

## NICOLAE ȚIMIRAȘ. THE VOICE OF A DIPLOMAT REGARDING THE ISSUE OF THE AROMANIANS IN ALBANIA

Emanuil Ineoan<sup>52</sup>

### ABSTRACT

*The present study tries to recover the biography of the diplomat Nicolae Țimiraș. Although he stayed only a few months at the Romanian legation in Albania, Nicolae Țimiraș was responsible for drawing up action strategies of the Romanian state in favor of the Aromanian communities in the area. His name thus remains emblematic for those representatives within the Romanian diplomacy, extremely important for what the orientation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Bucharest meant in the matter of Romanians outside the borders.*

**Keywords:** diplomacy, Aromanians, Nicolae Țimiraș, Albania, Italy, 1941.

### ARGUMENT

This study aims to present the biography and vision of a representative of the Romanian diplomatic corps, who was forced to carry out his activity in a difficult context, namely that of the period between 1936 and 1947. The fate of Nicolae Țimiraș is, from this point of view, emblematic of the transformations the Romanian state went through during this turbulent decade.

The study of professor Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca, namely “Diplomat Nicolae Țimiraș’s Reports about the Aromanians of Albania”<sup>53</sup> sparked the interest in the unfairly ignored figure of this diplomat. The lines below try to complete the biographical profile of the aforementioned diplomat, using a new, original archive source, namely his personal file, located in the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bucharest<sup>54</sup>.

---

<sup>52</sup> Researcher, The European Centre for Ethnic Studies, Romanian Academy, E-mail address: iemanuil@yahoo.com.

<sup>53</sup> Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca, „Rapoartele diplomatului Nicolae Țimiraș despre aromânii din Albania” [“Diplomat Nicolae Țimiraș’s Reports about the Aromanians of Albania”], in *Unitate romanică și diversitate balcanică. Contribuții la istoria romanității balcanice [Romanic Unity and Balkan Diversity. Contributions to the History of Balkan Romanianness]*, Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca and Anca Tanașoca, Bucharest, Pro Fundation Publishing, 2004, pp. 255–275.

<sup>54</sup> Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (further A.M.F.A.), Personal fund, Nicolae Țimiraș, Problem 77, Letter T, no. 60.

## BIOGRAPHICAL PROFILE

Nicolae Țimiraș was born on July 30<sup>th</sup> O.S. /August 12<sup>th</sup> N.S. 1912 in Bucharest. His father, Nicolae, was a lawyer, with literary inclinations<sup>55</sup>, and his mother, Letiția, née Creangă, a housewife<sup>56</sup>, was the daughter of captain Constantin Creangă, the son of the writer from Humulești<sup>57</sup>. Therefore, on the maternal line, Nicolae Țimiraș was the great-grandson of Ion Creangă.

An extremely important family detail for the concerns of the future diplomat is related to the female descendants from his mother's side. Thus, his grandmother Olga was the daughter of the Aromanian Petru N. Petru from Brăila, and his great-grandmother Elena was "born in Thessaloniki from a Macedonian family from there"<sup>58</sup>. Before he even met the Aromanian Olga, the one who would become his wife, grandfather Constantin Creangă was preoccupied with the Macedonian-Romanian element as a defining element in Romanian trade, circulating a series of projects meant to facilitate as many Aromanian-Romanian contacts as possible<sup>59</sup>.

After graduating from the Mircea cel Bătrân High School in Constanța, Nicolae Țimiraș attended the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy in Bucharest, the sociology section, and the Law courses of the same university<sup>60</sup>. With humour and self-irony, Nicolae Țimiraș explained his university options as follows:

"only laziness when it came to choosing between Law and Letters made me enroll at the same time in these two Faculties and attend them both, graduating them 1930–1933"<sup>61</sup>.

In 1934 he graduated the School of Reserve Cavalry Officers in Târgoviște.

After graduating the Faculty of Law, he enrolled in a doctorate in legal studies, but in the meantime, he also practiced law as a lawyer in Bucharest. At the end of 1935, he decided to participate in a competition for the post of legation attaché within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Of the 54 admitted candidates, only 15 passed the written test and were accepted for the oral exam. With an average of 6.75 out of 10, Nicolae Țimiraș was declared admitted by a committee consisting of Nicolae Titulescu, Savel Rădulescu, M. Arion, Ion Christu, Em. Pantazi, and Al. Ottulescu. Thus, on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 1936, he was appointed attaché to the legation, and on June 24<sup>th</sup>, 1936, he took the following oath:

---

<sup>55</sup> Nicolae Țimiraș's father wrote and translated poems, and in 1933 he received the Academy Award for the publication of a monograph on Ion Creangă. Constantin Mihăescu, "Cuvânt înainte" ["Foreword"], in Nicolae Țimiraș, *Rapsodii de vacanță. Călătorie în America de Sud [Holiday Rhapsodies. Travel to South America]*, Bucharest, Memoria Cultural Foundation, 2002, p. 7.

<sup>56</sup> A.M.F.A., Record 77, 1936, Birth extract Nicolae Țimiraș.

<sup>57</sup> Nicolae Țimiraș, *Anii tinereții [Youthful years]*, edition published and curated by Ion Manea, Berkeley, 1991, p. 15.

<sup>58</sup> „născută la Salonic dintr-o familie macedoneană de acolo”, in *Ibidem*, p. 12.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 24.

<sup>60</sup> C. Mihăescu, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>61</sup> „numai lenea de a alege între Drept și Litere m-a făcut să mă înscriu în același timp la aceste două Facultăți și să le urmez pe amândouă terminându-le 1930–1933”, in N. Țimiraș, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

“I pledge allegiance to the King, obedience to the Constitution and the laws of the Romanian people. I pledge to keep strictly the secret of the works and duties that will be entrusted to me in the service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs”<sup>62</sup>.

Nicolae Țimiraș presented himself as an excellent speaker of French but mentioned that he had notions of Italian and German and philosophical-literary knowledge<sup>63</sup>.

On June 25<sup>th</sup>, 1938, Nicolae Țimiraș obtained the rank of secretary of Legation 3<sup>rd</sup> class, having the highest mark in the written test. On March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1939, he was transferred to the Romanian legation in Budapest, and from October 1<sup>st</sup>, 1940, to the legation in Rome, thus familiarizing himself with the foreign policy of Romania in two extremely sensitive places. Between May 1<sup>st</sup>, 1941, and August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1941, Nicolae Țimiraș was posted to the consulate in Tirana, a position where his sensibilities towards the Aromanian world would be essential. From October 1941, he was sent to the Romanian legation in Rome, as legation secretary 3<sup>rd</sup> class.

In the internal assessment carried out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1942, it was stated:

“Mr. Țimiraș is an excellent official with a lot of tact and a lot of political sense. He has many literary skills and frequents intellectual and literary circles, where he presents Romanian culture as well as possible. He fully deserves to be promoted (...)”<sup>64</sup>.

Incidentally, from August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1944, Nicolae Țimiraș was confirmed as secretary of legation 2<sup>nd</sup> class. From Rome, on December 15<sup>th</sup>, 1944, he was transferred to the Romanian Legation from the Vatican. On May 9<sup>th</sup>, 1946, he was promoted to the rank of secretary of legation 1<sup>st</sup> class. Until 1947 he would have several diplomatic missions at the Holy See. In his personal biography, Nicolae Țimiraș stated that between 1944 and 1945 he was “out of the diplomatic service (underground)”<sup>65</sup>, without giving any other explanation about this situation.

On June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1946, Nicolae Țimiraș announced to the Minister of Foreign Affairs from Bucharest that he had married Paola Silvestri, an Italian citizen<sup>66</sup>.

On April 15<sup>th</sup>, 1947, he was recalled from the Romanian Legation at the Vatican to the Central Administration. A day later, on April 16<sup>th</sup>, 1947, Nicolae Țimiraș sent a letter from Italy to Bucharest to the vice-president of the Council of Ministers, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Gheorghe Tătărăscu, asking to be given a 6-month leave starting from 15<sup>th</sup> June reasoning that the wife was a student in the

---

<sup>62</sup> „Jur credință Regelui, supunere Constituțiunii și legilor poporului român. Jur de a păstra cu sfințenie secretul lucrărilor și îndatoririlor ce mi se vor încredința în serviciul Ministerului Afacerilor Străine.”, in A.M.F.A.

<sup>63</sup> A.M.F.A., Record 77, 1936, Stat de serviciu [State of service].

<sup>64</sup> „Domnul Țimiraș este un excelent funcționar de foarte mult tact și de mult simț politic. Posedă multe aptitudini literare și frecventează mult cercurile intelectuale și literare, unde prezintă cât se poate de bine cultura românească. Merită pe deplin să fie înaintat (...)”, in A.M.F.A., Foaie calificativă [Qualification Sheet], 1942.

<sup>65</sup> „în afara serviciului diplomatic (underground)”, in N. Țimiraș, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

<sup>66</sup> A.M.F.A., Report 77, 1936.

last year of the Faculty of Medicine in Rome and needed time to prepare her doctoral thesis<sup>67</sup>.

The decision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs no. 58378 of August 31<sup>st</sup>, 1947, reduced the budget-funded staff to the existing scheme in 1939. In the list of 234 employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs whose posts were to be suppressed, the name of Țimiraș is also found, along with Lecca Gheorghe, Petala Vintilă, Crutzescu Radu, Ciuntu Edmond, Stănescu Mihail, Karadja Constantin, etc. On this occasion, the vast operation of purging the Romanian diplomatic corps and the ideological alignment of the staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the new political commandments was consummated.

On September 7<sup>th</sup>, 1947, the Personnel Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, through Mihail Lupașcu, Head of Service, notified Nicolae Țimiraș, who was, for a short time, still first secretary of the Legation in Rome, the following:

“I have the honour to inform you that according to the decision of the Ministerial Commission for Economic Recovery and Monetary Stabilization No. 18 of August 12<sup>th</sup>, 1947, your budget-funded position was suppressed by ministerial decision No. 58378 of August 31<sup>st</sup>, 1947, on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 1947.”<sup>68</sup>.

Along with the position of the first secretary of the legation, the positions of the deputy head of office and the chamberlain at the Legation of Romania in Rome were also eliminated.

On September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1947, a deciphered telegram notified the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

“The Secretary of Legation Țimiraș, recalled to headquarters, left Italy for good, expatriating himself to Canada. This news was confirmed to me by the Italian Ambassador and the State Secretariat of the Vatican”<sup>69</sup>.

Thus began the exile of the diplomat Nicolae Țimiraș and his destiny as a political refugee. Together with his wife Paola, he leaves for Canada, to Montreal, where they lived for six years, then to the USA, to Berkeley, California. Their two children Maria-Laetitia (1956) and Paolo Francesco (1962)<sup>70</sup> were born in exile. During his stay in Canada, between 1947 and 1953, Nicolae Țimiraș worked as a lawyer at the Lacoste et Lacoste Office<sup>71</sup>. In the USA, he was a professor of Romanian at the US Army Languages School in Monterey (1953–1957), California,

<sup>67</sup> A.M.F.A, No. 28216, 5<sup>th</sup> May 1947.

<sup>68</sup> „Am onoarea a vă aduce la cunoștință că potrivit deciziunii Comisiunii Ministeriale pentru redresare economică și stabilizarea monetară No. 18 din 12 august 1947, postul Dv. bugetar a fost suprimat prin deciziunea ministerială No. 58378 din 31 august 1947, pe data de 1 septembrie 1947.”, in A.M.F.A., Report 77, 1936.

<sup>69</sup> „Secretar de Legațiune Țimiraș, rechemat în centrală, a părăsit definitiv Italia, expatriindu-se în Canada. Această știre mi-a fost confirmată de Ambasadorul Italiei și Secretariatul de Stat al Vaticanului”, in A.M.F.A., Telegramă descifrată de la Legațiunea din Vatican [Deciphered Telegram from the Vatican Legation], No. 98781, September 25, 1947.

<sup>70</sup> C. Mihăescu, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>71</sup> N. Țimiraș, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

and then a professor of Romance languages at Contra Costa College (1959–1980), San Francisco-Bay Area.

In 1978, Nicolae Țimiraș received his doctorate in Italian literature at the University of California, Berkeley. His wife, Paola, was a professor of anatomy and physiology at the same university<sup>72</sup>.

Nicolae Țimiraș represented an involved voice of the Romanian American exile, being the founder and president of the Romanian-American Academy of Arts and Sciences<sup>73</sup>.

In 1991, Nicolae Țimiraș visited Romania, the country where he had been proscribed in 1947. He died in 1996.

### THE AROMANIAN ISSUE

Although he worked at the Romanian Legation in Tirana for only a few months, between May 1<sup>st</sup>, 1941, and August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1941, the diplomatic reports he sent to the country impress with the probity of the analysis and the solutions presented. Far from representing the posture of the passive diplomat, who records with enough detachment the political events around him, limiting himself to an office-based knowledge of the realities, Nicolae Țimiraș tried to convince himself through documentary trips in the territory<sup>74</sup>, as a result of which resulted real studies, of the way in which the realities of the new Balkan state are read. Relevant for their high intellectual level, the diplomatic reports signed by Nicolae Țimiraș were included in the appendices of the study elaborated by the consul Emil Oprișan in 1945, *Romanians Abroad*

“in order to substantiate Romania’s foreign policy strategy in the issue of Romanian minority groups outside the country’s borders and, more precisely, for defining the attitude on this issue of the Romanian delegation at the future Peace Conference”<sup>75</sup>.

Romania’s interest in Albania was translated since the founding of this state through Bucharest’s interest in the Aromanian communities there. This represented with certainty the keystone of the diplomatic reports sent to the country by Nicolae Țimiraș.

The emeritus professor Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca pointed out in the aforementioned study “The Diplomat Nicolae Țimiraș’s Reports about the Aromanians of Albania” three reports signed by Nicolae Țimiraș during the period

<sup>72</sup> C. Mihăescu, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 8.

<sup>74</sup> In July 1941, he made an impressive documentary trip to the Aromanian centres from Albania. This resulted in the diplomatic reports highlighted by Professor N. Ș. Tanașoca in the aforementioned study.

<sup>75</sup> „în vederea fundamentării strategiei de politică externă a României în problema grupurilor minoritare românești din afara hotarelor țării și, mai precis, pentru definirea atitudinii în această problemă a delegației române la viitoarea Conferință de pace”, in N. Ș. Tanașoca, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

in which he was active in Tirana. In his personal file located in the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, there is also a report that provides important information about the fate of this community at the turn of 1941.

The report in question is entitled: "The Political and Economic Situation in Albania"<sup>76</sup> and is dated July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1941, No. 450/P. From the very beginning, Nicolae Țimiraș presents the argument of this synthesis/report:

"The general situation in Albania, which is actually an Italian province, interests us to the extent that it clarifies some military, political and economic aspects of Italy. I therefore aim to clarify what the situation was in Albania when the Italians came and then to examine in what direction and with what result the new masters sought to modify this situation"<sup>77</sup>.

The report's information on Albanian economic and political life is organized in a symmetrical manner, before and after "the union with Italy".

The following fragment seems to us relevant for the profile of this diplomat and for the lenses that he applies in his analyses of the Albanian political landscape:

"Discontent among the population is intensifying: among other things, the Italian regime is accused by people with responsibilities, of having exploited excessively the riches of the country, without organizing them; that it constructed military communications in its own interest, not in the interest of the public; that it wasted many millions with the complicity of enterprises under the patronage of Count Ciano; that Italy, instead of setting an example through its officials, sent to the Royal Lieutenancy and to all the ministries untrained and unfair officials. The mentality of these Italian representatives who are accused of receiving orders from Count Ciano over the head of the Royal Lieutenant, is that the Albanians, corruptible and lacking national consciousness, must be governed without any scruples. This mentality has been proven wrong in every way"<sup>78</sup>.

One can observe here a distinctive mark of the reports drawn up by Țimiraș, the look of the sociologist who analyses a political, economic, cultural setting from the positions of the one directly interested in offering work strategies, solutions, not just a static, disengaged chronicle.

---

<sup>76</sup> „Situația Politică și Economică din Albania”. A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P. The report is not numbered.

<sup>77</sup> „Situațiunea generală din Albania, care este de fapt o provincie italiană, ne interesează în măsura în care lămurește unele aspecte militare, politice și economice ale Italiei. Îmi propun deci a preciza care era situația în Albania la venirea italienilor și a examina apoi în ce direcție și cu ce rezultat au căutat noii stăpâni să modifice această situațiune.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>78</sup> „Nemulțumirile în rândul populației se accentuează: între altele, regimul italian este acuzat de oameni cu răspundere, că a exploatat în mod excesiv bogățiile țării, fără a le organiza; că a construit comunicații militare în interesul său, nu în interesul publicului; că a irosit multe milioane cu complicitatea unor întreprinderi patronate de Conte Ciano; că Italia în loc să dea pildă prin funcționarii săi, a trimis la Locotenența Regală și lângă toate ministerele funcționari nepregătiți și incorecți. Mentalitatea acestor reprezentanți italieni ce sunt acuzați că primesc ordine din partea Contelui Ciano peste capul Locotenentului Regal, este că Albanezii, coruptibili și lipsiți de conștiință națională, trebuie guvernati fără niciun menajament. Mentalitatea s-a dovedit eronată din toate punctele de vedere.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

Here's how Nicolae Țimiraș defines Romania's interest in Albania:

"Among current problems in Albania, Romania, although interested in everything that can determine a political orientation of Italy, is directly concerned with the problem of the Romanian minority and the problem of the Pindus.

a) The problem of the Romanian minority is related to the problem of the future territorial annexations of Albania, since the measures that will be taken towards the minorities will depend on the conditions that will arise after these annexations are carried out"<sup>79</sup>.

Reporting on the Aromanian issue seems to be treated in a similar way by the Italians and the Albanians:

"For the time being, as in the past, the Albanian Government does not seem willing to grant the Romanians autonomy and neither other freedom apart from the eight churches and six schools from the Corcea region, under the pretext that Romanians live free, and are not and do not want to be considered a minority. This point of view seems to be shared by the Italian circles, who do not see with much sympathy the development of the Orthodox and, in their opinion, Grecophile traditions of the Romanian element, and who would lean towards the idea of uniting the Orthodox Church with the Papal Church"<sup>80</sup>.

The refusal to grant minority rights to the Aromanians in Albania is justified by Tirana through the weak identity awareness of the Aromanians themselves, for whom the few churches and schools granted by the government are enough. On the other hand, Italy sees in this community an inconvenient Greek appendage, through the Orthodox confession:

"Lately, Italian circles show a tendency to minimize the importance of our minority in Pindus, and regarding the regime, they have reservations about granting autonomy to some Orthodox elements on the border of Greece"<sup>81</sup>.

For Rome, the idea of uniting the Orthodox Church with the Catholic Church seems to be the most accessible solution regarding this community. It seems that the idea had also gained Aromanian followers, with the diocesan councillor Gogeamani also bringing political arguments in favour of it<sup>82</sup>.

---

<sup>79</sup> „Dintre problemele de actualitate în Albania, România deși interesată pentru tot ce poate determina o orientare politică a Italiei, este preocupată direct de problema minorității românești și de problema Pindului.a) Problema minorității române este legată de problema viitoarelor anexiuni teritoriale ale Albaniei, întrucât măsurile ce se vor lua față de minorități vor depinde de condițiile ce se vor naște după efectuarea acestor anexiuni.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>80</sup> „Deocamdată, ca și în trecut, Guvernul albanez nu pare dispus să acorde românilor autonomie și nici alte libertăți în afară de cele opt biserici și șase școli din regiunea Corcea, sub pretext că românii trăiesc liberi, nu sunt și nu vor să fie considerați ca minoritate. Acest punct de vedere pare împărțit și de cercurile italiene, care nu văd cu prea mare simpatie dezvoltarea tradițiilor ortodoxe și, după părerea lor, grecofile, ale elementului românesc, și care ar înclina spre ideea unirii Bisericii Ortodoxe cu Biserica Papală.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>81</sup> „În ultimul timp, cercurile italiene manifestă tendința de a se minimaliza importanța minorității noastre din Pind, iar în privința regimului au rezervă față de acordarea de autonomie unor elemente ortodoxe la granița Greciei”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>82</sup> N. Ș. Tanașoca, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

In order to break the ties of the Aromanians with Romania, the Italian authorities refused to issue passports to the young people who wanted to study in schools in Romania, apart from the Orthodox and Mohammedan seminaries, which did not exist in Italy. The measure was of extreme seriousness, all the efforts of the Romanian state to build an Aromanian elite that it could later send to the places of origin thus being cancelled.

The solution delivered in the Țimiraș report is the following:

“To awaken the national consciousness of our minority, we could first proceed to the formation of their spiritual solidarity, using some enthusiastic nationalist elements, but, of course, taking into account the material part, we cannot remain indifferent to the subsidy needs of the priests and teachers from the few Romanian churches and schools today. This is for the beginning”<sup>83</sup>.

The Aromanian priests, in the diplomat’s view, must be supported in order to transform themselves into vectors of national consciousness. Orthodox confessional alterity in the religious context of the Albanian state must contribute to the formation of a “spiritual solidarity”<sup>84</sup>. This perspective, of the Romanian state, which must strengthen the national consciousness of the Aromanians through the autochthonous Aromanian clerical element, deserves to be remembered as a strategy for working in the territory. At the same time, we note the pragmatism of the diplomat Țimiraș who insists on the need to subsidize the Aromanian priests and teachers in Albania. It’s interesting the statement he immediately makes “for the beginning”. The addition is able to suggest that the pecuniary support of the Romanian state in the area should not be imagined as essential in the maintenance of a national conscience. Once the movement is started, things would naturally fall into place.

Predictably, Nicolae Țimiraș introduces the Aromanian leader, Alcibiade Diamandi, president of a representative structure, called the Pind Committee and intermediary between the Aromanian communities and the Italian authorities, in his report. Being in negotiations to support the project according to the needs of his community, Diamandi has two options for becoming for the Aromanians:

“the creation of an independent state of all Romanians in the Balkans, or possibly an autonomous state of the Pindus, under the auspices of Italy”<sup>85</sup>.

Nicolae Țimiraș does not only have the narrow view of the Aromanian issue, but also the most complex, territorial one:

“The Pindus problem is even more closely related to possible Albanian territorial annexations, since Albania claims the annexation of the Pindus region between the Gulf of Arta, Metzova-Grebena and Florina. Faced with such a complex problem, Italy

---

<sup>83</sup> „Pentru deșteptarea conștiinței naționale a minorității noastre s-ar putea proceda întâi la formarea solidarității lor spirituale, folosindu-se câteva elemente naționaliste entuziaste, dar, bineînțeles, luând în considerare și partea materială, nu putem rămâne nepăsători față de nevoile de subvenționare ale preoților și învățătorilor de la cele câteva biserici și școli românești actuale. Aceasta pentru început.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>84</sup> „solidarități spirituale”.

<sup>85</sup> „crearea unui stat independent al tuturor românilor din Balcani, sau eventual unui stat autonom al Pindului, sub egida Italiei”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.



is not yet decided neither on the annexation of the Pindus, nor on the regime that will be given to this region from a religious and educational point of view”<sup>86</sup>.

In his report, Țimiras states that the Aromanians themselves “stand up against the idea of being separated from Tessaglia, the only grazing land they use”<sup>87</sup>.

It should be noted that the Romanian diplomat uses the term Romanian minority when referring to the Aromanians, being convinced that the Romanian state’s actions in the area are justified by a kin-state affiliation.

### FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Nicolae Țimiras belongs to the category of those diplomats in the second echelon of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Bucharest who, through their professionalism, loyalty, and ability to understand the world they live in, have built long-term strategies, away from the spotlight. After going through the diplomatic reports signed by him, we cannot help but wonder how much the Romanian state lost by the fact that Nicolae Țimiras spent only a few months at the Romanian Legation in Tirana and how useful his expertise would have been in the post-war period.

### REFERENCES

- Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (further A.M.F.A.), Personal fund, Nicolae Țimiras, Problem 77, Letter T, no. 60.
- Mihăescu Constantin, „Cuvânt înainte” [“Foreword”], in Țimiras Nicolae, *Rapsodii de vacanță. Călătorie în America de Sud [Holiday Rhapsodies. Travel to South America]*, Bucharest, Memoria Cultural Foundation, 2002.
- Tanașoca Nicolae Șerban, „Rapoartele diplomatului Nicolae Țimiras despre aromânii din Albania” in Tanașoca Nicolae Șerban and Tanașoca Anca, *Unitate romanică și diversitate balcanică. Contribuții la istoria romanității balcanice [Romanic Unity and Balkan Diversity. Contributions to the History of Balkan Romanianness]*, Bucharest, Pro Foundation Publishing, 2004.
- Țimiras Nicolae, *Anii tinereții [Youthful years]*, edition published and curated by Ion Manea, Berkeley, 1991.

---

<sup>86</sup> „Problema Pindului este și mai strâns legată de eventualele anexiuni teritoriale albaneze întrucât Albania, pretinde anexarea regiunii Pindului între golful Arta, Metzova-Grebena și Florina. În fața unei probleme atât de complexe, Italia nu este hotărâtă încă nici asupra anexiunii Pindului, nici asupra regimului ce se va acorda acestei regiuni din punct de vedere religios și școlar.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

<sup>87</sup> „se ridică contra ideii de a fi separați de Tessaglia, unicul teren de pășune pe care-l folosesc.”, in A.M.F.A., Diplomatic Report, July 1, 1941, No. 450/ P.

