to achieve... Those organizers and executives, who are interested in this result, are also fully aware that it is virtually impossible to force out from all spheres of life the language of communication of

at least one third of the population without causing quite serious social upheavals. This becomes even more relevant in the situation where the overwhelming majority of the country knows and speaks Russian every day. This case leads to a deliberate deep destabilization of the society.”<sup>13</sup>

Yet, the “Egyptians” had a different opinion...

### **A Moral Lesson or the Market Redistribution?**

The anti-Russian orientation and political engagement of the claim were seen as blank obvious, though the members of the Club denied this charge. At the press-club meeting, that took place in the Center of the Independent Journalism the next day after the announcement of the scandalous decision of the court, the representatives of C.A.I.R.O. stated that their claim was advanced not against the radio stations, but against the Coordination Council. According to their words, it is very difficult to open a Romanian-speaking radio station in Moldova.<sup>14</sup> The same opinion was expressed in the interview of the Club’s president Diana Uscatu published after the official interpretation of the law on radio and television: “ We want to give a moral lesson to the society on **how** it should treat jurisprudence.”<sup>15</sup> The statement distributed the same day among all newspapers editorial boards was devoted to the attempts to deny any connection with political parties and “stress, that we /members of the Club/ have nothing against Russian speakers and other co-citizens, who became hostages of the imperial manners of Russia.”<sup>16</sup>

If this is true, then why was the claim not made against radio stations broadcasting, for instance, in French? Why out of the channels retransmitting by the SUN TV company the plaintiff selected only those, which were translated into Russian, and not the already mentioned English speaking CNN? Does this imply that the absolute majority of the country is fluent in these two European languages? Or this is the selective thirst for justice?

The noble image of the young “enlighteners” and guardians of the rights of the majority was distorted by the confessions that slipped out of their mouths and out onto the pages of the supporting newspapers. One of the Club’s members right after the court’s verdict was pronounced announced that it was the first victory of the Romanian language over the Russian since the times of the declaration of Moldovan independence.<sup>17</sup>

The newspaper “Tara” (an edition of the Christian-Democrat Popular Party, ex-Popular Front, known for its unification inclination) published on the 21 of September an article about the “C.A.I.R.O. case” under the title “C.A.I.R.O Won the Battle for the Romanian Language!” The battle for the language, not for the justice or maintenance of the legislation! The title of the article published the same day in the newspaper “Flux” is even more outspoken: “ The Victory over the Russian Language.”

A week later a journalist named Vlad Pohila wrote in the newspaper “Mesagerul”: “Withdrawal of licenses basically means closure of the insistent activity of the intense centers of russification... and thus is totally justified.”

The remark of Igor Burciu, columnist of the newspaper “Tara” sounds like an undisguised recognition of the political inclination of the claim: “ At the press-club meeting C.A.I.R.O. stressed that it was just an attempt to restore justice and denied any political affiliation. Perhaps, it is really the case, though one can be involved in politics or support some political idea and not pronounce it openly.”<sup>18</sup>

Another young journalist, Sorina Stefarta, rejoiced in a childish manner at the tumultuous storm: “ It would be quite amusing to see that someone finally managed to shake the Russians.”<sup>19</sup>

The accusation of the activity of the sued radio stations that “caused” “a dramatic situation, where the access to the information is limited for the Romanian-speaking population”<sup>20</sup> is also groundless. The tenseness of the situation could have been resolved by a simple turn of the tuning of a radio set to another wave. There have been several radio stations in the country broadcasting only in the state language. (Two-three ten minutes news editions during the twelve- hour

broadcasting do not have the leading key. This judgment is based upon my personal experience of working for one of the Romanian-speaking radio stations.) It is indisputably that their number is not big enough, and nobody argues that the National radio needs urgent support to improve the existing situation (currently it has to fire its personnel and diminish broadcasting due to the lack of the state financial support), yet, it is a different problem and the Russian speaking radio stations are not to be blamed for this.

Unfortunately, several facts make us doubt the economic “purity” of the case and the absence of the ideological and financial inspirers of the Club.

First of all, till the present time none of the Club’s leaders was eager to clearly explain why the organization was founded, how many members it has, and what the financial sources of the Club are. Meanwhile, registration of an NGO requires a significant financial contribution to pay the state tax and preparation of the registration documents. Initiating a claim is also an expensive occupation. Where from does an NGO get this support?

The next interesting moment is the time when the claim had been made. For some mysterious reason it coincided with the termination of license of at least three radio stations-defendants. According to the legislation, the former user of a frequency has a priority in the tender if only there is no claim from the side of the Coordination Council. It is rather difficult to refrain from thinking that the claim was a refined (and reasonably expensive) method of competitors’ elimination, a method invented if not by the Club’s members, then by those who are behind their backs.

Parliamentary debates that sprang up after the proposal of the deputy Nicolae Tulbure to explain the provision of the 13<sup>th</sup> article of the law of radio and television were also quite demonstrative. In spite of the fact that the parliamentary members were only required to give an interpretation of the law, some of the debaters proposed to let the radio stations do whatever they want (even broadcast in Swahili, as one of the deputies said), but to impose a ban on the local advertising. (Stepping aside from the subject, I would like to mention that now in the pre-elections period audio-visual mass media are prohibited to broadcast political adds, but are allowed to organize round tables with representatives of all competing political movements free of charge (!!!).

There were also other proposals, which clearly showed the intention to create obstacles for the successful businessmen. One of the deputies proposed to raise the license fee for the foreign radio stations, thus making it significantly different from the one for the local ones, and prohibit them broadcasting of advertising.<sup>21</sup> Isn’t it a strange position for a poverty-stricken country in the need of working positions and foreign investments?

Confrontation of financial interests hidden behind C.A.I.R.O. claim was an open secret. The president of the Association of On-line Press, one of the experts in the elaboration of recommendations for mass media of the General Commission on Human Rights of the European Union Alexandru Dorogan made a clear statement about this: ”Imperfection of the legislation regulating distribution of frequencies is at the heart of the conflict. Our people are unaware of the fact that radio frequency is a national property, and that the number of these frequencies is limited. The demand for frequencies will always exceed their availability. That is why we need a fair mechanism of distribution of frequencies, a mechanism based on clear principles... There should be a balance in frequencies distribution, otherwise some radio stations may become monopolists on the market of advertising and the fight for its redistribution will go on.”<sup>22</sup>

### **Pyrrhic Victory or Battle Draw?**

Nothing is perpetual in this world, and fights around C.A.I.R.O. also came to naught by fall. The time to count the hatched chickens came. What are the outcomes of C.A.I.R.O. claim?

The court had fully complied with the claim, and we could think that the Egyptians won the battle, yet... By changing the law the Parliament made the court’s verdict pointless, which basically

means the defeat of C.A.I.R.O. However, this is not set in stone yet since the Club appealed against the court's decision, and the case is not closed yet.

Radio stations and TV channels - defendants have not stopped broadcasting. The majority of these radio stations shifted to retransmission only. In the interview given me this January, the Chairman of the Coordination Council, an experienced journalist Alexei Ciubasenco said that C.A.I.R.O. action returned the state of business to 1995, when nobody cared of the local production of programs neither in Russian nor in Romanian. "We tried to avoid power-involving methods in our work, tried to convince radio stations owners in the necessity of having locally produced programs in their grid. We did succeed, though not without minor violations of the law. Now the new members of the Council (the five years term of the Council was terminated in January 2001 – E.Z.) will have to begin from the very beginning in more complicated conditions."<sup>23</sup>

The lesson to the society is more than doubtful. Those citizens who are not fed up with the full of vigor wrangle on the pages of newspapers had another chance to see who is who on the Moldovan political Olympus, to become sure that the state of affairs on the nationalistic front had not changed ("the more we run, the more we remain at the same place" - as it was said in "Alice in Wonderland".) Seeing this, the Russians began moving one after another to the Russian embassy for the Russian citizenship, the Moldovans – to the German embassy for the Schengen Visas.

Transnistrian separatists were perhaps the only ones for whom this case became an unexpected gift. They could only dream of such an occasion to claim the necessity of independence from Moldova. As we can see it from the publications of Transnistrian press, reviewed on the pages of "Moldavskie Vedomosti", "Novoe Vremea", "Nezavisimaia Moldova", they did not miss this opportunity. It is difficult to disagree with the mayor of the Moldovan capital Serafim Urecheanu who said in the already quoted article: "Moldova again reminded its existence to the free world, those unions, whose membership is so important for us, in a doubtfully good way."<sup>24</sup>

### **Everything is ahead?**

The unseemly C.A.I.R.O. case could have been forgotten in the archives, if there existed confidence in the impossibility of such attempts in the future. Unfortunately, there are no grounds for being confident. As soon as the President of the country Petru Lucinski had promulgated the law, the Egyptians again appeared on the pages on the newspaper "Flux": "The President's act is just another proof of the fact that the authorities forget the national interests in favor of the instructions from Moscow, thus confirming their full submission to Kremlin. C.A.I.R.O. declares its intention to call in question the decision of the Parliament in front of the Constitutional Court." Now, besides the requirement to shut down the Russian-speaking radio stations and TV channels, they demand much more. "Pointing out the existing law violations (the law on languages functioning – E.Z.) we demand that the Government: 1) should develop the nomenclature of professions and the methods of testing the state language skills... in 30 days period from the date of the submission of this petition; 2) should organize the procedure of testing the state language and the Russian language skills among those persons, who have to communicate with citizens while performing their daily duties."<sup>25</sup>

In fact, it is not the issue of C.A.I.R.O., though its president promised to introduce order in the Coordination council, and take revenge on the newspapers who were incautious enough to express a negative evaluation of the organization. (By the way, Diana Uscatu keeps her word: in the beginning of January the Club brought an action against Iulia Korolikova, a journalists of the newspaper "Vremea", who in the article "Suitcase-train station-Russia" dared to express her opinion that the policy of forced migration of the Russian speaking inhabitants is continuing in a new form.) If there are no "graduates", there will be someone else. As the editor-in-chief of the newspaper "Nezavisimaia Moldova" Boris Marian (Moldovan by origin, fluent in both languages) wrote in one of the September articles, "I will not be surprised if tomorrow or the day after

tomorrow these people (members of the Christian-Democratic Popular Party – E.Z.) let to the battle for the 99 percent dominance of the Romanian language some league of the rights protection of the Persian cats, club of elephants riders or someone else of this kind.”<sup>26</sup>

It is not the issue of the imperfection of the legislation, since all the laws gradually need revision.

It is the issue that while there are such ideas in the minds as the superiority of one nation over another, the thought that it is “the other” to be blamed for your personal misfortunes or economic problems of your country, the confidence in the legitimacy of solving your problems at the expense of others, we will not be able to avoid conflicts. This is particularly true if we speak about the minds of those at power. And this is especially correct if their opinion is shared by the representatives of the forth power – the mass media.

Moldova, as other republics of the ex-USSR, is doing its best to enter Europe and become a full member of the European Union. Is it possible if there is no atmosphere of tolerance, ability to understand and respect each other without dependence on the origin, social status, gender and age?

---

<sup>1</sup> Țara, 21.09.00.

<sup>2</sup> Nezaavisimaia Moldova (NM), 15.09.00.

<sup>3</sup> Săptămîna, 12.01.01

<sup>4</sup> Irina Livezeanu, *Cultura și naționalism în România Mare. 1918-1930.* – București, 1998. P.118.

<sup>5</sup> Țara, 31.08.00.

<sup>6</sup> Irina Livezeanu, *Cultura și naționalism în România Mare. 1918-1930.* – București, 1998. P.123-124.

<sup>7</sup> Țara, 21.09.00.

<sup>8</sup> NM, 21.09.00.

<sup>9</sup> NM, 27.09.00.

<sup>10</sup> Moldavskie vedomosti (MV), 23.09.00.

<sup>11</sup> MV, 23.09.00.

<sup>12</sup> Buletinul Consiliului Coordonator pentru radio și TV. 2001, Nr. 5, p.20.

<sup>13</sup> Kișinevske novosti (KN), 06.10.00.

<sup>14</sup> Flux, 23.09.00.

<sup>15</sup> Flux, 19.10.00.

<sup>16</sup> Flux, 17.10.00.

<sup>17</sup> MV, 23.09.00.

<sup>18</sup> Țara, 26.09.00.

<sup>19</sup> Flux, 13.10.00.

<sup>20</sup> Dialog, 01.09.00.

<sup>21</sup> MV, 29.09.00, KN, 06.10.00.

<sup>22</sup> Jurnal Național, 26.10.00.

<sup>23</sup> KN, 06.10.00.

<sup>24</sup> Flux, 03.11.00.

<sup>25</sup> NM, 21.09.00.

<sup>26</sup> NM, 21.09.00.