New Europe College Yearbook 2010-2011

IONUȚ FLORIN BILIUȚĂ
DUNYA DENIZ CAKIR
ANA-MARIA GOILAV
MARIANA GOINA
SILVIU-RADIAN HARITON
SUSAN MBULA KILONZO
CRISTIAN NAE
THEODOR-CRISTIAN POPESCU
COSMIN GABRIEL RADU
KONRAD SIEKIERSKI
ANDREEA ȘTEFAN

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

IONUȚ FLORIN BILIUȚĂ

Born in 1980, in Focșani, Romania

Ph.D. Candidate in History, Central European University, Budapest
Thesis: *The Archangel's Consacrated Servants. An Inquiry in the Relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Iron Guard in Interwar Romania and Beyond*

2006 (May), Two Years Research Scholarship in Systematic Theology received from Diakonisches Werk – EKD, Germany;

2007 (June), Ratiu Family Foundation's research scholarship for a Ph.D. in History;

2008 (April), Ph.D. scholarship in Theology granted by Leuven University (Belgium);

2008 (May), Rațiu Foundation Scholarship for a Ph.D. in History at Oxford Brookes (UK);

2011 (May-June), Visiting Junior Research Fellow, Modern European History Research Center, Faculty of History, University of Oxford (Oxford, UK);

2011-2012- Junior Research Fellowship awarded by Institute for European History (Mainz, Germany).

Conferences attended in Switzerland, USA, Canada, Austria, Germany, Hungary, Romania.

Articles on Intellectual History of Romanian Nationalism, History of the Orthodox Church, Romanian fascism, Phenomenology, Patristics, Bzyantium.

Projects: Eastern Europe (SCOPES), Eastern Christianity in Post-Imperial Societies.

SECULAR VERSUS RELIGIOUS NATIONALISM IN 19TH-20TH CENTURY ROMANIA. STIRRING THE DEBATING ABOUT THE ESSENCE OF ROMANIAN NATIONALISM

Introduction

Between 1920 and 1940 the relationship between culture and ethnicity constituted one of the most dominant political themes in Eastern Europe. The cultural, historical, anthropological debates shaped national identity in every country in the region. After 1918 the building of the national state in East Central Europe had as a principal consequence a quest to define the nation. The political regimes engaged in an official sponsored project to define nationhood. The main reasons behind this political attitude were the inhomogeneous population inside their borderlands or the menacing strong neighbors. In the same time revisionism, political conservatism, artistic avant-garde, anti-modernism and fascism joined hands with the same purpose: to provide a right-wing definition of the nation where racial nationalistic grounds were the backbone for an exclusivist and anti-Semite ideology which eventually led to an explosive state of facts.

The rise of Soviet Russia on the one hand and fascist Italy and Germany on the other hand had a tremendous effect on Eastern Europe: in the conflict between the god of the Nation and the idol of the class, the countries from the Eastern Europe attempted to avoid a political partnership with the revolutionary states and involved in different regional and international alliances. But these political alliances could not put an end to the appeal of the fascist states: it seemed that by the end of the 1930s, under the influence of the economical crises, the god of the Nation ruled over Eastern Europe, as well. This balancing situation is also true in Romania's case. Around this confrontation in creating the national identity I construct my paper. The "geo-cultural bovarism" (Sorin Antohi)

of the countries in the region is the main metaphor which describes the permutations of different categories, including nation and religion.[1]

The literature on the Romanian case is poor. Although in interwar Romanian there was a hotly debate over the nation between the traditionalists and modernizers, there are still unclear aspects about it and its connection with the emergence of the fascist movement of the Iron Guard in the mid 1930s. A historiographical overview concerning this issue should begin with Keith Hitchins. In the context of the debates over the role played by the centre on the periphery in economic development, Romanian started to play a major role and to interest the specialists. It is in this context that the first volume in which one of Keith Hitchins's first texts regarding the traditionalist group of *Gîndirea* was published.[2] Hitchins continued to express his insights on the interwar debate regarding the Romanian character in a new monograph which framed the whole traditionalist camp into a historical context lacking from the previous text.

Another scholar who published in the same period was Sorin Alexandrescu, a Romanian scholar. First in an article[3] and then in a book, entitled "The Romanian paradox"[4] he had one of the first attempts to reconstruct the Romanian debates and to critically analyze the context in which they took place. Zigu Ornea produced the first synthesis which attempted to integrate the traditionalist camp of Nichifor Crainic and the generation led by Nae Ionescu within the intellectual and political trends already present in interwar Romania with the emerging Iron Guard.[5] When it has been published, Ornea's book provided the clearest comparative framework for the traditionalist movement in the field and intended to be the first monograph on the Romanian interwar period which integrated Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu, the main actors of this thesis in a broader cultural context in which the influences coming from other intellectuals and the relevance of the political factor counted, as well. Mac Linscott Rickets[6] proved that Eliade's Romanian roots were more complicated as believed before. He was one of the first exegetes who underlined the capital presence of Nae Ionescu's in the future intellectual development of Mircea Eliade.

The 1990s brought about a socio-historical approach of the Romanian interwar in general and of Romanian nationalism in particular. Irina Livezeanu was the first scholar in the field which in her book concerning the emergence of Romanian nationalism took into account the fact that nationalism came as a reaction to different problems to which the Romanian state came across after the unification of 1918.[7] Compact

ethnic minorities, the heterogeneous distribution of the wealth between different Romanian provinces, diverse systems of schooling, dissimilar policies applied by the Romanian state through its administration to homogenize the Romanian population became problems for a Romanian state wanting to achieve ethnic homogenization. The autochtonist replica was a complementary solution to the problems to which Romania struggle. Leon Volovici's book is important for the present research because it showed the connection between the nationalist ideology of Orthodoxism and its exclusive character exercised mainly on the Jews.[8]

Although a reputed specialist on Romanian Communism, Katherine Verdery remained faithful to this sociological, anthropological approach of the Romanian interwar. Writing about the traditionalist camp and, especially, about Nichifor Crainic she noticed that the Romanian discourse about national identity in an Orthodox key had two other reasons: on the one hand a reply to a historical theory which considered that Romanian people as a Latin people had to adjust its civilization according to other state from Europe (namely, France) and on the other hand that Church tried to re-enter the political game in the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s.

Other important contributions are authored by Alexandra Laignel-Lavastine[9] and Marta Petreu.[10] Both books show the way in which the nationalist project of the traditionalists ended up in becoming just a puppet-tool for the Romanian fascist movement. People like Mircea Eliade who wrote texts like "Why do I believe in the final victory of the Legionary movement?" or Emil Cioran, the author of "Transfiguration of Romania", a book heavy loaded with the fascist ideology of the Iron Guard, joined the movement in the late 30s. They were the most prestigious intellectuals coming from the nationalist circle of Nae Ionescu and with access to Crainic's writings. The reason why the second generation of Romanian traditionalists chose to enroll in the Iron Guard, but failed to continue the "ethnic ontology" of Nae Ionescu in its confessional aspect, or the Orthodoxist project of Nichifor Crainic, remains a topic untackled by these two books.

In 2000 a wave of revisionism was felt in the historiography on the related topic. The monograph of Florin Țurcanu on Mircea Eliade's early years eased up the accusations of anti-Semitism and fascism against him and demonstrated that Eliade was very much influenced by an intellectual and political context to which only Zigu Ornea made a fragmentary reference.[11] Țurcanu's contribution for my topic is that he

proved without doubt that Eliade was supporting a nationalist spiritual revolution embodied in the Iron Guard, but this revolution was not a Christian, Orthodox revolution. The latest relevant monograph, written by Philip Vanhaelemeersch,[12] attempts a comparison between the two debates to see the connections and the differences between them. Starting from the intellectuals from "Gîndirea" journal, Philip Vanhaelemeersch draws a comparison of different traditionalist currents and establishes the origins of this movement: after the war, there was a certain interest towards establishing a national definition, but this definition was build according to Western rules. Crainic and Blaga tried to offer an alternative by building an autochtonist perspective in which the nation should have been depicted by starting from the social realities of the Romanian state. The peasantry and the village, Orthodoxy and the Christian tradition became the main categories of Crainic's followers, starving for a national ideal uncorrupted by the decadent West.

Sorin Antohi is another important scholar that devoted time to this particular issue. "Civitas imaginalis"[13] is one of the most daring attempts to establish the roots of Romanian ethnical ontology. Starting from the Romanian revolution of 1848, Sorin Antohi suggests that any nationalist project had a utopian feature, namely, no connection with the surrounding reality. Furthermore, these nationalist projects were meaningless because they had no applicability in the Romanian social environment. In the interwar this utopian characteristic determined the traditionalists to embrace a fascist project of "a beautiful Romania as the sun in the sky" in which no minority had a place and a political alliance with fascist Italy and Germany was compulsory.

The importance of the present topic has been partially emphasized by all the aforementioned scholars. The aim of my thesis is to shed light on why Orthodoxy served as a source of inspiration for the Romanian nationalists especially for Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu in the debate about the character of the Romanian ethnicity. Another fundament issue on the agenda of this paper is to answer what was Orthodoxy for Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu. Although the relationship between Orthodoxy and national identity has been the subject of the abovementioned historiography on the subject, the connection between Orthodoxy and the rebirth of the Romanian nation has been insufficiently discussed. Even though all these scholars focused on building the Romanian concept of ethnicity, the present paper brings new input to the historiographical debate. In fact, it can explain the relevance of Orthodox spirituality

and tradition for the building of Romanian ethnicity. The presents thesis propose an innovative angle of analysis, namely not just a secular project of defining Romanian ethnicity, but rather a definition which also took into account categories borrowed from the vocabulary of the Orthodox church and spirituality.

The main focus of my research is to explain the relationship between Orthodoxy and nationalism as studied and expressed in the works of the 19th and 20th century intellectuals, with a special emphasis on the Conservative and interwar Orthodoxist capms. More precisely, my paper intends to show the way in which Orthodoxy served or not as the conceptual basis for the construction of the Romanian concept of ethnicity in the 19th century and the inter-war period. After stating that Orthodoxy for Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu is synonym not with the Romanian Orthodox Church as an institution, but with a spiritual, confessional and doctrinal concepts used by the Orthodox Church, I will attempt to see how the concept of Orthodoxy was used by the traditionalist camp in their attempt to build an ethnic definition grounded in this concept. The analysis will focus on Nae Ionescu and Nichifor Crainic because one represented the traditionalist side of the debate and the other a radicalization of the traditionalist definition. Also, the choice fell on them because of their view which connected Orthodoxy with Romanianness had a career which went after the 1940s. Nae Ionescu and especially Nichifor Crainic were used by both fascist and communist ideologies in their attempts to shape a nationalist ideology. I consider this *longue durée* of intermingle between Orthodoxy and nationalism throughout the 20th century to be the most important reason for considering not just the ecclesiastical, but also the secular origins of this quest for ethnicity. I am also interested what were the source and the entanglement between the first attempt to define the Romanian nation through culture and the focus on Orthodoxy as the main ideological and intellectual category defining the Romanian nation. I chose mostly Nichifor Crainic as the main actor of the thesis because he had excellent theological expertise and made a conscious link between Orthodox spirituality and the concept of Romanian ethnicity. Also, his contribution was more consistent on this topic than Ionescu's.

On the other hand, Nae Ionescu metamorphosed the traditionalist nationalist project from the status of a cultural language to an ethnic ontology and this transforms him into an important actor in my story. Philosopher and professor at the University of Bucharest, he was interested in developing an ontological racial concept of Romanian ethnicity by

using a philosophical method which was absent in Crainic's case. For the present thesis, the two case studies are important because they show the way in which the debate about Romanian ethnicity was shaped from two different perspectives, that of the theologian and that of the philosopher. Furthermore, their insights are bound up with the idea of Orthodoxy which creates a persuasive context.

The text will use a one-fold methodology. I will analyze the discourse of the two thinkers as expressed in their books, speeches, letters and articles. Their writings are imbued with references about the importance of Orthodox spirituality in defining Romanian ethnicity. Their mutual interest in Byzantine ecclesiastical art, in church architecture, their bitter critique of the "liberalization of the Church" (Nae Ionescu), the common perceptions regarding European history, will be duly subjected to close scrutiny. The thesis will attempt to establish a comparative approach of the two case studies. I shall explore the similarities and differences between 19th century and the interwar Orthodoxist approaches and influence. Subsequently, an intellectual comparison between the two case studies will also be very useful. Different approaches from intellectual history (Fritz Stern, Roger Woods, Jeffrey Herf, Zygmunt Bauman) and nationalist studies dealing with the relation between intellectuals and nationalism (George L. Mosse, Alastair Hamilton, Richard Steigmann-Gall, Brian Porter, Iván T. Berend, etc.) will be used to integrate the two Romanian intellectuals into a much larger framework than the Romanian case. The case study will also be placed in a larger framework through comparison with the Balkan countries in the same period.

The text has several chapters. The first describes the 19th and inter-war historical and cultural background of the intellectual debates concerning the idea of ethnicity. Beginning with Titu Maiorescu (1840–1917) and reaching Nichifor Crainic (1889–1972), this particular part intends to provide the reader with a summary of the cultural trends involved in the debate. More precisely, in the 19th century the *Junimea* society tried to define the Romanian nation in relation with the village and the traditional values described by Orthodox spirituality. Against the Liberal opponents who attempted to build a Romanian civilization based on Western values, the Conservatives from the *Junimea* society undermined the importance of the Western urban civilization. Maiorescu and his followers believed that the Romanian ethnicity should be constructed starting from a national culture inspired by the Romanian village. After 1900, the debate fades away. Although Nicolae Iorga and Constantin Rădulescu-Motru developed

Maiorescu's idea in a new direction, the Liberals became more important in Romanian culture.

After 1918 when Greater Romania was formed, the problems concerning the definition of the nature of around Romanian ethnicity began to emerge. In the newly formed state almost 30% of the population were ethnic minorities. The official Liberal ideology advocated an integrationist policy inspired by the Western paradigm. The reaction of the traditionalists was voiced mainly by Nae Ionescu and Nichifor Crainic. Also, from 1927 the Iron Guard movement started to gain public support using a similar ideology as the aforementioned intellectuals. Accordingly, the chapter is built around two main statements. On the one hand, any debate concerning the Romanian view about ethnicity was asserted in a cultural framework. On the other hand, I will try to point out the political agenda behind these cultural debates.

It seems the interwar nationalism managed to cross the hard winter of the first years of Communist Romania only to find its mutations all over the years of Ceausescu's regime. Also, Orthodoxy and nationalism joined hands once more to sustain a totalitarian regime in its bid for total control over the Romanian society. After 1990, this mechanism was put again into practice. Nevertheless, different Romanian thinkers and theologians like Răzvan Codrescu and others cultivated the nationalist ideology of the interwar period in a strong connection with Romanian Orthodoxy.[14] Accordingly, inside the Romanian 20th century history an organic continuity was established, despite a stumbling capacity of adaptation to different political contexts. Diagnosing accurately the mutations of this flagellum named nationalism mixed with religion is the last instance of my academic undertaking.

Defining Romanianness in the 19th century Romania. Europeanists fighting each other

The cultural debate on the Romanian ethnicity was one of the most interesting and puzzling cultural events from the Romanian history. After four centuries of Ottoman dominations, the Romanian principalities became aware of their own ethnical identity. After the 1859 unification, a quest for a Romanian understanding of ethnicity and quality of being Romanian started to animate the spirits of the Romanian intellectuals. As the Russian Slavophil movement, the 19th century Romanian intellectuals

began their ethnical adventure by improvising a cultural identity of their own people.[15]

The cultural debate on the Romanian ethnicity was one of the most interesting and puzzling cultural events in Romanian history. After four centuries of Ottoman dominations, the Romanian principalities became aware of their own ethnical identity. After the 1859 unification, a quest for a Romanian understanding of ethnicity and the quality of being Romanian started to animate the spirits of the Romanian intellectuals. As the Russian Slavophil movement, the 19th century Romanian intellectuals began their ethnical adventure by improvising/ inventing a cultural identity of their own people.

The present chapter has two aims. First I will show that between the 19th century and interwar stage of crystallization of the Romanian ethnic definition canon there is certain continuity. The debate regarding the Romanian ethnicity and its character from the interwar was directly connected with the efforts of the "Junimea" members in the 19th century. The emphasis on the importance of 'organic' character was stressed by both the 19th century conservatives and traditionalists in the interwar period. Another aim of the chapter is to show that there was a constant debate in modern Romania regarding the Romanian character. Connected with a cultural and economic development, the definition of Romanian identity troubled both the Liberal and the autochtonist orientations in Romanian culture and politics. I will always point out that cultural debates regarding Romanian ethnicity were always backed by a strong political agenda.

The text will be divided in two parts. In the first part I will deal with the early definition over Romanian ethnicity from the 19th century. The efforts of the "Junimea" society to build up a Romanian culture starting from the social realities of the Romanian village and their contempt towards the Liberal generation of 1848 who believed that importing different institutions and cultural trends was the solution to alleviate Romanian cultural and economical backwardness. Titu Maiorescu (1840-1917) and the *Junimea* circle attempted first to create a Romanian national culture and to define what meant to be Romanian. The positivist legacy of Maiorescu and his followers was continued by Nicolae Iorga and reached a peak at the beginning of the 20th century. I will argue that, although the first wave of Romanian modern understanding of nationalism was secular, the interwar view was much more religious Orthodox-based.[16] How this transition was possible and what were the conditions

The second part investigates the traditionalist camp after the reunification of 1918. After shaping the framework of the debate between the Westernizers and the traditionalists, this part of the chapter will focus on the traditionalists, mainly on Nichifor Crainic (1889-1972) and his counterpart Nae Ionescu (1890-1940). At this point I will suggest some possible answers on why Orthodoxy began to play such a major role for Nichifor Crainic's definition of what it meant to be a Romanian. The fact that Nichifor Crainic was a theologian, the expressed need of the Church to come back into the political life, the fascination exercised in that particular age by a certain stream of archaism, all these factors contributed to the emergence of Orthodoxy as the link between Romanianness and the Romanian culture as expressed in the villages. The importance of the village will also be questioned, almost all the major traditionalists coming from villages. Secondly, the village became important because it represented the missing link between the "Junimea" and the interwar nationalists. I will also point out the possible implication of the Church and of different political agendas in the debate regarding Romanian ethnicity. The preliminary conclusions will be provided to put the whole debate into a larger framework in order to better understand the implications and connections of the Romanian nationalist environment with other historical contexts and definitions of the nation.

After 1856, young Romania faced the terrible fate of any youthful state in the Balkans: after several centuries of foreign oppression, it had to define an ethnic identity of its own in order to sustain its claims for political legitimacy. Nevertheless, the post 1848 Romantic atmosphere with its highlight on nationality and enlightenment for the ordinary people the main statements was speculated also by the Romanian intellectuals who wanted to define a perspective on the Romanian ethnicity.[17] No less important was the birth of a Romanian cultural canon; although Nicolae Bălcescu in "Romînii supt Mihai Voievod Viteazu" tried to idealize the Romanian past because the present was too dark, in the absence of a glorious Romanian history, after 1866 the Romanian intellectuals started to build their national canon on cultural grounds.[18]

The most important movement which created the canon was *Junimea* from Iași.[19] Created by some Romanian students returning from different corners of Europe, for the Romanian culture *Junimea* society represented the first conscious intellectual movement attempting to create an intellectual concept of Romanianness. In order to understand properly the impact of the *Junimea* movement there are two aspects on which the analysis must focus. First of all, *Junimea* had a specific intellectual

background which needs to be explained. Created especially by students who studied in Germany, the intellectual profile of the movement was rather conservative and anti-liberal.[20]

Against the 1848 liberal spirit, the *Junimea* movement was preoccupied not with the import of different customs and civilization from the West. Rather, they tried to discover a genuine Romanian culture and to build the Romanian view about ethnicity on it. The intellectual sources of this bitter critique against 1848's cultural imports from the West are multiple. From a sociological and philosophical perspective, the representatives of this circle were influenced by Herbert Spencer who advocated for a gradual, "organic" development of any society.[21] Accordingly, any development of the Romanian society based on these imports was considered to be a foreign interference in the Romanian path in history. Historically, the most important source quoted by the *Junimea* intellectual was Henry Buckle, the English historian, who criticized firmly the French Revolution and its influence on the European states.[22] Another important source was Schopenhauer and his pessimistic view over reality; Schopenhauer's disagreement with the present reality was used by the Junimist thinkers to address a critique towards Romania's liberal institutions depicted as imports without a specific social and cultural background.[23]

These sources were used especially by Titu Maiorescu to criticize the 1848 moment in Romanian culture and history. The leading intellectual figure of the *Junimea* movement, Maiorescu developed an interesting theory of the Romanian path in history (a critical *Sonderweg*?) by suggesting that all the political and cultural imports after 1848 were alien to the Romanian spirit. He used to call them "forms without content" because, in his opinion, the Romanian people were not prepared for them. In one of his renowned texts "În contra direcțiunii de astăzi a culturei române" [Against today's direction in the Romanian culture] he says:

> Before we had a political party which has need for an organ of its own and a public longing for science, who needs different readings, we created political journals and literary reviews and we have falsified and we despised journalism as such. Before we had a culture to burst over the school's bench, we have built Romanian athenees and cultural societies and we have despised the spirit of the literary societies. Before we had even a single shadow of scientific activity we have created the Romanian Academic Society… and we falsified the Academy's ideas. Before we had even required artists, we have create the Conservatoire of Music; before we had even a talented painter, we have created the School of Arts; before we had a single

valuable dramatic play, we have founded the Romanian National Theatre and we have despised and falsified all these forms of culture.[24]

Maiorescu's critique is aimed against a direction of the Romanian culture which after the Peace treaty from Adrianople (1829) attempted to build a Romanian culture. Ioan Heliade-Rădulescu and his intellectual circle intended to develop this canon from shaping a Romanian literature by simply translating different literary works from foreign literature. "It does not matter how bad you write, just write!" was the slogan of this intellectual circle. They were facing a delicate dilemma: although they were all convinced liberals and wanted to implement liberal political values in the Romanian political environments, the cultural and political tradition behind such a bold attempt was missing. Therefore, Heliade-Rădulescu and his followers tried to borrow the institutions and the main cultural and political trends from the West in order to surpass the political backwardness of the Romanian society. These intellectuals were involved in the revolutionary events from 1848 and, in Maiorescu's view they were responsible for the irrational cultural imports from the West.[25]

In order to challenge Heliade-Rădulescu's initiative for building a Romanian canon based on imports, but also Simion Bărnuțiu's school of Latinists, Maiorescu chose to start from an autochtonist perspective which had to take into account the social realities of Romania. To see the way in which Maiorescu intended to build the Romanian culture there are two statements to be made. On the one hand, despite his 1840's Liberal forerunners, Maiorescu proposed an esthetic alternative for writing original literature. Inspiring himself from German aesthetics and western literature, but adapting these theoretical concepts to Romanian realities, Maiorescu borrowed only the esthetic principles of writing literature in order to produce an original literature. Translation from another language was no longer good enough for giving birth to a national literature and this had been already seen by the 1848 generation in the articles "Dacia literară" [Literary Dacia] journal.[26] In this context, Titu Maiorescu was the first to understand the need for a Romanian understanding of literature and he started to act as a literary critic who offered his generation a theoretical guide for writing original pieces of literature. For example, when he spoke about writing poetry, he stressed that for certain poetry to be important, this must have two conditions: the material and the ideal.[27] For the material condition of the poetry to be perfect, the poet had to comply with two requirements: to choose the less abstract words in order to convey the

poetic message, to use epithets in order to enrich the poetical and linguistic style, to use personifications and the correct use of literary comparison.

The ideal condition of the poetry can be reduced to three main principles to which the poet has to achieve an original poetry:

> 1. A great speed in imagination of the poetical ideas. 2. An exaggeration or at least a highlight and a new view of the things under the impression of feeling and passion. 3. O fast growing development towards a final happy end or towards a catastrophe".[28]

But writing an original poetry did not mean that Junimist poets were writing a Romanian poetry. As Zigu Ornea pointed out, Maiorescu was playing a dangerous game: although he was a positivist thinker who wanted to establish a new aesthetics based on reason and against Romantic values of feeling and the historical past, Maiorescu had to cut a deal with the Romantic tradition represented by Dimitrie Bolintineanu and Vasile Alecsandri. This compromise was embodied in his direct encouragement towards the Romanian writers to discover Romanian folklore and to excavate the vestiges of the Romanian historical past.[29] Accordingly, *Junimea* was found as a literary circle which had as an intricate task to promote an authentic Romanian literature on Maiorescu's theoretical bases. As Alex Drace-Francis pointed out, "art and learning were for Maiorescu to be judged against Europeans norms: national character does not represent for him, at least at this stage, the principle criterion determining aesthetic judgment. In fact the reverse could be said to be true: only the impartial application of the aesthetic principles will allow the national character to flourish".[30]

Titu Maiorescu sought to establish a Romanian cultural canon by promoting different writers and poets on the Romanian market and in the school's curricula. Mihai Eminescu (1850–1889), Ion Creangă (d. in 1889), Alexandru Odobescu (1834-1895) were only few of the writers who started to publish in "Convorbiri literare" [Literary talks], the journal of *Junimea*. For example, when it comes to Eminescu, one can understand that Maiorescu's project was heterogeneous: although Eminescu was labeled as the last Romantic poet, his interest in folklore and ancient Romanian literature was praised even by Titu Maiorescu.[31] The most interesting of his poetries is *Scrisoarea I* [Letter I] in which he became the spokesman of the Romanian ethnicity against foreigners who were depicted as a parasite category and against the decadence of the Romanian nation.

In "Ai noștri tineri la Paris învață", Eminescu addressed a sharp critique to the Romanian youth who preferred to spend their lives in decadence and so-called erudition forgetting the place from where they have left. The bravest attempt of Eminescu was the novel "Geniu pustiu" [Empty genius]. As G. Călinescu used to say, the hero of this novel, although a character taken from a utopia,[32] Toma Nour is a complex character in which Eminescu depicted a man who lost his roots because of the French Revolution, has discovered the primary force of reason and the struggle for the national ideal.[33] What has to be added to Titu Maiorescu's attempt to build the Romanian literary canon is the political background behind it. As Ioan Stanomir has accurately showed in his monograph dedicated to Mihai Eminescu, Romanian literary canon has behind a strong political canon, the Conservative canon. Buckles, Spencer, Tönnies or Edmund Burke were nothing more than the main spokesmen of Conservative party all across Europe and they were the sources of inspiration for Eminescu and Maiorescu.[34]

As Titu Maiorescu, who together with Petre Carp became after 1866 one of the young leaders of the Romanian Conservative Party, Mihai Eminescu was against a Liberal "contractual state" which followed Jean–Jacques Rousseau's famous idea.[35] The Romanian conservatives advocated publically for a "natural" or an "organic" state, capable to develop itself by accustoming with the present social realities from the young Romanian state. This is one more reason in favor of a bitter assessment of the Romanian conservatives represented by Maiorescu and Eminescu against the 1848 spirit which was considered the incarnation of their most dangerous enemy: the Romanian Liberal Party which was depicted as the incarnation of the disruptive spirit of the French Revolution.[36]

This is one of the most interesting particularities of the Romanian case: the cultural canon is conditioned directly by a political canon. Although Alex Drace-Francis seems to disagree with this political influence over the nationalist project of Maiorescu and his companions,[37] the 19th century "Junimea" members "acted both politically and culturally to impose their own view".[38] The Conservatives built their own ethnical canon by starting to understand and use a Romanian culture (a rural one) in order to maintain in culture the same continuity as in politics. Although they were discontented with the Western cultural and political imports, the Liberals considered that an adequate Romanian culture behind the concept of Romanian ethnicity must be helped by borrowing institutions and concepts from the West in order to overlap the social and political

backwardness of the Romanian society. Although the goal of the two parties was the same, the origins and the means through which they understood to create it were different.

The interwar period: "the great debate" over Romanian ethnicity. Liberalism and nationalism in interwar Romania

After 1918, the things started to change in what was then Greater Romania. The unification with the Romanian provinces in the Russian and Austrian empires brought a sense of fulfillment to the Romanian nationalist elites. But it also questioned the sense of Romanianness: the price Romania had to pay was high and the new state had to confront with social realities that were not at all encouraging.[39] Around 30 % of the Romanian population was represented by different ethnic minorities (Hungarians, Germans, Jews, Ukrainians, Gypsies, etc.) and the State had to come to terms with this complicated situation. One can argue whether it was possible to speak about Romanian ethnicity when this was contested in its own country given the fact that in the new provinces the economical and cultural elite was not Romanian.[40]

The Romanian State engaged in a process of unification of the new provinces into a centralized mechanism and to Romanianize the ethnic minorities from the new provinces. Certain laws concerning public education and homogeneous administration were introduced to achieve these goals, although sometimes these harsh measures were received squarely by the inhabitants of the new united provinces.[41] Together with the electoral and land reforms from 1921, all these political initiatives targeted the unification on a social and ethnical scale of the Romanian population. Nevertheless, these initiatives coming from the centre were not always welcomed. For example, people like Onisifor Ghibu in Bessarabia protested against the primary school's unification put into practice by the Romanian State.[42]

The Romanian State embarked also into a large campaign of cultural and historical justification of the Romanian claims over the new acquired territories. Accordingly, large archaeological campaigns were initiated in all the Romanian provinces in order to prove the archaeological homogeny of the Romanian people all across the country. Vasile Pîrvan became the most know Romanian archaeologist and his book named "Getika" (1925) was the direct result of this archaeological excavations. As Philip

Vanhaelemeersch has pointed out, archaeology was the most accessible way through which the Romanian state wanted to began a new ethnical cultural canon. Starting from archaeological evidences, the Romanian state was able to encourage the building of a definition of the Romanian ethnicity.[43]

At this point a certain remark must be made. Unlike the period before 1918, when the Romanianness was defined only in cultural terms, in interwar Romania there is a constant renegotiation of the ethnic understanding and building at least at three fundamental dimensions: political, cultural and historical. From a political perspective, the ethnical building process was considered a finished business after the triumph of 1918. However, the State and the main political parties enflamed a different nationalist discourse which had direct consequences in the cultural and historical sphere. Because the state financed different nationalist projects, some intellectuals decided to join hands with the State and to subordinate their academic expertise to the nationalist project patronized by the National Liberal Party or the Royal House.

In the interwar period there were two main understandings of Romanianness. On the one hand, the thinkers inspired by the Western like Mircea Lovinescu[44] and Ștefan Zeletin[45] considered that Romanian cultural and social destiny had to be fulfilled by borrowing and adapting the institutions and customs from the West. They were the continuators of both the 1848 generation and of the *Junimists* from Iași. As Keith Hitchins argued, the sympathizers of this trend "treated Romania as a part of Europe and insisted that she had no choice but to follow the path of economic and social development already taken by the urbanized and industrialized West".[46] It is interesting to question why this path towards the West was adopted by a large number of Romanian intellectuals. Although there are several explanations behind this cultural polarization I think that the first explanation was related to the fact that when Lovinescu and Zeletin started to publish their main works the Romanian Liberal Party, the main advocate of tiding up the relationship with the West, was in power (1923-1928).

Furthermore, their goal was to establish a nationalist cultural which will be the expression of the bourgeois city and industrial and financial development of the Romania embodied in the political ideology of the National Liberal Party. As Thomas J. Kiel noticed "the National Liberal Party looked towards building a state stimulated, state organized, and state protected capitalism under the leadership of a Romanian bourgeoisie to carry out its economic modernization agenda. The National Liberal

Party realized that its own political success depended on it being actively engaged in building a larger bourgeoisie in Romania. Despite the economic growth of the late 19th century and early 20th century, the Romanian bourgeoisie remained small, especially that portion of the of the bourgeoisie who were "Romanian" by ethnicity".[47]

Eugen Lovinescu (1881-1943) was the most influential literary critic of his time. After 1918, he became one of the first intellectuals supporting the official nationalist ideology of the Romanian Liberal government. Lovinescu's theory about the synchronism between Romanian and Western culture[48] suggested that Romanianness had to be constructed from Western models and the Romanian society was called to adjust itself according to Western customs,[49] but, despite the 19th century Europeanists, this process had to be carried on according to the needs of the Romanian society. He believed that after the assimilation period from the 1848 until 1918 had to be followed by a certain period of integration of different borrowings coming from the West.[50]

Lovinescu was convinced that the after the unification from 1918 the time came to be developed a genuine Romanian culture which was supposed to define the Romanian character. Behind this intellectual project of building the nationalist canon there is also a political project namely the Romanian Liberal Party. Lovinescu and Zeletin's ideas were developed during the hegemony of the Romanian Liberal Party (1922–1928) and these ideas echoed a political ideology that wanted to adjust Romania to Western standards. Privileging the modern Romanian town, the capital of the heavy industry, good schools and the political parties was the main social concern of the Europeanists. Accordingly, the Romanian character had to be build starting from these Western values in order to overlap the social and political backwardness of the young Romanian State.

Nationalism in religious garments. The autochtonist understanding of Romanianness

The autochtonists tried to respond to this attempt of building the Romanian national canon by shifting their views in the opposite direction from the pro-Liberal intellectuals. If the Europeanists wanted to define the Romanian character starting from Western borrowings, they preferred to search for the premises of the national canon at home. Mixing together avant-gardism with its emphasize on archaic culture with a Romantic

Volkgeist already present in the Romanian culture, the traditionalists began to focus on the Romanian village and the spirituality encapsulated in it.[51] The Romanian village with its culture and folklore became the place from which they wanted to start building the real Romanian cultural canon. Despite Liberal thinkers like Lovinescu, the Romanian traditionalists did not have a clear agenda on their minds. Their efforts transcended the cultural, political or economical compounds of the Romanian national character.

One has to question why in the interwar Romania nationalism emerged in an Orthodox key and was embraced by such a large number of intellectuals. Although it is obvious that in the interwar Romania an "integral nationalism" (Irina Livezeanu) was developed in order to achieve a certain ethnical homogenization of the minorities living in the new acquired provinces, Irina Livezeanu's explanation of the direct allegiance between Orthodoxy and nationalism in the Romanian traditionalism against a strong Jewish minority is misleading.[52] Orthodox Christianity depicted and forged as a genuine cure against the Jew minority has been also described extensively by Leon Volovici.[53] When he speaks about Crainic, he states that "his first objective was the 'de-Judaization' of Jesus and the Bible itself".[54] However, the text quoted by Leon Volovici is rather a later text of Nichifor Crainic, one from his fascist period. At the beginning of his career, Crainic dismissed anti-Semitism as an incoherent ideology of nationalism. Stating that Crainic intended to eradicate the Jewish background of the Christian Bible in order to frame a nationalist Orthodoxy is contradicted by one of Crainic's most poignant texts. Arguing against the Aryan theology of the Third Reich which tended to exclude any Jewish influence from Christian theology and Bible,[55] Crainic wrote a text called "Race and Religion" in which he claimed that Christianity cannot be labeled as a Jewish religion because its founder was both human and divine.[56] Crainic's bitter attack on Alfred Rosenberg's Germanic ideology which was both anti-Semite and anti-Christian demonstrates quite accurately that Romanian nationalism used Orthodoxy for other purposes rather than just tackling a Jewish minority.[57] Rather, against both Livezeanu and Volovici, one has to argue as Thomas J. Kiel truthfully noticed that "Anti-Semitism was not a creation of nationalism. Rather, it was assimilated into Romanian nationalism as one of its key elements. The modern Romanian nationalist project struggled with the 'origins' of and the identity appropriate to the Romanian people".[58]

Another question arises: why Orthodoxy and spirituality became such crucial concepts in the interwar period for the nationalist discourse? The explanatory reasons are be manifold. From a political perspective, given the fact that Liberals were mostly atheist and the National Peasant Party was mainly formed by Transylvanian Greek-Catholics the Orthodox stream which seems to characterize the writings of the Romanian autochtonists can be labeled as an Orthodox political and cultural reaction to the exclusion from the public sphere of the most important Christian denomination in Romania.[59] Culturally, in order to sustain their claims for an organic development of the Romanian state and nation, they had to identify an uninterrupted development in the Romanian history. They have identified this organic continuity in the Romanian history with the tradition of the Orthodox Church, an idea also popular among legionary youth.[60]

On the other hand, the connection between confession and nationality was nothing new in the 19th century Balkan region, especially for the peoples subjected to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and Ottoman monarchies.[61] In the case of Romanian Orthodoxy, not just the intellectuals tried to define the Romanian nation according to the principles of Eastern Christianity, but also the Orthodox Church itself became an important actor on the scene of national building process and attempted to institutionalize its own project of building the Romanian nation.[62] It is known that after 1918 the Church wanted to play a major role in the main scene of the political debate by defining itself as the "national church" of the Romanian people, especially after 1925 when the Romanian Patriarchate was proclaimed and, therefore, the Romanian Orthodox Church became completely independent from the Patriarchate in Constantinople. Through its clerical and schools apparatus the Church became one of the most supportive actors of the State nationalist propaganda.[63]

However, the Church chose to play a double role: on the one hand, the Church embraced the nationalist discourse of the State but on the other hand the Church started to develop its own nationalist speech. The case of Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae's inflammatory articles developing a direct interdependence between Orthodoxy and nationalism published in *Gîndirea* conducted by Nichifor Crainic is another proof of the fact that there was a mutual dialogue between the traditionalist intellectuals and the Romanian Orthodox Church.[64] The association between nationality and confession in the Romanian case became also manifest in 1927 on the occasion of the promulgation of the concordat between the Romanian State and the Vatican.[65] Because of the large amounts of land properties

and financial subventions granted to the Roman Catholic Church by the Liberal government, the Orthodox Church responded in the Romanian Parliament through the voice of the Metropolite Nicolae Bălan who in a speech entitled "The national Church and its Rights" defined Orthodoxy as the only church able to contribute to the development of the Romanian nation.[66] Although the Orthodox Church protested vehemently against the concordat, this was adopted by the Parliament and left the Church with the feeling of a wounded pride. The disappointment relating to the approval of the Concordat and the dissolution of the Romanian character of the Greek-Catholics who considered the promulgation of it as a personal triumph can be seen with a clear eye in Nichifor Crainic's and Nae Ionescu's articles and there is a direct consequence of their support for the Church.[67]

Why intellectuals like Nichifor Crainic and Nae Ionescu started their claims for building a national creed inspired by a traditionalist key remains the issue at stake. One of the explanations for this kind of attitude was provided by the intellectual cultural context in which they have developed their insights about tradition and spirituality. Living in an age in which the pessimism of Oswald Spengler's statements towards the Western culture[68] and the death of any spirituality in front of the mechanized industrial environment from the bourgeois city, the focus on the Freudian unconsciousness and on Heidegger's existentialism, these major changes in the European culture were deeply influential for the Romanian intellectuals:

> In their search for new values they [the traditionalists] eagerly embraced all things Eastern. A veritable wave of irrationalism and mystical ideas seemed to break across Rumanian intellectual life. They came from Asia, especially India, but from Europe, too. Alongside Buddhism and Yoga, Christian and mystical philosophy, as expounded by the Fathers of the Church, Kierkeegard and Berdyaev exercised a profound influence on Romanian thought.[69]

Furthermore, another important factor which led the traditionalists to assimilate in their cultural discourse the village depicted as the matrix of the Romanian spirituality was a sociological reality: 72% of Romanian population lived in rural areas[70] and the peasant problem was one of the most problematic issues of the modern Romanian state.[71] After 1918 the peasant problem caught the attention of different Romanian parties and

governments and especially to this electorate the nationalist building project was directed.[72] The Western minded intellectuals considered that Romanian village had to be mechanized and the illiterate peasants had educated in order to relieve the peasantry from its backwardness which assured to Romania the status of an undeveloped country.[73] Nevertheless, between 1923 and 1928 the Liberal government had not succeeded to encourage an economical revival of the Romanian peasantry which turned eventually its hopes in Maniu's National Peasants Party.[74] Alongside the nationalist discourse of the State, the most important representatives the traditionalist camp originated from the villages and they wanted to offer a cultural discourse which reflected the majority of the Romanian population in the absence of a political party which defended their national identity.[75]

I will have to argue that coming from a rural environment and criticizing vehemently the positivist and mechanized West, the traditionalists embraced paradoxically the 19th century Junimist idea of an "organic" development of the Romanian state and national building project which considered that imports from the West had to be rejected and future Romania and Romanian ethnicity had to be shaped according to the social and cultural realities of the majority of the Romanian population meaning the peasantry. A deep impact on both the Junimists and the autochtonists had the book written by Ferdinand Tönnies named *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (1887) which emphasized the importance of the community described as a spiritual relationship and tradition between all the inhabitants of a certain village over the mechanized society of the big city. The conflict between the two terms was based on an economical reality which was a paradoxically consequence of the Romanian society. As Andrew C. Janos has pointed out,

> In the West, social mobilization implied the rising public awareness of masses who had been already detached from the norms of the traditional Gemeinschaft by the experience of the market economy. There the 'masses' were wage earners and small producers who had learned to live in a world of give-and-take and to fend for themselves without the emotional support of the kinship groups, communities, and extended families. In other words, the masses had been rationalized before being mobilized; they have been acculturated to the impersonal norms of the modern Gesellschaft before entering onto the political stage… In Romania, the acculturating experience of the market had largely been lacking. The images of the modern world had been transmitted through the medium of education, and hence had been reduced to a form of vicarious experience. Thus while the lower classes

of the West were modern both socially and politically, those of Romania became modern politically (in that they could formulate and articulate demands) but not socially (for they continued to look for the moral and emotional support of kinship, household, and community).[76]

The difference between the 19th century intellectuals and the 20th century traditionalists lays in the fact that Titu Maiorescu and his followers wanted to engineer a Romanian culture which would have fitted perfectly in the universal culture of his time. By advocating the importance of the Romanian traditional village and the historical past as continuous, organic category of the present The village was downplayed not as a mark of Romanian spirituality or ethnicity, but as a basic social reality from which the Romanian ethnicity had to be built organically. For the traditionalists the village was the nexus between an unaltered Romanian spirituality which was in the same time the intersection between Romanian character and Orthodoxy as a guarantee of the Romanian spirituality.

Final remarks

The Romanian debates over the understandings of Romanian ethnical canon can be considered to be the one of the most important historical phenomenon in the Balkan's history. First of all, I will have to conclude that between traditionalists from the 19th and 20th century cannot be traced a direct connection. Representing a social class namely the Romanian landowners, the Conservatives of Titu Maiorescu were defending their own social and political capital by generating a national canon under their signature. The great differences between 19th and 20th century traditionalist intellectuals are the fact that in the 20th century Nae Ionescu and Nichifor Crainic were not representatives of a Conservative political canon because the Conservative Party disappeared after the land reforms from 1920's. Secondly, although is obvious that both canons are based on the concept of tradition and the importance of the Romanian village is a common feature, the 19th century intellectuals were secularized thinkers. In the interwar period, the interest towards building the national canon from Orthodoxy and Christian spirituality as it was represented in the Romanian village is a certain feature of the second Romanian debate over ethnicity.

In the Balkan's context the closest case study to the Romanian debates about ethnicity is the 19th century Russian case. As the Romanian Junimists,

the Russian Slavophiles were Germany trained intellectuals who attempted to define Russianness by building a national canon based on the Russian spirituality and Russian village.[77] The difference between the Romanian case and the Russian case was the fact that there was a great emphasis on Orthodox spirituality which was never present in the minds of the Romanian Conservatives. The struggle for the Romanian national canon from a cultural perspective was a phenomenon disseminated across the Balkans. As in the Serbian case, the 20th century Romanian traditionalists became deeply involved in different fascist movements. After 1933, Nae Ionescu became the Iron Guard's main ideologue and many Romanian intellectuals joined this fascist movement because of his influence.

From a personal point of view, the topic in itself is paradoxical. The Liberals who always tended to be more constant than the nationalists; the traditionalists issued two different expressions of the Romanian ethnicity and the interwar discourse about the Romanian ethnic canon cannot be considered definitive. Some further investigations regarding the building of the Romanian ethnic definition in the traditionalist manner are necessary. Again, the distinction between the secular and religious approach of the Romanian definition of ethnicity needs some further scrutiny. Christianity was depicted in a mythical manner and was deprived of any concrete connection with the city. For them, only rural Christianity matters not in itself, but because it was connected with a village's tradition which was used as the perfect enemy against the Liberal town-based cultural discourse.

I have to agree with Umut Korkuk that Christianity and Orthodoxy represented for the traditionalists their ideological foundation which was later transformed into an efficient political weapon against the their Liberal and against any other right-wing claim for defining the Romanian ethnicity.[78] Although Nae Ionescu and Nichifor Crainic were the spearheads of the traditionalist movement which started to radicalize and became the fifth column of the Iron Guard, there must be stressed out the fact that traditionalists were not always committed Christian believers. Lucian Blaga is only one example that crosses the minds of those who are focused on this issue. Again, what would be very useful to point out is the fact that this traditionalist attempt to offer a Christian grounded definition of the Romanian ethnicity ended up as a source of inspiration for the right-wing radical movements from Romania, namely the Iron Guard and the Romanian Fascia. Also, this traditional approach of the reality began to be critically approached especially by Mircea Eliade who

developed their ethnical ontology into a much Christian "indigenization of the universalities" (Sorin Antohi) through which any category of being had to be Romanian and had to be Christian.

As a final remark, I would like to say that the cultural process of constructing a definition to the Romanian ethnicity was never fully finished. After 1927, the traditionalist speech was borrowed by the Iron Guard and some of the leaders of the traditionalist movement started to collaborate directly with the Romanian fascist movement because they thought that this was the direct political incarnation of their nationalist creed. This marriage between has led eventually to a total failure of the initial goal of the nationalist creed. Instead of defining the Romanian ethnicity, the traditionalist produced an exclusivist autochthonous view regarding the Romanian ethnicity which brought only derision towards the other minorities and violent radicalization of the terms used for defining Romanianness, but not a mutual accepted definition.

NOTES

[1]   "Romania and the Balkans From geo-cultural bovarism to ethnic ontology", *Tr@nsit online*, Nr. 21/2002, Internet accessed June 1st, 2011.

[2]   Hitchins, K., "Gîndirea: Nationalism in a Spiritual Guise" in Kenneth Jowitt (ed.), *Social Change in Romania 1860–1940. A Debate on Development in a European Nation*, Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978.

[3]   Alexandrescu, S., "Junimea: discours politique et discours culturel" in I. P. Coulianu (ed.), *Libra: Études roumaines offerts à Willem Noomen*, Groningen, 1983

[4]   Alexandrescu, S., *Paradoxul român* [The Romanian Paradox], Univers, Bucharest, 1998.

[5]   Ornea, Z., *The Romanian Extreme Right. The Nineteen Thirties*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1999).

[6]   Ricketts, M., L., *Mircea Eliade. The Romanian Roots*, I-II, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1988.

[7]   Livezeanu, I., *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania. Regionalism, Nation Building, & Ethnic Struggle, 1918–1930*, Cornell University Press, New York, 1995.

[8]   Volovici, L., *National Ideology&Antisemitism. The Case of Romanian Intellectuals in the 1930s*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1991.

[9]   Alexandra Laignel-Lavastine, *Cioran, Eliade, Ionescu. L'oubli du fascisme*, (Paris: PUF, 2002).

[10] Petreu, M., *An Infamous Past. Emil Cioran and the Rise of Fascism in Romania*, Ivan. Dee, Chicago, 1999.

[11] Țurcanu, F., *Mircea Eliade. Le Prisonnier du l'Histoire*, Editions la Decouverte, Paris, 2003.

[12] Vanhaelemeersch, P., *A generation "without Beliefs" and the Idea of Experience in Romania (1927 - 1934)*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2006.

[13] Antohi, S., *Civitas imaginalis. Istorie și utopie în cultura română* [Civitas imaginalis. History and utopia in the Romanian culture], Polirom, Iași, 1999.

[14] Răzvan Codrescu, *În căutarea Legiunii pierdute* [Seeking the lost Legion] (Bucharest: Vremea, 2001), p. 121-142.

[15] Walicki, A., "Russian Social Thought: An Introduction to the Intellectual History of 19th Century Russia", *Russian Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 1977, p. 1-20.

[16] A common situation was in Poland. Please see Porter, B., *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Politics in Nineteenth Century Poland*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002, p. 15.

[17] Hitchins, K., *Rumania 1866–1947*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994); Romanian translation, Humanitas, Bucharest, 1994, p. 68.

[18] Iván T. Berend, *History derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the long nineteenth century*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2003, p.44.

19 For Junimea, please see Ornea, Z., *Junimea şi junimismul* [Junimea and the Junimism], Eminescu, Bucharest, 1978; but also Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 6-99.

20 For the impact of the German influenced elites on the Romanian intellectual life in general and about Junimea in particular, please see Zeletin, Ş., "Romantismul german şi cultura critică română" [The German Romanticism and the Critic Romanian Culture] in *Minerva*, 1/3, 1929, p. 63-83; Vianu, T., *Influenţa lui Hegel în cultura română* [Hegel's influence in Romanian culture] (Bucharest: Editura Casei Şcoalelor, 1933).

21 For Herbert Spencer and Junimea, please see Zub, A., *De la istorie critică la criticism. Istoriografia română sub semnul modernităţii* [From Critic History to Criticism. The Romanian Historiography under the Sign of Modernity], Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 2002, p. 76.

22 Hitchins, K., *Rumania,* p. 70.

23 Hitchins, K., *Rumania,* p. 71

24 Maiorescu, T., "În contra direcţiunii de astăzi a culturei române", p. 133-134 in Maiorescu, T., *Critice I* [Critical Essays], Minerva, Bucharest, 1978.

25 For 1848 generation in the Romanian culture and the critique of Maiorescu, please see Drace-Francis, A., *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture. Literacy and the Development of a National Identity*, Tauris Academic Studies, London, 2006, p. 135-142; 176-195.

26 For the impact of these articles please see Vîrgolici, T., *Începuturile romanului românesc* [The Beginnings of the Romanian Novel], Minerva, Bucharest, 1962, p. 12-41.

27 Maiorescu, T., "Poezia română. Cercetare critică" [Romanian poetry. Critical survey] in *Critice I*, p. 17.

28 Maiorescu, T., "Poezia română. Cercetare critică" in *Critice I*, p. 39.

29 Ornea, Z., *Junimea* , p. 26.

30 Francis-Drace, A., *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture*, p. 178.

31 Ornea, Z., *Junimea şi junimismul*, p. 479.

32 For this utopic character of Eminescu's hero, please see Antohi, S., *Imaginaire culturel et réalité politique dans la Roumanie moderne. Le Stigmate et l'utopie*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1999, p. 111.

33 *Opera lui Mihai Eminescu 1*, Minerva, Bucharest, 1976, p. 252-256.

34 Stanomir, I., *Reacţiune şi conservatorism. Eseu asupra imaginarului politic eminescian* [Reactionarism and Conservatorism. Essay on Eminescu's political Imaginary] Nemira, Bucharest, 2000, p. 17-53. Please also see Ivan T. Berend, *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2003, p. 41-48, 61-68.

35 Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 263.

36 The most interesting and paradoxical aspect of the debate was related with the fact that "Junimea" society represented a modernizing direction, already moving away and against the medieval outlook of the Romanian 19th century.

The most interesting aspect was related with its emphasis on complete independence from Constantinople's mirage. To see how this independence was shaped in ecclesiastical terms, please see Paschalis Kitromilides, "The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the national centre" in Paschalis Kitromilides, *An Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*, Ashgate, Londra, 2007, p. 359-369.

[37]   Drace-Francis, A., *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture*, p. 180.

[38]   Alexandrescu, S., "Junimea: discours politique et discours culturel" in I. P. Coulianu (ed.), *Libra: Études roumaines offerts à Willem Noomen*, Groningen, 1983, p.48.

[39]   For the historical context after 1918, please see Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 320-332 and Livezeanu, I., *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania. Regionalism, Nation Building, & Ethnic Struggle, 1918 – 1930*, Cornell University Press, New York, 1995, p. 29-48.

[40]   Please see Fischer-Galați, S., "The interwar period: Greater Romania", p. 293-295 in Giurescu, D., and Fischer–Galați, S., (eds.), *Romania. A Historical Perspective*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1998.

[41]   Livezeanu, I., Cultural Politics in Greater Romania, p. 92.

[42]   Ghibu, O., Considerații, p. 4 in Livezeanu, I., Cultural Politics in Greater Romania, p. 55.

[43]   Vanhaelemeersch, P., A generation "without Beliefs" and the Idea of Experience in Romania (1927 - 1934), Columbia University Press, New York, 2006, p. 23.

[44]   Please see Lovinescu, E., Istoria civilizației române moderne [The History of the Romanian Modern Civilazation], Institutul Cultural Român, Iași, 1998.

[45]   *Burghezia română: Originea și rolul ei istoric* [The Romanian Bourgeoisie: Its origins and historical role], Nemira, Bucharest, 2005. For Ștefan Zeletin please see Trencsènyi, B., "The 'Münchansenian Moment': Modernity, Liberalism, and Nationalism in the Thought of Ștefan Zeletin" in Trencsènyi, B., Petrescu, D., Petrescu, C., Iordachi, C., Kántor, Z., (eds.), *Nation-Building and Contested Identities. Romanian and Hungarian Case Studies*, Polirom, Iași, 2001, p. 61-80.

[46]   Hitchins, K., *Rumania 1866–1947*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994, p. 292.

[47]   Kiel, T., *Romania's Tortured Road towards Modernity*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 2006, p. 113

[48]   For the best description of this concept in the Romanian culture and its relation with building the national canon, please see Nemoianu, V., "Variable Socio-political Functions of Aesthetic Doctrine: Lovinescu vs. Western Aestheticism" in Kenneth Jowitt, (ed.), *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation,* Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978, p. 174-207.

[49]   For a short usage's description of the Lovinescu's *synchronism* in Romanian society, please see Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 334-335.

50 Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 336.

51 For avant-garde, please see Bandier, N., "Avant-gardes in the First Half of the Twentieth Century: New Perspectives", *Contemporary European History* 14/3 (2005), p. 393.

52 Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania*, p. 12-13.

53 Volovici, L., *National Ideology and &Antisemitism. The Case of Romanian Intellectuals in the 1930s*, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1991), p. 97-98:"Nichifor Crainic found in Christian theology his main argument for advocating the fight against Judaism and elimination of Jews from Romania's social and intellectual life. His arguments were not new by any means; what was new was his polemical aggressiveness, unprecedented in Romanian theological exegesis."

54 Volovici, L., *National Ideology and &Antisemitism*, p. 98.

55 For the de-Judazation of the Bible/ Christ in the Third Reich done by the Nazi *Landskirche* and the contribution of Dietrich Eckart, please see Steigmann-Gall, R., *The Holy Reich. Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919 – 1945*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 13 and passim.

56 Nichifor Crainic, "Rasă și Religiune" [Race and Religion] in Răzvan Condrescu (ed.), *"Fiecare în rândul cetei sale." Pentru o teologie a neamului* ["Everyone in his own troop." For a theology of the people] (Bucharest: Christiana, 2003), p. 48-66.

57 Leuștean, L., "For the Glory of Romanians": Orthodoxy and Nationalism in Greater Romania, 1918-45', *Nationalities Papers*, 2007, 35 (3), pp. 721.

58 Kiel, T., *Romania's Tortured Road towards Modernity*, p. 127.

59 The same degree of desconsideration was also enjoyed by other minorities such as the Jews. Please see Lya Benjamin, "Antisemitismul codrenist" [Codreanu's Antisemitism] in Lya Benjamin, *Prigoană și rezistență în istoria evreilor din România, 1940-1944. Studii* [Persecution and resistance in the history of the Jews in Romania. Studies] (Bucharest: Hasefer, 2001), p. 13-27.

60 Paul A. Shapiro "Faith, Murder, Resurrection: The Iron Guard and the Orthodox Church" in Kevin P. Spicer (ed.), *Antisemitism, Christian Ambivalence, and the Holocaust* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2007), p. 136.

61 Please see Turczysky, E., *Konfession und Nation. Zur Frühgeschichte der serbischen rumänischen Nationsbildung* (Dusseldorf: Schwamm, 1976), p. 7 and passim but also Sugar, P., "Nationalism and Religion in the Balkans since the 19th Century", p. 11 in Sugar, P., *East European Nationalism, Politics and Religion* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

62 Verdery, K., "National Ideology and National Character in interwar in Romania", p. 105 in Banac, I., &Verdery, K., (eds.), *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*, Yale Center for International and Area Studies, New Haven, 1995.

[63] Mirel Bănică, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română, stat și societate în anii '30* [The Romanian Orthodox Church, State and Society in the '30s] (Iași: Polirom, 2007), p. 14.

[64] Most interesting are "Ortodoxie și națiune" [Orthodoxy and the Nation] in *Gîndirea* XIV/2 (1935), p. 76-84 and "Românism și Ortodoxie" [Romanianness and Orthodoxy] in *Gîndirea* XV/8 (1936), p. 400-409.

[65] Fr.Moraru, A., *Biserica Ortodoxă Română intre anii 1885 și 2000. Biserică, Națiune, Cultură* [The Romanian Orthodox Church between 1885 and 2000. Church, Nation, Culture] Vol. 3, I, IBMBOR, Bucharest, 2006, p. 92.

[66] Fore more details about this struggle please see Fr. Păcurariu, M., *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române* [The History of the Romanian Orthodox Church] Vol. 3, IBMBOR, Bucharest, 1981, p. 401-405.

[67] Ornea, Z., *The Romanian Extreme Right. The Nineteen Thirties*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1999, p. 79.

[68] or Oswald Spengler's critique of modernity, please see Herf, J., *Reactionary modernism. Technology, culture, and politics in Weimar and the Third Reich*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 49.

[69] Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 299.

[70] For a complete statistic, please see Livezeanu, I., *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania*, p. 36.

[71] Roberts, H. L., *Rumania. Political Problems of an Agrarian State*, Anchor Books, Yale, 1969, p. 89.

[72] Please see Lampe, R., J., *Balkans into Southeastern Europe. A Century of War and Transition,* Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006, p. 91: "Article 1 [of the Romanian Liberal Constitution from 1923] proclaimed Romania to be a 'unified and indivisible national state'. At least it spoke of the population as individual citizens rather than ethnic Romanians."

[73] For Romania backwardness, please see Hitchins, K., *Rumania*, p. 342.

[74] Henry L. Roberts, Rumania. Political Problems of an Agrarian State, p. 108.

[75] For example, Crainic came from a small village called Bulbucata (Vlașca county); for this please see Crainic, N., *Zile albe. Zile negre* [Good days. Bad days], Gîndirea, Bucharest, 1991, p. 1. Also, Lucian Blaga was the son of an Orthodox priest from the village Lancrăm (Alba county).

[76] On the economical consequences of this attitude please see Janos, A. C., "Modernization and Decay in Historical Perspective: The Case of Romania" in Jowitt, K., (ed.), *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation,* Institute of International Studies, 1978, p. 100-101.

[77] Lavrin, L., "Kiriensky and the Problem of Culture", *Russian Review*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 1961, p. 112.

[78] Korkut, U., "Nationalism versus Internationalism: The Roles of Political and Cultural Elites in interwar and Communist Romania" in *Nationalities Papers 34*, No. 2, 2006, p. 135.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexandrescu, S., "Junimea: discours politique et discours culturel" in I. P. Coulianu, Ed. *Libra: Études roumaines offerts à Willem Noomen*, Groningen, 1983

_____. *Paradoxul român* [The Romanian Paradox],Univers, Bucharest, 1998.

Antohi, S., *Imaginaire culturel et réalité politique dans la Roumanie moderne. Le Stigmate et l'utopie*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1999.

_____. "Romania and the Balkans From geo - cultural bovarism to ethnic ontology", *Tr@nsit online*, Nr. 21/2002, Internet accessed June 1st, 2011.

Bănică, M., *Biserica Ortodoxă Romană. Stat și societate în anii '30* [The Romanian Orthodox Church. State and Society in the '30s], Polirom, Iași, 2007.

Boia, L., *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească* [History and Myth in Romanian Conscience], Humanitas, Bucharest, 1997.

Chirot, D., *Social Change in a Peripheral society: The Formation of a Balkan Colony*, Academic Press, New York, 1976.

Drace-Francis, A., *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture. Literacy and the Development of a National Identity*. Tauris Academic Studies, London, 2006.

Giurescu, D., C., & Fischer-Galați, S., (eds.), *Romania. A Historical Perspective*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1998.

Glenny, M., *Balkans. Nationalism, War, and the Great Powers*, Granta Books, London, 1999.

Herf, J., *Reactionary modernism. Technology, culture, and politics in Weimar and the Third Reich*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

Hitchins, K., *Rumania 1866–1947*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994; Romanian translation Humanitas, Bucharest, 1994.

_____. "Gîndirea: Nationalism in a Spiritual Guise" in Jowitt, K., Ed. *Social Change in Romania 1860–1940. A Debate on Development in a European Nation*, Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978.

_____. "Orthodoxism: Polemics over Ethnicity and Religion in interwar Romania" in Banac, I., & Verdery, K., *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*, Yale Center for International and Area Studies, New Haven, 1995.

Janos, A., C., "Modernization and Decay in Historical Perspective: The Case of Romania" in Jowitt, K., (ed.), *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation,* Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978.

Kiel, T., J., *Romania's Tortured Road towards Modernity*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 2006.

Korkut, U., "Nationalism versus Internationalism: The Roles of Political and Cultural Elites in interwar and Communist Romania" in *Nationalities Papers 34*, No. 2, 2006.

Lampe, J., R., *Balkans into Southeastern Europe. A Century of War and Transition* New Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006.

Lavrin, J. "Kiriensky and the Problem of Culture" in *Russian Review*, Vol. 20, No. 2, (1961)

Laignel-Lavastine, A., *Cioran, Eliade, Ionescu. L'oubli du fascisme*, PUF, Paris, 2002.

Livezeanu, Irina. *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania. Regionalism, Nation Building, & Ethnic Struggle, 1918 – 1930*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Micu, D. *Gîndirea și gîndirismul*, Minerva, Bucharest, 1975.

Moraru, A., Fr. *Biserica Ortodoxă Română intre anii 1885 și 2000. Biserică, Națiune, Cultură* [The Romanian Orthodox Church between 1885 and 2000. Church, Nation, Culture] Vol. 3, I, IBMBOR, Bucharest, 2006.

Nemoianu, V., "Variable Socio-political Functions of Aesthetic Doctrine: Lovinescu vs. Western Aestheticism" in Jowitt, K., Ed. *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation,* Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978.

Ornea, Zigu. *Junimea și junimismul* [Junimea and the Junimism]. Bucharest: Eminescu, 1978.

Păcurariu, M., Fr., *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române* [The History of the Romanian Orthodox Church] Vol. 3, IBMBOR, Bucharest, 1981.

Petreu, M., *An Infamous Past. Emil Cioran and the Rise of Fascism in Romania*, Ivan. Dee, Chicago, 1999.

Ricketts, M., L., *Mircea Eliade. The Romanian Roots*, I, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1988.

Roberts, H., L., *Rumania. Political Problems of an Agrarian State*, Anchor Books, New York, 1969.

Sălcudeanu, N. "Present Day Reverberations of the Traditionalist–Nationalism–Orthodoxism Sythesis professed by *Gîndirea* Magazine" in Crăciun, M., & Ghitta, O., *Ethnicity and Religion in Central and Eastern Europe*, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.

Schmitter, P., C., "Reflections on Mihail Manoilescu and the political consequences of the Delayed–Dependent Development on the Periphery of Western Europe" in Jowith, K., (ed.), *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation,* Institute of International Studies, Berkeley, 1978.

Stanomir, I. *Reacțiune și conservatorism. Eseu asupra imaginarului politic eminescian* [Reactionarism and Conservatorism. Essay on Eminescu's political Imaginary], Nemira, Bucharest, 2000.

Steigmann-Gall, R., *The Holy Reich. Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919–1945.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

Stern, F. *Politics of Cultural Despair. A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*, Anchor Books, New York, 1965.

Sugar, P., F., "Nationalism and Religion in the Balkans since the 19th Century" in Peter F. Sugar, *East European Nationalism, Politics and Religion*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 1999.

Trencsènyi, B., "The 'Münchansenian Moment': Modernity, Liberalism, and Nationalism in the Thought of Ștefan Zeletin" in Trencsènyi, B., Petrescu, D., Petrescu, C., Iordachi, C., Kántor, Z., (eds.), *Nation–Building and Contested Identities. Romanian and Hungarian Case Studies*, Polirom, Iași, 2001.

Turczysky, E., *Konfession und Nation. Zur Frühgeschichte der serbischen rumänischen Nationsbildung*, Schwamm, Dusserldorf, 1976.

Țurcanu, F., *Mircea Eliade. Le Prisonnier du l'Histoire*, Editions la Decouverte, Paris, 2003.

Vanhaelemeersch, P., *A generation "without Beliefs" and the Idea of Experience in Romania (1927 - 1934)*. Columbia University Press, New York, 2006.

Verdery, K., *National Ideology under Socialism. Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1990.

_____. "Beyond the Nation in Eastern Europe" in *Social Text*, No. 38 (1994), pp. 1-19.

_____. "National Ideology and National Character in interwar in Romania" in Banac, I., & Verdery K., Eds. *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe*, Yale Center for International and Area Studies, New Haven, 1995.

Volovici, Leon. *National Ideology & Antisemitism. The Case of Romanian Intellectuals in the 1930s*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1991.

Woods, Roger. *The Conservative Revolution in the Weimar Republic*. London: Macmillan, 1996.

Walicki, Andrezj. "Russian Social Thought: An Introduction to the Intellectual History of 19th Century Russia", in *Russian Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (1977).

Zub, Alexandru. *De la istorie critică la criticism. Istoriografia română sub semnul modernității* [From Critic History to Criticism. The Romanian Historiography under the Sign of Modernity], Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 2002.

_____. *Junimea: Implicații istoriografice* [Junimea: Historiographical implications]. Junimea, Iași, 1976.