CZU: 341.217(4)UE:327(478) **https://doi.org/10.59295/sum3(193)2026_34**

MOLDOVA - UNIFICATION AND INTERNATIONAL LAW AT THE CIVILIZATIONAL FRONTIER: SMALL STATES, DEMOCRATIC SURVIVAL, AND THE QUEST FOR THE WEST

Pawel MACIĄG,

Mercy University, New York City, USA, International Relations and Diplomacy Program, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland, the Centre for East European Studies

This study analyzes the modern argument for uniting the Republic of Moldova with Romania through international law, democratic self-determination, and Western Civilization as a legal order. Using public statements from the President of the Republic of Moldavia (Maia Sandu), current survey research, and the geopolitical pressures being placed on the Republic of Moldova by Russia, this paper posits that the unification discourse is a strategic-legal response to the structural vulnerability that small democratic countries face in their quest to protect themselves legally, and constitutionally, in an increasingly unstable world order caused by revisionist powers. Furthermore, the example provided by the Republic of Moldova illustrates that the contemporary "search for the West" does not constitute an exercise in establishing cultural identity; it constitutes an attempt to establish an environment where there are established rules and protections afforded under those rules that guarantee a rule of law based on a constitutional democracy.

Keywords: *international law, small state, sovereignty, self-determination, rule of law, democratic resilience, European Union integration, state unification.*

MOLDOVA - UNIFICAREA ȘI DREPTUL INTERNAȚIONAL LA FRONTIERA CIVILIZAȚIONALĂ: STATE MICI, SUPRAVIEȚUIRE DEMOCRATICĂ ȘI CĂUTAREA OCCIDENTULUI

Acest studiu analizează argumentul modern pentru unirea Republicii Moldova cu România prin prisma dreptului internațional, a autodeterminării democratice și a Civilizației Occidentale ca ordine juridică. Folosind declarații publice ale Președintelui Republicii Moldova (Maia Sandu), cercetări sociologice actuale și presiunile geopolitice exercitate asupra Republicii Moldova de către Rusia, această lucrare susține că discursul reunificării reprezintă un răspuns strategic-juridic la vulnerabilitatea structurală cu care se confruntă statele democratice mici în încercarea lor de a se proteja juridic și constituțional într-o ordine mondială tot mai instabilă, generată de puteri revizioniste. Mai mult, exemplul oferit de Republica Moldova ilustrează faptul că „căutarea Occidentului" contemporană nu constituie un exercițiu de stabilire a identității culturale; ea reprezintă o încercare de a crea un mediu în care există reguli stabilite și protecții garantate de aceste reguli, care asigură un stat de drept bazat pe o democrație constituțională.

Cuvinte-cheie: *drept internațional, state mici, suveranitate; autodeterminare, reziliență democratică, integrare în Uniunea Europeană, unificare statală, Republica Moldova, ordinea juridică occidentală.*

Introduction: Small States, International Law, and the Civilizational Question

Since 1945, the prohibition on the use of force and the right of sovereign states to maintain their territorial integrity have been central to maintaining stability among states. At the same time, however, international law has never viewed sovereignty as inviolable (i.e., permanent): States are free to be dissolved, to join other states or groups of states in order to create new political entities, etc., through lawful and consensual means. For those smaller states subject to persistent and heavy pressures from outside forces, the conflict between territorial stability and self-determination will thus typically become even more pronounced. The current debate regarding the potential reunification of the Republic of Moldova with Romania provides an example of such a conflict, which also has important implications for international law. It is not a typical instance of either annexation or secession. Instead, the issue at stake is whether a small, democratic state situated at the periphery of two competing geopolitical systems can protect its interests through institutionally aligned, constitutional and international-lawfully permissible mechanisms of unification.

President of the Republic of Moldova Maia Sandu's recent statements regarding unification have made clear the legal dimensions involved in her views. In January 2026, she stated that she would vote for unification herself if there was a referendum on the issue (while at the same time stating that she did not believe that a majority of the population supported unification) [39; 41]. Thus, Sandu's stance creates a distinction between a personal political view and a democratically authorized decision and represents unification as being based on issues of democratic survival rather than rights of history

This article advances three claims. 1) International law recognizes the legitimacy of voluntary union through the actions of two or more sovereign states, where such union is supported by the legally-binding decisions of each state's constitution and by their respective democratically elected governments. 2) Re-emergence of unification in recent years has been due to diminishing trust in international law as a protective framework for the interests of countries, rather than increased interest in ethno-nationalism. 3) Moldova's experience serves as evidence for a larger trend that exists among smaller democracies on the periphery of well-developed international legal frameworks: it appears that the choice of "civilization" increasingly becomes a matter of the quality of legal protection and the stability of democracy.

The concept of "the West" is central to this research project. In addition to being used as a cultural term, the West will be conceptualized here as a legal tradition grounded in principles of constitutional government, respect for the rule of law, judicial independence, and obligatory membership in multilateral organizations [21; 41]. Moldova sits at the uneasy intersection of a rules-based international order and a classic sphere-of-influence system where raw power often outweighs legal principle. That position is exactly what makes this part of the study so relevant. In many ways, Moldova has become a living example of the real-world dilemma that drives the central question of this article: what legal options remain for small democracies when the protective power of international law is increasingly in doubt?

Research methods

This study uses a combination of doctrinal and conceptual methods to analyze the application of public international law regarding sovereignty, territorial changes, and self-determination, as well as the processes of legal integration and institutional constraints within the EU. The arguments were supported by closely analyzing all primary legal sources (treaty articles, constitutional provisions, and relevant institutional standards), and synthesizing literature related to small states, democratic legitimacy within territorial change, and the legal-institutional framework of the West. There was no attempt to measure empirically whether unification, or alternative ways of legally binding themselves could provide an avenue for the democratic preservation of a state; rather there was an effort to clarify the legal requirements that would allow either unification or other alternatives to preserve democracy.

Moldova at the Legal and Geopolitical Frontier

The Republic of Moldova holds a structurally ambiguous place in today's international legal system. Upon gaining independence from the former USSR in 1991, the new state took on a unique position located between several opposing forms of legal, political, and cultural systems [28; 29].

Thus, being geographically located near the frontiers of two distinct legal-political-cultural zones (EU/EEA and CIS/Eurasia) was only one side of what can be described as a frontier condition [38]. Beyond its purely geographical role, the border embodies the clash of multiple competing normative systems. These overlapping regimes place conflicting demands on the Moldovan state and seriously constrain its ability to build a stable democracy [6]. Since its entry into the United Nations in 1992, Moldova has legally become an independent state under international law with the same rights and responsibilities as other states [48]. The emergence of the new post-Soviet states was, for the most part, dealt with using the concept of state succession. On the domestic level, however, the process was much more dramatic; in fact, it was a complete institutional rupture/dislocation. Therefore, when it came time for Moldova to take over the governing institutions from the Soviet Union, those institutions/governing habits were based upon Soviet constitutionalism. Constitutionalism that emphasized central authority and consistently placed political authority above

the Rule of Law. Consequently, although there have been numerous efforts to reform Moldovan law along European lines, significant developments in independent legal culture and institutional resilience lagged behind formal constitutional adoption [1; 7; 38]. Moreover, because the progress made during these periods was subject to potential political reversals [13; 14], they remain fragile.

In many ways, the unresolved conflict in Transnistria serves as the primary example of the "frontier" that has been created by Moldova. For over two decades, the region has existed separately from Moldova with the backing of Russian armed forces, and yet there has never been a single instance of international recognition [34; 37; 50; 49]. Russia's ongoing use of force in the territory without the permission of the government in Chișinău creates both a violation of Moldova's territorial integrity and some of the fundamental principles of international law [6; 48]. Thus, Moldova finds itself in a very similar situation to other borderland countries, that is, they exist in a world where its sovereignty is not complete. Therefore, a number of researchers have characterized Transnistria as one type of "frozen conflict." However, these conflicts do not exist as frozen anomalies; rather, they serve as tools for leverage which limit the options available to the country while at the same time creating a façade of legal stability [34; 37; 50]. In addition to providing military aid to separatists in Transnistria, research has documented Russia's attempts to influence political processes inside Moldova. These include economic coercion, media manipulation, and election interference, all carried out in areas between the lines of formal legitimacy and actual enforcement [2; 3; 20; 38; 44]. Russia uses aspects of international law in ways that benefit it. Sovereignty and self-determination are cited whenever Russia benefits from them. Russia ignores institutionalized checks on authority (e.g., judicial settlement and multilateral oversight) when doing so serves their goals [38]. This behavior has led scholars to characterize Russia's actions as creating managed legal instability - international law persists but does not protect those whose sovereignty it was intended to safeguard [20; 37]. Given all this, faith in international law as a reliable protection against outside threats has understandably eroded. In response, countries caught in these borderland situations are increasingly looking for stronger safeguards through tighter, more binding forms of affiliation.

In this context, association with the European Union represents Moldova's attempt to move beyond its frontier status by pursuing deeper legal incorporation. A significant portion of EU legislation was transposed into Moldovan law during the association process. In addition, the requirement to align domestic institutions with EU practices has had a clear disciplining effect. Nevertheless, because Moldova did not gain access to the EU's core body of law or its security commitments upon completing the association, the country remains outside the Union's protective framework [14; 23; 42].

Scholars who follow EU enlargement have long described this kind of relationship as asymmetric integration: countries are expected to take on heavy obligations and make far-reaching reforms, but without gaining the corresponding rights, decision-making power, or institutional protections that full members enjoy [31; 48; 49]. While association provides borderland states with some degree of legal certainty regarding their obligations, it also generates strategic ambiguity and thus does not provide adequate protection [19; 24]. Romania is positioned uniquely vis-à-vis Moldova. Because Romania is an active participant in the EU and NATO and shares both a common history and language with Moldova, Romania is considered a fully embedded actor in Western legal culture. To the extent that unification occurs through mutual agreement between democratically authorized governments acting under constitutional authority, then it could occur in accordance with international law. As such, unification would represent a mutually agreed-upon redefinition of sovereignty rather than annexation or external interference.

However, Romania's embedded sovereignty also makes clear the asymmetry facing Moldova - that is, formal independence outside of strong legal structures versus shared sovereignty within a well developed legal structure. Thus, Moldova's frontier position is not an accident or transitory. Instead, it is an expression of a structural condition resulting from a weakened form of international legal universalism. When international guarantees lose strength, borders separating normative regimes instead become zones of contention rather than zones of stability. Thus, dependence on protection without being part of a dense network of legal institutions may seem less secure than embedded sovereignty.

Democratic Consent, Public Opinion, and Constitutional Constraints

The extent to which changes in sovereignty may be made legally under international law depends upon agreement among states, and now increasingly upon popular democratic approval. Democratic consent is both the basis for legitimate action by a government at the international level and also provides a legal basis for actions taken by that government. Classical international law relied solely on the consent of States in determining their rights and obligations, while recent developments in the international community (i.e., post-Cold War) have emphasized democratic legitimacy in those areas of the law dealing with territorial change. Franck's thesis concerning an "emergent right to democratic governance" as a condition precedent to international legitimacy has generated considerable debate. However, it is observable in State practice [18] that many States approach territorial changes without a clearly established democratic authority with increased trepidation, even when there appears to exist a high degree of inter-State consensus [47; 48]. Both international courts and institutions have facilitated this development in the form of indirect recognition. Specifically, advisory opinions issued by international courts, election monitoring activities undertaken by such institutions, and soft-law instruments all serve to reinforce the notion that the will of the people should be determined in accordance with certain principles, including the holding of elections that are free and fair, and that provide some measure of pluralism and procedural integrity [15; 16; 27]. Where territorial transformation occurs as a result of consensual union (the voluntary merging or dissolution of state sovereignty), these requirements take on even greater significance [4; 11].

In addition to their socio-political relevance, empirical research findings about how people think about reunifying with Romania have a direct connection to current legal developments. Polls taken in recent years show that a majority of respondents do not believe that unification with Romania should take place. Additionally, there is a sizeable number of respondents who remain undecided [43; 45; 46]. Rather than being simply demographic statistics, these results can define what actions are legally permissible politically within international and constitutional law, and if the required level of democratic approval needed before taking such actions has occurred [18; 47].

From an international law standpoint, since there is no evidence that a majority of the population supports reunification with Romania at this time, there can be no immediate moves made towards unification. Any attempts to move forward with plans to unify prior to receiving a clear indication of what the population wants would violate both the internal rules of the country's constitution and the internationally recognized principle of genuine self-determination. Therefore, the impact of public opinion on the legal environment in Moldova is limiting, rather than advisory. However, given the existence of a significant portion of the population who have yet to make up their minds as to how they feel about reunification with Romania, it appears that opinions are not fixed. Referendum scholars have noted that the way individuals form their opinions is malleable and influenced by factors including how information is framed, the extent to which voters have confidence in government institutions, and other aspects of the political environment in which individuals vote [24; 43]. The dynamic nature of opinion formation is particularly relevant in countries experiencing disinformation, unequal access to media information, and prolonged foreign influence [17; 44]. If there is any doubt regarding the legitimacy of democratic consent due to either formal or informal irregularities during the election process itself, then there will be questions raised regarding its legal validity under both international and constitutional law [15; 16; 27].

Moldova is one example of a country where the issue of external influence affecting elections has been clearly documented. Experts and analysts working with European organizations have detailed Russian attempts to affect electoral outcomes in Moldova using methods including disinformation campaigns, proxy political operatives, and economic pressure [17; 38; 44]. External influences like these blur the distinction between an individual forming their own preferences independently versus making decisions based upon influences from outside sources. They raise additional issues as to whether existing models for understanding self-determination - specifically those relying on referendums - continue to adequately address democratic governance when electoral systems are compromised by systematic forms of interference. An increasing number of legal scholars argue that self-determination cannot be solely defined as a singular plebiscitary event. Rather, self-determination requires an ongoing process within a larger democratic system characterized by free media, resilient institutions, and long-term pluralism [18; 46; 49].

The requirement for legal unification represents a high hurdle for both parties. As far as Moldova is concerned, in order for any potential referendum on reunification to be legitimate, there has to be both a formalistic (legal) requirement and a demonstration of resistance to foreign interference at least equal to the level required for legally meaningful democratic consent. An additional barrier comes from national constitutional law. The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova sets out the country's sovereignty and its territorial unity; however, it explicitly recognizes the priority of democratic decision-making. In addition to being very difficult to amend due to their seriousness, the processes of amending the fundamental structure of the state are designed to prevent constitutional disruption. Based on the legal analysis of the issue, a constitutional reform that would allow for unification would need to be passed by a qualified parliamentary majority, and then approved by a referendum [7; 26]. The two-stage procedure is consistent with international standards regarding the representation and expression of democracy [18; 47]. Additionally, the process helps stabilize the situation and prevents unification from being carried out unilaterally by a temporary political majority. Thus, the Moldovan constitutional framework acts as a gatekeeper. While it does not exclude unification as such, it makes any attempt to achieve unification subject to strict democratic control. It strengthens the notion that sovereignty lies with the people and not with the political elite who may act without regard for other interests [7]. Unification would also need to conform with Romania's constitutional provisions. Romanian constitutional law affirms the sovereignty of the Romanian State while allowing for amendments to its Constitution to occur based upon democratically legitimate procedures [47]. There have been arguments made by some Romanian jurists that, if unification were achieved based on mutual consent and democratically authorized by both sides, it could be constitutionally permissible and in conformity with international law [7; 52]. From the perspective of international law, a lawful bilateral agreement can only occur when both parties have acted through lawful domestic mechanisms and have demonstrated their consent via constitutionally acceptable means. The fact that both sides have provided such consent allows for a distinction to be drawn between lawful unification and either annexation or absorption. Legitimacy via democratic consent is not just important domestically, but it also provides an important indicator to the international community regarding whether or not they should recognize changes in territory. While recognition is always going to remain a political decision, it is influenced and restricted by legal legitimacy. International bodies and governments are much more willing to recognize territorial changes that demonstrate clearly the free will of those whose territories are changing [7; 18; 47]. In terms of the Moldovan example, this factor will play an essential role. Given the sensitivities surrounding regional security issues and the ongoing dispute over territory, any form of unification that lacks robust democratic legitimacy will likely suffer international reluctance to recognize it and create uncertainty about recognition [37; 48]. On the other hand, a transparent, constitutionally-based, and credibly-procedural process of unification will greatly enhance the prospects of international recognition [7;47].

Unification and European Union Accession as Legal Pathways

Joining the European Union is one of the most difficult and far-reaching forms of international integration. Once you're in, you're transferring important chunks of your sovereignty to a supranational legal order where EU rules have direct effect and take priority over national law, something the Court of Justice has made clear over the years [8; 9; 10; 29]. For any candidate country, this means bringing its entire legal and institutional system into line with the full acquis communautaire: constitutions, courts, administration, markets, fundamental rights, the works [12; 48]. Most scholars agree that enlargement is a powerful transformative process that starts reshaping a country's domestic order long before membership day arrives [31, 19; 48, 49].

In Moldova's situation, the Association Agreement and candidate status have already pushed through some real changes, judicial reforms, anti-corruption steps, and harmonizing rules with EU standards, all under pretty close European oversight [13; 14; 29; 44]. The problem is that without full membership, these gains remain fragile.

Moldova remains outside the EU's core legal safeguards and security guarantees. It has no seat at the decision-making table and no access to collective defense mechanisms. On top of that, enlargement fatigue

and Europe's growing geopolitical caution have made the accession timeline feel more and more uncertain. This weakens the stabilizing effect that EU integration is supposed to offer countries on the front line [19; 23; 37; 48]. Researchers who follow this closely often describe it as asymmetric integration. Candidate countries are required to adopt large parts of EU law and carry out demanding reforms, but they receive none of the corresponding rights, institutional protections, or real voice that full members have [31; 49]. For small democracies sitting on the geopolitical edge, this imbalance can end up creating more vulnerability than genuine shelter [19].

Unification with Romania is a completely different legal path. Instead of applying as a separate country, Moldova would join the EU and NATO by simply extending Romania's existing membership across the new unified territory. From the EU's point of view, this wouldn't be treated as a normal enlargement. The German reunification precedent shows that EU law can be extended to newly integrated territory on the basis of state continuity, without having to go through the whole accession procedure [49]. This route would cut out years of uncertainty and deliver immediate access to the full legal and security framework.

That said, unification comes with its own serious risks. Unlike the step-by-step nature of accession, unification is basically irreversible. Its legitimacy would therefore rest heavily on clear, strong, and lasting democratic consent from the people on both sides [7; 18; 47]. Even if everything is done strictly by the book, it could still trigger sharp external reactions in such a tense neighborhood, which is why process, legality, and transparency would matter enormously [15; 16; 20; 48]. In the end, EU accession and unification with Romania aren't mutually exclusive; they're complementary options. Building up the country through regular integration could gradually strengthen its institutions and democracy, possibly changing how Moldovans feel about unification further down the line. Unification, by contrast, would be a quicker legal shortcut into those protective structures, but only if it's backed by broad and solid public support. Both paths are ultimately about the same thing: anchoring Moldova inside a rules-based system strong enough to restrain raw power and protect genuine democratic self-government.

Western Civilization, Legal Universalism, and Democratic Survival

The Moldovan situation prompts us to question whether Western legal civilization remains capable of fulfilling the universalistic aspirations of the past when we find ourselves in an era where power politics is again on the rise. Throughout much of the time since the Cold War ended, there was a consensus that international law and Western institutional order reinforced one another. Therefore, it was believed that liberal democracy, the rule of law, and multilateral legalism formed a cohesive normative framework that provided both legitimacy and security. However, the renewed debate about reunification in Moldova shows how fragile this assumption really is.

Present-day legal theory conceptualizes Western civilization as a legal-institutional structure. Thus, it is able to deal with the limitations of culturalist theories of Western civilization [22]. Culturalist theories cannot account for either normative heterogeneity (the differences among values) inside Western countries or for the ability of non-Western states to internalize Western legal values [5; 33; 40; 45]. Therefore, it is possible to treat alignment with Western countries not as heritage but as a type of legal membership. Habermas's post-national constitutional theory creates a new definition for what it means to be "Western", one centered on an understanding of democratic constitutionalism, the rule of law, judicial review and the principle that law should limit and control political power.

Thus, this way of thinking is consistent with how the European Union has defined itself as a community governed by law (rather than culture or civilization) [8; 10; 35]. Therefore, when frontier countries such as Moldova embrace Western ideas they are embracing the same types of legally enforceable structures that restrict domestic authority and foreign influence. Thus, debates regarding both EU accession and unifying with Romania have taken place almost exclusively in terms of institutions and legality rather than culturally or in terms of identity.

International law has traditionally claimed to provide itself with legitimacy based on claims of universality. While this universality has never been perfect, there was a considerable growth of international legal institutions and expectations regarding compliance during the post-1991 period, especially in Europe [32; 33; 51].

Recently, scholarly work has documented a trend toward a decline in this type of universality. Weaknesses in enforcement mechanisms due to selective application of norms, exceptions due to geopolitical interests, and use of norms for political purposes have undermined trust in international law's potential to constrain powerful actors [20; 30; 38]. A major consequence of this development has been the loss of predictability in legal environments for small states, upon whom reliance on a predictable and enforceable legal environment is crucial to the long-term viability of their democratic systems [28; 29]. The experience of Moldova demonstrates these dynamics.

Although Russia repeatedly violated the territorial integrity of Ukraine, remedies available to Ukraine are mostly declarative in nature [48; 52]. The contradiction between legal provisions on paper and their implementation in practice has changed the role of international law for democratic small states such as Ukraine from a protective shield to a rhetorical tool [23; 37]. Thus, democratic survival has evolved not only as a domestic political issue but also as a legal problem created by external factors such as economic pressure, information control, and coercive influence [18; 36; 49]. Studies related to democratic regression assert that international organizations can act as external guarantors of democratic standards. Participation in tightly integrated legal regimes enhances the costs that authoritarian deviation incurs for participating governments through enhanced supranational scrutiny, judicial supervision, and reputational constraints [35; 36; 49]. Conversely, being excluded from such regimes leaves democracies vulnerable to incremental institutional weakening, particularly in small states subjected to prolonged foreign pressures [23; 37; 38]. From this perspective, Moldova's search for the West is less an expression of ideological alignment than a defensive legal strategy designed to preserve democratic self-governance under adverse circumstances. In other words, unification with Romania represents an extreme manifestation of legal protection against international legal uncertainty at the price of independent statehood. This exchange represents a significant challenge to traditional conceptions of sovereignty, which equate them with autonomous decision-making and non-subordinate status [29; 32].

Contemporary legal theory tends to regard shared sovereignty as an adaptive response to dependency relations, asymmetrically distributed power, and structural vulnerabilities. In densely populated regimes with rules limiting unilateral discretion, expectations may stabilize, and the possibility of arbitrary decisions may be reduced [21; 25; 48], thereby enhancing democratic self-governance. The Moldavian example thus demonstrates a paradox: the greater the decrease in faith in international law, generally speaking, the higher will be the interest in Western legal civilization.

When universal promises disappear, localized legal communities acquire greater attractiveness. In this sense, international law may be moving into a new phase in which density in legal relationships is replacing equal treatment before law as the most important determinant of real sovereignty. Therefore, the principal alternative faced by states situated at frontiers of conflicting legal orders is no longer whether they choose independence or dependence but instead what forms of legal embedding they wish to adopt and what implications these will create for their democratic action capabilities and institutional strength [21; 25; 48].

Conclusion: Moldova, Unification, and the Limits of the International Legal Order

The discussion about the potential reunification of Moldova with Romania is an example of that larger issue, an actual change in how small countries currently understand and experience sovereignty, democracy, and legal protections from the current international system.

This does not seem at first glance like a question of either territorial changes (national identity or otherwise), but rather shows a growing divide between what international law formally provides (equality among sovereigns; territorial integrity; peoples' right to self-determination) and what international law actually delivers regarding securing democratic existence. International law still affirms the principle of sovereign equality; the principle of territorial integrity; and peoples' right to determine their own political future. However, those principles do not function uniformly in practice. For states with little in terms of physical/material power, sovereignty has come to represent a legal status more than an actual effective condition. especially given that international law enforcement can be selective, and/or coercion may occur below the level of open violence. Accordingly, the renewed interest in unification rhetoric cannot be seen as

a rejection of international law. Instead, it constitutes an implicit critique of international law's present-day shortcomings. Appeals for unification are based much more on legal density than either on historic restoration or ethno-national unity. Legal density is shown through Romania's legal structure; it views the polity as an undivided entity subject to common laws and standards that apply to all levels of authority and foreign entities. As such, the call for unification draws its primary force from the institutional and legal continuities inherent in unification, rather than symbolic expressions of unification or ethno-nationally defined calls for unification.

In this regard, the experience of Moldova is an example of how democratic consent may act as an upper boundary on the occurrence of legitimate sovereign change. International law limits legitimate sovereignty transformations that are democratically authorized. This limitation is a part of a larger paradox in Western legal culture. On the one hand, it portrays itself as a global legal system based on universally applicable principles to all states. For states outside of dense legal systems, universal principles increasingly approximate aspirational standards - rather than actual enforceable guarantees. accordingly, western institutions serve as vehicles for strategic affiliations rather than neutral guarantors of legality. As a consequence, Moldova's "search for the West" also exemplifies a paradox of the contemporary international legal order. As general mechanisms of international law fail to protect small democracies from violations of their rights, specificized legal systems (EU law), NATO membership, and/or consensual unification have become attractive alternatives to universal guarantees of enforcement.

Sovereignty isn't being thrown away; it's being redefined in legal terms. This is actually a pretty big development in international legal theory. If real, effective sovereignty now depends more on whether a state can plug itself into strong, protective legal institutions than on the old idea of formal equality between all states, then the whole classical structure of international law is undergoing a fundamental change. The purpose of the Moldova case study was not to create a model for how other countries might transition from authoritarianism, but to serve as an example or tool to diagnose the implications of this transition for political theory in general.

Moldova provides evidence that democracy may endure even when there are severe structural impediments to its development; demonstrates that constitutional law can resist the pressure of strategic actors who seek to exert influence on the state externally; and illustrates that unique legal mechanisms have developed exactly at times when common global guarantees of democratic values were being eroded. Regardless of whether Moldova seeks to pursue greater integration as an independent country or as part of a consensually unified Romania, that decision is contingent upon democratic will. What is clear, however, is that the decision-making process itself is determined less by identity than by law.

In this manner, Moldova is not a unique case at Europe's periphery; it represents an early signpost of a larger shift in the relationships between international law, western legal civilization, and democratic survival in a contested world.

Bibliography:

1. BUTLER, W. E. *Soviet law*. 2nd ed. London: Butterworths, 1988.
2. CAŁUS, K. *More independence, less fear: Moldova's perspective on Russia after a year of war in Ukraine*. OSW Commentary. Warsaw: Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich, 20 February 2023.
3. CAŁUS, K. *Transnistria in the new international reality. OSW Commentary.* Warsaw: Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich, 29 December 2023.
4. CASSESE, A. *Self-determination of peoples: A legal reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
5. CHAKRABARTY, D. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
6. *CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS.* San Francisco, 26 June 1945.
7. *CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA*.
8. COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. V*an Gend en Loos v. Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen, Case 26/62. 1963 E.C.R. 1.*

9. COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. *Costa v. ENEL, Case 6/64. 1964 E.C.R. 585.*
10. COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. *Les Verts v. European Parliament, Case 294/83. 1986 E.C.R. 1340.*
11. CRAWFORD, J. *The creation of states in international law*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
12. CRAIG, P., DE BÚRCA, G. *EU law: Text, cases, and materials.* 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
13. EUROPEAN COMMISSION. *Joint staff working document on the European Neighbourhood Policy: Country report – Moldova.* SWD (2015) 74 final. Brussels, 2015.
14. EUROPEAN COMMISSION. *Moldova 2023 report.* SWD (2023) 698 final. Brussels, 2023.
15. EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR DEMOCRACY THROUGH LAW (VENICE COMMISSION). *Code of good practice on referendums.* CDL-AD (2007)008.
16. EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR DEMOCRACY THROUGH LAW (VENICE COMMISSION). *Joint guidelines on preventing and responding to misuse of administrative resources during electoral processes.* CDL-AD (2016)004.
17. EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE. *Second report on foreign information manipulation and interference.* Brussels, 2023.
18. FRANCK, T. M. *The emerging right to democratic governance.* Routledge, 2011.
19. GRABBE, H. *Six lessons of enlargement ten years on. Journal of Common Market Studies*, 2014, vol. 47, no. 1, p. 41–56.
20. GRANT, T. D. *Aggression against Ukraine: Territory, responsibility, and international law*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
21. HABERMAS, J. *The postnational constellation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.
22. HILL, W. H. *No place for Russia: European security institutions since 1989.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2018.
23. HOBOLT, S. *Europe in question: Referendums on European integration.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
24. IKENBERRY, G. J. *Liberal leviathan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
25. *INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS.* 1966.
26. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRACY AND ELECTORAL ASSISTANCE. *Quorum requirements for a referendum to be valid: Moldova.*
27. KATZENSTEIN, P. J. *Small states in world markets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
28. KEOHANE, R. O. *Lilliputians' dilemmas*. International Organization, 1969, vol. 23, no. 2, 29.
29. KOCHENOV, D. *EU enlargement and the failure of conditionality.* The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2008.
30. KOSKENNIEMI, M. *From apology to utopia: The structure of international legal argument.* Reissue with a new epilogue. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
31. KOSKENNIEMI, M. *The gentle civilizer of nations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
32. LENAERTS, K. *The rule of law and the coherence of the judicial system of the European Union.* Common Market Law Review, 2007, vol. 44. No 6.
33. LEVITSKY, S., ZIBLATT, D. *How democracies die.* New York: Crown, 2018.
34. LYNCH, D. *Engaging Eurasia's separatist states.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2004.
35. MÄLKSOO, L. *Russian approaches to international law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
36. MÜLLER, J.-W. *Constitutional patriotism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
37. NEWSMAKER. *Sondaż dotyczący zjednoczenia Mołdawii z Rumunią*. September 2025.
38. OŚRODEK STUDIÓW WSCHODNICH. *Russia's instruments of influence in Moldova.* Warsaw: OSW, 2023.
39. REUTERS. *Moldova's President Sandu says she would vote to join Romania.* 12 January 2026. Available at: https://www.reuters.com/world/moldovas-president-sandu-says-she-would-vote-join-romania-2026-01-12/
40. SAID, E. W. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
41. SANDU, M. *Interview by A. Campbell and R. Stewart. The Rest Is Politics podcast, episode 170.* London: Goalhanger Podcasts, 11 January 2026.
42. SCHIMMELFENNIG, F., SEDELMEIER, U. *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.

43. SCHIMMELFENNIG, F., SEDELMEIER, U. *Governance by conditionality. Journal of European Public Policy,* 2004, vol. 11, no. 4.
44. SUPREME COURT OF CANADA. *Reference re Secession of Quebec*. [1998] 2 S.C.R. 217.
45. TALMON, S. *Recognition of governments in international law.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
46. TOMUSCHAT, C. *Modern law of self-determination.* Leiden: Brill, 1993.
47. UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY. *Resolution 46/223. Admission of the Republic of Moldova to membership in the United Nations*. 2 March 1992.
48. UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY. *Resolution 72/282. Withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territory of the Republic of Moldova.* 22 June 2018.
49. VON DER DUNK, F. G., KOOIJMANS, P. H. The unification of Germany and international law. *Michigan Journal of International Law,* 1991, vol. 12, no. 3.
50. WOLFF, S. A resolvable frozen conflict? *Nationalities Papers*, 2011, vol. 39, no. 6.
51. UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY. Resolution 2625 (XXV). *Declaration on Principles of International law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.* 24 October 1970.
52. SCHEPPELE, K. L. Autocratic legalism. *University of Chicago Law Review,* 2018, vol. 85.

Data about author:
***Paweł MACIĄG*,** PhD Senior Lecturer, International Relations and Diplomacy Program, Mercy University, New York, USA, Adjunct Faculty, Centre for East European Studies, University of Warsaw, Poland In November 2025, recipient of the Erasmus+ award granted by the European Union at Moldova State University, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova.
ORCID: 0009-0000-2852-6512
E-mail: pawel.maciag@uw.edu.pl ; pmaciag@mercy.edu

Presented: 22.01.2026
Reviewed: 10.04.2026
Accepted for publication: 20.05.2026