PARADIGMS

Cultural Nationalism and Its Evolution in Modern Romania

CĂTĂLIN TURLIUC

Cătălin Turliuc
Researcher at the A. D. Xenopol Institute of History of Jassy. Author, among other titles, of the book **Interwind Destinies: Modern Romania and Its Ethnic Groups** (2003).

"I say that the true liberty of any nation can only be national."
(Simion Bărnuţiu)

THE EXPLANATIONS given throughout time regarding nationalism and the manifestations connected to it generated numerous taxonomies and interpretations, intense debates, and many scholarly papers. The thing that is most easily noticeable—for both laymen and professionals—is the conceptual inflation around nation and nationalism.[1] Most of the debates and interventions in this field had a strong conceptual and normative character, as opposed to the empirical approaches. This may also be the explanation of the fact that there are a multitude of definitions for nationalism. Exaggerating a bit, we could say that there are as many definitions as the people who studied it. Nationalism has been gradually considered to be an ideology, a political and social philosophy, a doctrine, a movement, a cultural artifact, a modern religion, a socio-psychological reality. It has been classified as being

"good" or "bad," weak or strong, progressive or reactionary, offensive or defensive, separatist or unifying. It has also been stated that nationalism is a permanent reality, or one that is anterior to modernity, one that is exclusively modern or already almost extinct and condemned by history. We distinguish here among the approaches influenced by perennialism, ethnicism (ethno-symbolism), primordialism, modernism, instrumentalism, creationism (in the sense of "inventing" or creating nations, vision which was promoted by postmodernism), and suchlike.[2] In fact, the main thing that nuances and differentiates between such approaches can be summarized in the answer given by the researchers in the field: Is nation, and specifically nationalism, a reality that was naturally (biologically and/or genetically) determined, or an invented one?[3] Is it, in other words, an "organic" or a "mechanical" result of historical evolution? The protean character of nationalism has always been fertile ground for contradictory, often polemical approaches. The diversity of the approaches initiated with the purpose of explaining the origin, the spread and the particularities of nationalism also comes from the models formulated by different authors which give credit to either diffusionism, a movement that includes the model center–periphery, that of social communication, of the transfer of normativity and acculturation, or to mobilizationism, a direction centered on internal colonialism and on economic determinism, or on various social-integrative variants.

Another model employed by the researchers in the field is that of *nation building*—a subdivision of diffusionism—which is often connected with the theories on the centrality of the state and of civic nationalism. Most of the texts on nationalism highlight oppositions like: civic nationalism versus ethno-nationalism or ethnic nationalism; Western nationalism versus Eastern nationalism; nationalism versus cosmopolitism; liberal nationalism versus integral nationalism; emancipatory nationalism versus imperial nationalism etc. Obviously, this list can continue, but its purpose is just to underline the numerous cleavages and/or separation points on which a large part of the writings on this subject is focused. Moreover, due to contextual and especially ideological or political reasons, civic nationalism is accompanied by a series of epithets like "constitutional," "Occidental," "patriotic," "inclusive," "good," while ethnic nationalism is associated with cultural nationalism, which is "Eastern," "exclusive" or "bad."[4] Another aspect which is easily seen by those familiar with the field is the way nationalism is approached: either as a particular (most often), or universal category. Certainly, nationalism is not just particular. It is universal, as ideology and vision, it is the foundation of the present world order, and anyone who would try to picture a non-national world today would rapidly realize how stable the world of the nation states is. It is also true that, despite is general character, nationalism has been manifesting itself in particular forms. That is why it is easier to talk about

nationalisms with different determinations, contents and aspects, chronotopically layered.[5] Nationalism has an internal regeneration force that makes it autonomous as a social force and at the same time self-sufficient.[6] Nationalism has most frequently been analyzed in its political, social, economic or cultural aspects, leading to excessive separation, instead of a global interpretation.[7] The study of nationalism, far from producing a grand narrative recognized as a referential necessity, is still anchored in an ambiguity full of germinative vocation for new intellectual approaches towards investigating the *national* in all of its aspects.[8] It becomes more and more obvious that national identity, its realities and phenomena must be analyzed on three levels: the individual, personal one; the political system one; and third, the ideological level.[9] Finally, to conclude our preliminary considerations, we have to mention that the study of nationalism per se has not recently mobilized many researchers, who are now more preoccupied to connect this phenomenon with globalization, European integration, human rights, multiculturalism or with the analysis of the global system.

I*n what* follows, we want to succinctly analyze the content and the validity of the concept of Romanian cultural nationalism,[10] to relate it to national cultural associationism, and to identify the stages in its evolution during the modernization of our society up to the present day.

Is there a genuine cultural nationalism? The question would be at least strange and, in more recent times, we can not talk about a *Kulturnation*.[11] Without getting here into an elaborated debate, we only need to underline that a constant marker of this manifestation is to be found within a cultural form, in the widest sense used to define this concept.[12] The opposition civic nationalism/cultural nationalism[13] resides in the fact in the fact that civic or contractual nationalism has as referent the state and the process of its modernization and democratization, while cultural nationalism is reflected in relation with the original community, language, tradition, customs, historical experiences etc. Yet, both are mostly types and, to a certain degree, they function together.[14] In an important study, Anthony D. Smith talks about purifying culture through authenticity, which leads to cultural and social exclusion together with other factors that strengthen the national dimension.[15] It is important to mention that, despite of the complex literature dedicated to nationalism—as easily noticeable—comparatively few works are dedicated to the role cultural nationalism[16] has played, ever since the Enlightenment period, in constituting the modern nations. Within our geopolitical area, cultural nationalism had a seminal role in crystallizing and affirming the nation and, because of that, there are more consistent historiographic preoccupations in this direction. Political and cultural nationalism represented two forces that completed and intensified one another in our case, contributing to the

realization of the national state[17] and to the development of its particular characteristics. If cultural nationalism was especially directed towards developing a community spirit—unfortunately, barely present in our society—the political one aimed at the modern type of state. The politicization of cultural nationalism was done—as we will see in the following—very rapidly and with remarkable results also through national cultural associationism. Cultural nationalism, in the Romanian case, but also in other situations, was generated by the cultural elite, which developed a historicist ideology[18] according to which the Romanian nation, like many others, is unique in its individuality, has its own historical itinerary and it is meant to contribute to the general progress of humanity through its own nature.

In the Romanian space we identify the beginnings of such a vision, in nuce, in Ioan Inochentie Micu-Klein's writings and activity. He brings forth a series of arguments,[19] asking for rights for the Romanians, not only as members of a religious community, but also of a linguistic one, as he underlines the Latin origin of the Romanian language. The Transylvanian School, through its leaders and their work, marked a very important moment in affirming the national aspirations and in crystallizing the Romanian demands of this kind. Under the visible influence of French contractualism, German Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) and Josephinism, the national demands summarize the cultural nationalism of the era (in a Herderian sense). The *Supplex Libellus Valachorum*[20] (the two memoranda of March 1791 and, respectively, March 1792), drawn up by directly or indirectly by Samuil Micu, Petru Maior, Gheorghe Şincai, Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, Iosif Meheşi, Ioan Para, Ignatie Darabant, Ioan Bob, Gherasim Adamovici and others, represented, mainly but not exclusively, the genuine manifestation of the spirit of political-national emancipation, based on the arguments formulated in the spirit of cultural nationalism (ethnicity, age, precedence in occupying the territory, continuity etc.). The cultural ambiance specific to the period between the end of the Enlightenment and the beginning of Romanticism, during which the most important representatives of the Transylvanian School operated, decisively influenced authors like Petru Maior who, in his work *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* (History for the beginning of Romanians in Dacia, 1812), sets the foundation of a modern vision about the origin of Romanians, in the Dacian-Roman synthesis. The Herderian vision on the nation[21] is enhanced by writers within the Transylvanian School, eloquent in this sense being the examples of Alexandru Gavra[22] or the better known Aaron Florian (in his early writings).

In the Romanian Principalities, the openness towards national values manifested itself by internalizing the idea of emancipation from the Ottoman domination and the Greek-Levantine cultural influence. Naum Râmniceanu, under

Transylvanian influence,[23] or Dinicu Golescu,[24] also saw the nation as a natural extension of the family. Certainly, in this case, as in Transylvania's case, the ideas about the social contract, about the new modern rules introduced by the French Revolution and by the ideocrats of the time strengthened the trend towards the crystallization and the affirmation of an emancipatory nationalism. At the same time, the contacts, across the mountains, with the Transylvanian area increased and became stronger in the national sense. If in Transylvania the most visible vector of the national-type approaches aimed at the Romanians' full political emancipation and, implicitly, at equal rights with the other nationalities, in the Romanian Principalities the tendency was towards a Western,[25] modern, national development. Most Romanian historians, and not only them, see the beginning of Romanian nationalism at the end of the 18th century, related to the activity of the Romanians in Transylvania towards their national emancipation. We believe, and shall try to bring forth arguments in this respect, that Romanian nationalism first manifested itself as nativism,[26] still present the end of the 18th century, in the context of the same cultural Enlightenment trend mentioned in the case of most Western nationalisms. Nativism operated in Transylvania as well as in the Romanian Principalities: in the first case, against those who came later than the Romanians (Hungarians, Saxons of Transylvania etc.) and who were seen as such and, in the second case, against the "Greeks,"[27] perceived as representatives of the suzerain power. Thus, the Romanian national "awakening" has as its background the Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment under the form of nativism, present until the third decade of the 19th century. In other words, Romanian national identity was naturally shaped in contrast with the identity of the neighbors and of the populations with which the Romanians had had contacts, by highlighting their historic priority in the area. On the other hand, Romanian nativism undoubtedly combined with modern political elements, which were rational and specific to the area and to Europe. The "vehicle" and the engine behind this process was the intellectual elite, small in number, but influential and animated by an active, modernizing, reformist spirit. Too many Romanians or foreign specialists have debated, unfortunately, on the "quantity" and not on the "quality" that was the foundation of Romanian nationalism's birth. It must be mentioned that, in the full meaning of the word—or at least in the way it is employed in the specialist literature—Romanian nationalism becomes strong only at the middle and during the second half of the 19th century, when it is consecrated in the political administration and governance of the country.

We underline that the Romanian elites from the first half of the 19th century took action especially in the direction of national affirmation in an ethnic sense, and that the concern with full civil and political rights for everyone was second on the priorities list. Naturally, the Romanian national identity was born just like

the other national identities, based on solidarities. These were based on social, cultural and political nuclei, having family as a main factor. When the bottom-level organic solidarities met with the high, organized ones, the premises for a social bond appeared, given that the organized solidarities answered the needs of the organic ones, created and satisfied aspirations, guided and controlled them through the state mechanism at hand.[28] The modern state was based precisely on this balance between the needs and the aspirations of the two solidarities, often using as a remedy the national element, many times seen as the expression of the "common" will.

The ethno-national vision that manifested itself in the form of cultural nationalism was a constant presence in Romanian social life towards the middle of the 19th century. Suffice to mention the large number of cultural societies and associations, sometimes just covers for discreet or secret societies with objectives that were many times political, and which promoted Romania under the form of Dacia-Romania. Subjects like History, Philology, Geography etc. are now under the umbrella of the national dimension and, just like them, the entire education of the new generations. A new public opinion was emerging, a public opinion sensitive to the national messages promoted in the publications of the time. There were several well known publications, important in themselves for the national symbolism,[29] which circulated around the year 1848. Cultural associationism becomes a current form of agglutination of the enlightened spirits, which mobilize themselves in a national sense. Yet, we must not exclude the political side, where a "national party" rises, with modernizing and, obviously, national ambitions.

The 1848 Revolution broke down the walls built by the former regime and forcefully demonstrated the national aspirations, meaning the union of the Romanian Principalities amid the transformations desired by the progressive elites. Moreover, now, along with such requests, complaints specific to civic nationalism are formulated, like citizenship for some minorities, the emancipation in a modern sense of a large category of the population etc. We see that all the proclamations and political programs of 1848, as well as most of the writing of that age, include a common plea for national regeneration—starting from the ethnic reality and the affirmation of the nationality—in a political-institutional frame that was to be democratized, according to the Western European model. Relevant for us here is the fact that the 1848 generation marked the movement towards the dynamic, active phase of the affirmation of the national identity, without manifesting negative tendencies towards the population of other origins that lived in the Romanian Principalities. The text of the Islaz Proclamation states, in its article 21 "the emancipation of the Israelites and political rights for any compatriots of other religions."[30] A similar request is also to be found in the

Requests of the National Party in Moldavia in article 27, which asks for the gradual emancipation of the Israelites. The gypsies are also taken into consideration, the abolition of their slavery being requested in the programmatic documents of 1848. The empathy manifested for the foreigners in the Romanian Principalities is to be noticed within the more general framework of the political objectives, advanced with the purpose of reorganizing the political-institutional realities. Thus, we read in the text of the Islaz Proclamation: "Boyars, you have been generous with the foreigners; you have fed them, made them rich, called them in to share your rights with them . . . You all reach out your hands in order to rally all the layers of the society towards one goal, which we could call, without any shame, Nation . . . Citizens in general . . . Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Germans, Armenians, Israelites . . . The country is ours and yours. You like living here and the country lets you do so . . . From today onwards, we all eat at the same table, in a brotherly feast; we shall all have the same rights."[31] These examples, along with many others that could be invoked, show us the extent to which Romanian revolutionaries, animated by a powerful national belief, understood to affirm, according to the spirit of the time, the necessity of the "awakening of the nation" and of building a new foundation for it. Yet, this solidarity must be understood only as a desire of the Romanians who could impose their national will because, as stated in the Proclamation of the National Party in Moldova, addressed to the people: "We are Romanians and, as Romanians, we have our rights, which we shall defend and support! We have the right to improve our country, as we are masters of our territory."[32] It is a well known fact that the national desires regarding the union of the Romanians, autonomy and independence, the clear political individualization of the Romanians on the map of Europe, were all comprised in the real national program elaborated in 1848, a program that marked the future development of Romanian society. In Transylvania, where, because of the general situation of the Romanians, the national problem had been acute for some time, the voice of Simion Bărnuțiu in the Blaj Cathedral could be heard on 16 May 1848: "I say that the true liberty of any nation can only be national . . . Romanians' hearts have always beaten for freedom and we see them now, awake and wonderfully united, so that they will never suffer and be under other nations any more; they all gathered to get back their rights, taken away by the Hungarians, by the Saxons, by the Szeklers, for hundreds of years, and to defend from future disappearance their own right, which no Goth dared to touch, nor the barbarians, and not even the pagan Turk, but now the liberal Hungarians tell us in the face that they want to take it away from us today, in the era of brotherhood and freedom."[33] Another 1848 revolutionist, George Barițiu, wrote in 1844, referring to nationality, that: "It has been a while since the countries in Europe have started to understand and to recognize that the strength of a people, its

foundation, its good political organization, its hopes, its present and its future reside in national unity, they have understood that only nationality can create tight bonds, which last longer than any other political bond."[34]

All of the above examples, to which more could be added, show how nationality was understood in 1848 and its role in creating the social bond that reflected the spirit of the time and the Romanian realities. As far as the elements related to ethnicity are concerned, they are clearly expressed in many of the preambles to the proclamations, programs or articles where history is invoked as main argument for the national struggle. Even if most of the 1848 revolutionaries agreed on the fact that the Western social model represented the clearest indicator of the progress—then being equal to civilized Europe—some of them, Mihail Kogălniceanu and Nicolae Bălcescu, for example, would try to answer the problem of its implementation in the Romanian society "organically," so that historical national structures would be preserved and would develop, by keeping the identity of the Romanian society, not only as a civilization, but as a nation as well.

Starting from the unquestionable reality, so clearly supported by documents, that ethnicity and nationality were the main components in the formulation of the Romanian national program of 1848, we shall try to explain that only in the period that followed the revolution can we talk about a Romanian nationalism in the true sense of the word. It is now that the national ideal gradually becomes national policy. In post-revolutionary Transylvania, the situation of the Romanians and of their national aspirations enters a new stage (after the immobility of the neo-absolutist period) during the so-called liberal regime inaugurated in 1860. Unfortunately, the instauration of dualism and the prorogation of the Sibiu Diet (the cancelation of its decrees) reopened, in the new formula of resistance to Magyarization, the struggle for national and political emancipation. The confrontation between passivism and activism internally consumed the national movement. Moreover, two national parties appeared in 1869 in Banat and in Transylvania, but with different approaches. Eventually, they would merge in 1881, but under passivism, a policy completely abandoned starting with 1905. If on a political level the changes naturally continued those previously formulated by the Transylvanian School and by the 1848 revolutionists, the full national maturity was reached along with the mobilization in the fight for the union with Romania. The perfect expression of cultural nationalism was exceptionally embodied, among others, by the Transylvanian Association for Romanian Literature and the Culture of the Romanian People (ASTRA), founded in October 1861.[35]

In Bukovina, cultural nationalism is manifest in the activity of Hurmuzachi brothers and, later, in cultural associations like The Society for Culture and Lit-

erature, Arboroasa and Concordia. The Romanian National Party was founded in 1892, but was not as combative and energetic as the one on the other side of the mountains. The group around the *Junimea literară* publication in Chernowitz clearly expressed the national orientation through the constant struggle for a union with Romania.

In Moldavia, on the other side of the Pruth River (Bessarabia), the Romanian national trend emerged more clearly towards the end of the 19th century. Associations of students from Bessarabia were founded in 1898, and led by Ion Pelivan, sought to awaken the national consciousness and cultivate the Romanian language. A Society for National Culture was also founded here. The magazines *Basarabia* and *Moldovanul*, *Luminătorul* and, later, in 1913, *Cuvânt moldovenesc*, although representing different trends and groups, all promotet a Romanian project based on cultural nationalism. The Moldavian National Party was founded in 1917, and in 1918, within the well known context, the union with Romania was eventually achieved.

After the modern national Romanian state was founded and especially after the adoption of the 1866 Constitution, Romanian nationalism took the form of ethno-nationalism, manifest both in the legislative field and in public activity, in the widest sense of the term. Cultural nationalism was epitomized, among others, by societies like Românismul, The Cultural League for the Union of All Romanians or The Brotherhood of Good Romanians. Politically, the founding of the Democratic Nationalist Party in 1910 vigorously reaffirmed nationalism as an identity/existential project.[36] The historian Nicolae Iorga, a real leader of Romanian nationalism, especially starting from the period before the World War I, considerably influenced this period through his work and activity. Referring to Romanian society, Iorga demonstrated the organic character of the national ideal and affirmed: "In a society that is not yet fixed, too soon prey to the enthusiasm of the beginning, passionately searching for the material goods of life, the social ideal must be the national one."[37] Analyzing the role Iorga had in the perspective of the national ideology, of the qualitative and structural mutations which Romanian nationalism went through at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the last century, Mihail Manoilescu considered that: "This nationalism, which is more evolved and much finer in all its nuances, without the declamatory exaggerations of the last generation's nationalism, more deeply anchored in the Romanian realities, more serious in all its manifestations and, most importantly, more organically integrated into Romanian society was, no matter what others may say, Iorga's masterpiece."[38]

Realizing the Union in the wake of World War I also opened a new perspective for contemporary Romanian nationalism. The de facto and later de jure accomplishment of the national ideal changed the tone of Romanian national-

ism. The necessity of state and national consolidation, the presence of numerous minorities, the assumed internal and external commitments, and the new vision on the world after the first devastating global war in the history of the humanity would change both Romanian social life and the doctrines and the ideologies of the time. Alongside Nicolae Iorga, *spiritus rector* in the matter, a "new school" of historians appeared and continued, to a certain extent, the concern for national issues.[39]

From a sociological perspective, the problem of nation and nationalism were constantly approached by Dimitrie Gusti—obviously influenced by the historicist perspective—and by the sociological school of Bucharest, by Petre Andrei, Eugeniu Sperantia, Nicolae Petrescu, George Em. Marica, Traian Brăileanu, Nicolae Roșu and others. Three main sociological directions manifested themselves in the mentioned period, on the national issue: the national reformist trend represented by Dimitrie Gusti and his followers; the national trend illustrated by Petre Andrei and Nicolae Petrescu, and the legionary, right-wing trend represented, among others, by Traian Brăileanu and Nicolae Roșu. Dimitrie Gusti identified sociology as the science of the nation, ascribing it a spiritual and voluntary nature. Petre Andrei was the supporter of a moderate and non-xenophobic cultural nationalism. Traian Brăileanu, influenced by the ideas of Vilfredo Pareto and of Vasile Conta—in the first place—expressed the idea of national autarchy, being the representative of a nationalism which we can only describe as totalitarian.

The entire debate around national specificity, which involved scientists and researchers with different preoccupations and different orientations in the interwar period, was symptomatic for the acuity with which the Romanian society regarded the national issue. The common element of all these approaches is the fact that they all justify the borders of the united Romania and, at the same time, they explain the particularities of the regime enjoyed by the minorities of Romania.

As a general observation, we can affirm that, starting with the fourth decade of the last century, along with the ascension of the right and of revisionism at the European level, the general Romanian elite became more and more preoccupied by and sensitive to the subjects concerning the national question, thus manifesting their concern for the Romanian geopolitical reality of a country which also included a large minority population. World War II also enhanced in Romania, as everywhere else, the nationalism and the intransigence towards the non-Romanian ethnic element and, in this sense, influenced public life and the intellectual productions which now had to justify the Romanians' firm rights on territories that had been lost even before we entered the war, in the summer of 1940.

The period after World War II was marked by the limitation imposed by the communist ideology in approaching the national problem and the issues related to it. Thus, in a first stage, until the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1956) and in the following period, the practical approaches and the literature dedicated to this problem were imbued with the somewhat abstract idea of proletarian internationalism; then, right after this moment, the "delicate" approaches to this problem became bolder and bolder, sometimes marked by strong nationalism. Despite these limitations and ideological influences, a series of important works were written—especially after 1965—on the genesis of the Romanian nation, on the shaping of the national program, on the national struggle of the Romanians under foreign sovereignty etc., a non-ideological, frontal approach not being however possible. Towards the end of the communist era, due to the legitimacy crisis of the system, an unclear nationalism was activated, also promoted by protochronism, which reduced the credibility of the approaches to the national issue. As a main feature, specific to the whole literature after World War II, we would underline, along with the strong ideological imprint, the selective, separated approach to national realities. Considering ab initio nationalism as being retrograde, archaic, fascistic, chauvinist etc. in the official ideology, it was impossible to objectively research this phenomenon. Yet, at the same time, especially for tactical and political strategy reasons, the regime promoted, during its last decades, a superficial, aggressive nationalism, with unquestionable effects on Romanian social life.

The change triggered by the events of 1989 opened the way for comprehensive reconsiderations of the national problem and of nationalism, in politics as well as in the scholarly approaches in the field. Gradually, the values associated with nationalism were abandoned and the new ideology of multiculturalism began to dominate in the flow of ideas and emerged in the public life. Under the pressure of globalization, under the imperative of Europeanization, it is today considered exotic to affirm one's attachment to national ideology or to its values. Yet, I am sure—and the signs of it are appearing—that a reinterpretation and revalorization of the national ideas, those which accompanied our society on its way to modernity and democracy, will take place in the foreseeable future, thus invalidating the importance given by some people to globalization and cultural relativism.

BEFORE FORMULATING the necessary synthetic conclusions regarding the aspects approached in this work we want to underline that during the modernization and democratization of Romanian cultural nationalism (a project with roots in the past, but always opened to the future), the political

component also developed (as a rationalist project, more deeply anchored in the present). The extent to which they manifested themselves, the pre-eminence of one form over the other have always been the result of some specific political or historical context. The revolutionary movements and the moments of abrupt changes of paradigms have always favored the civic approaches to nationalism amid increased social mobilization. The politicization of Romanian cultural nationalism was more intense during the modernization of the national state starting in the last decades of the 19th century. The Romanian cultural nationalism went through three stages which are relatively well defined: the first stage of *germination* took place around the 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th century (approximately 1740–1830); the second period, of *crystallization*, occurred around the middle of the 19th century (approximately 1830–1860); finally, the third, that of *social-political articulation*, took place between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the last century (approximately 1860–1920). After this moment, in the context of a united Romania, cultural nationalism merged, yet without losing its specific identity, into what we can call integral nationalism. Empirically, we can identify several forms of cultural nationalism until more recent times.

To sum up our approach, we conclude that:

1. Nationalism is a protean reality with specificities identifiable in different chronotopic sequences;

2. The modern world and democracy can not be analyzed, understood and conveniently discussed without a vision (theory) on nationalism;

3. Cultural and political nationalism are complementary and the periods when one dominates can be identified on a historical scale in most modern states;

4. The empirical dimension of the study of nationalism is as important as studying it from a theoretical perspective;

5. The analysis of nationalism must include the individual, the social and, finally, the ideological levels;

6. In Romania's case we can identify several stages in the evolution of nationalism, under its various manifestations (nativism, ethno-nationalism, cultural, political nationalism etc.);

7. Romanian nationalism does not essentially differ from other nationalisms developed in the European area or in our region;

8. There is a clear bi-univocal relation between cultural nationalism and cultural-national associationism;

9. The conceptual and normative acquisitions in the study of nationalism are fundamental for overcoming its negative semantic meaning and for the values that it implicitly promotes.

❑

Notes

1. There are few empirical studies which bring arguments for the theoretical and conceptual debate. See Henk Dekker, Darina Malova, and Sander Hoogendoom, "Nationalism and Its Explanations," *Political Psychology* 24, 2, Special Issue, National Identity in Europe (June 2003): 345–376.
2. Taxonomies like this are relatively common and often seen in the specialist literature. Mentioning all of them would take dozens of pages, which would not be useful for the subject approached by us.
3. See the excellent study signed by Elias José Palti, "The Nation as a Problem: Historians and the 'National Question,'" *History and Theory* 40, 3 (Oct. 2001): 324–346.
4. See also our opinion in Cătălin Turliuc, "National Idea and the Modern State," *Xenopoliana* (Iaşi) 6, 1–2 (1998): 26–36 or more recently John Gledhill, "The Power of Ethnic Nationalism: Foucault's Bio-power and the Development of Ethnic Nationalism in Eastern Europe," *National Identities* 7, 4 (Dec. 2005): 347–368.
5. Cătălin Turliuc, *Organizarea României moderne: Statutul naționalităților 1866–1918*, Vol. 1, *Identitate și comunicare socială* (Iaşi: Performantica, 2004), 67.
6. See also the interesting argumentation offered by Homi Bhabha, "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation," in H. Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990).
7. Many authors have written on the more extended or more restrictive definitions of nationalism. See a pertinent list in Alexander Motyl, "The Modernity of Nationalism," *Journal of International Affairs* 45, 2 (Winter 1992): 307–324.
8. New perspectives are constantly emerging and we want to mention here the study of Manu Goswami, "Rethinking the Modular Nation Form: Toward a Sociohistorical Conception of Nationalism," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44, 4 (Oct. 2002): 770–779, who discusses the nationalism's objective and subjective forms, the modular nationalism, a concept developed by Benedict Anderson and about the rapport between type-ideal and socio-historical conceptions in the study of nationalism.
9. See, for example, Max Haller, "New Societies or Social Anomie in the Europe of Tomorrow?" *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie/Revue suisse de sociologie* 18, 3 (1992): 635–656; id., "Voiceless Submission or Deliberate Choice? European Integration and the Relation between National and European Identity," in H. Kriesi, K. Armingeon, H. Siegrist, and A. Wimmer, eds., *Nation and National Identity: The European Experience in Perspective* (Zurich: Ruegger, 1999), 263–296; Athena S. Leoussi and Steven Grosby, eds., *Nationality and Nationalism* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2004).
10. John Hutchinson has a remarkable analysis of the concept, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of Irish Nation-State* (London: Allen&Unwin, 1987).
11. See the case of Elmar Holenstein, "Conceptul de Kulturnation: o aberaţie sistematică," in B. Baertschi and K. Mulligan, *Naţionalismele*, trans. (Bucharest: Nemira, 2010), 187–213.

12. John Hutchinson's demonstration in this sense is very interesting; he distinguishes cycles and waves of political and cultural nationalism, which substitute and enhance each other.

13. The *locus classicus* of this opposition is the comparison between how the nation is seen in France and in Germany. See the classic work of Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and in Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992) or the work of Louis Dumont, *German Ideology: From France to Germany and Back* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

14. If, mutatis mutandis, we were to transfer the discussion in the legal field, we would have to deal with the rapport *jus solis–jus sanguinis.*

15. Anthony D. Smith, "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism," *International Affairs* 72, 3 (July 1996): 445–458.

16. We shall not start here, for obvious reasons, to explore the Herderian vision on our topic. It is, anyway, well known and it is often quoted in various works on nationalism.

17. Without elaborating too much here on the concept of national state we shall only mention that state and nation can be taken separately. There are nations without a state (the Kurds, the Scots etc.) and states without a nation (for example, Kosovo).

18. Ever since the past became *national* a wide path opened towards what we call cultural nationalism.

19. We mention: Romanians are the earliest inhabitants of the country, they are the most numerous, they do the hardest work, pay the highest taxes and the Leopoldine Diplomas expressing the imperial will must be respected and put into practice.

20. See David Prodan, *Supplex Libellus Valachorum*, first edition 1948, republished 1967, 1984, 1998.

21. See, among others, the works of Nicolae Bocşan, *Ideea de naţiune la românii din Transilvania şi Banat (secolul al XIX-lea)* (Cluj-Napoca: PUC, 1997) or Sorin Mitu, *Geneza identităţii naţionale la românii ardeleni* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1997).

22. Mathematics and geography teacher, head teacher of the Arad Preparandia (1821–1877). He was the author of a first attempt at a Romanian Encyclopaedia. For him, nation represented an organic, blood connection.

23. Between 1788 and 1795 he was in Transylvania, at Hodoş-Bodrog monastery.

24. His trip to the West is famous, remembered in *Însemnare a călătorii meale, Constantin Radovici din Goleşti, făcută în anul 1824, 1825, 1826* (Buda, 1826).

25. See Cătălin Turliuc, "Modernization and/or Westernization in Romania during the Late 19th Century and the Early 20th Century," *Transylvanian Review* 17, 1 (Spring 2008): 3–11.

26. Obviously, we are talking here about a different meaning than the one of the consecrated American term nativism.

27. In the most general and wider sense of Christian from the south of the Danube.

28. See Alexandru Duţu, *Ideea de Europa şi evoluţia conştiinţei europene* (Bucharest: All Educaţional, 1999).

29. *Dacia literară* (Literary Dacia), *Magazin istoric pentru Dacia* (Historical magazine for Dacia) etc.

30. Apud P. Cornea and M. Zamfir, *Gândirea românească în epoca pașoptistă (1830–1860)*, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Minerva, 1969), 55.
31. Ibid., 58.
32. Ibid., 64.
33. Ibid., 358–366.
34. Apud V. Cristian, *Contribuția istoriografiei la pregătirea ideologică a revoluției române de la 1848* (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Române, 1985): 38.
35. An interesting analysis dedicated to Transylvania at the end of the 19th century from the perspective of cultural nationalism in James P. Niessen, "Museums, Nationality, and Public Research Libraries in Nineteenth-Century Transylvania," *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 41, 3 (Summer 2006): 298–336.
36. The formula belongs to Dan Dungaciu, *Națiunea și provocările (post)modernității* (Bucharest: Tritonic, 2004).
37. Nicolae Iorga, *Generalități cu privire la studierea istoriei* (Vălenii de Munte, 1911), 50.
38. Mihail Manoilescu, *Tragica predestinare a geniului moldovenesc* (Iași: Moldova, 1993), 113.
39. We mention here: Gheorghe I. Brătianu, Constantin C. Giurescu, George Sofronie, Silviu Dragomir, Ioan Lupaș and others.

Abstract
Cultural Nationalism and Its Evolution in Modern Romania

The present paper tackles one of the most important issues connected with modern Romania, namely, cultural nationalism and the associationist movement. An introductory part deals with various taxonomies, definitions and opinions about nationalism in general and about cultural nationalism in particular. We present the evolutionary stages of Romanian cultural nationalism as follows: genesis (1740–1830); crystallization (1830–1860); social-political articulation (1860–1920). Some of our conclusions are: nationalism is a protean reality and should be discussed and analyzed according to different chronotopic sequences; the modern world and democracy cannot be properly understood if we ignore nationalism; cultural and political nationalism are complementary; empirical analyses are as important as theoretical approaches in order to study nationalism; when we discuss nationalism we have to keep in mind three levels: individual, state and, last but not least, ideological; cultural nationalism and cultural-national associative movements are in a strong relationship; Romanian cultural nationalism is similar to other nationalisms developed in our geopolitical area.