

The Transylvanian Elite in Greater Romania and its Difficulties of Integration

The Case of O. Goga*

EUGENIA BÎRLEA

THE ENTHUSIASM brought by December 1st 1918 gave place rapidly to all sorts of problems for the Transylvanian elite, who constituted a temporary government entitled Ruling Council, had to face when taking over the administration of Transylvania and, on the other hand, integrating the province into Greater Romania. The problems were many and not easy to solve, if we take into consideration that the Transylvanians counted among their elite mostly priests and schoolteachers, as other professions were less attainable for them and only at the expense of a compromise with the government of Budapest. There were not enough schoolteachers for the newly founded schools and high schools, thus the recourse to improvised solutions was unavoidable. The hardships and, at the same time, the disappointments emerged soon among those involved, from Transylvania and from the Old Kingdom.

The political situation became more complicated on account of the differences in legislation and mentality between the united provinces and the Old Kingdom. As a result of universal suffrage, in Parliament took seats obscure figures, below the political and intellectual level of the pre-war Romanian members of Parliament. In a few years on the political scene gained ground the Peasants' Party led by the schoolteacher Mihalache,¹ while general Averescu's popularity melted like wax. The only element of continuity was the Liberal Party, so powerful until the death of its leader, Ionel Brătianu (November 1927), that it was removed from power just for a short period of time. Only in 1928, Maniu's National Peasants' Party, formed by several mergers, succeeded to throw it from power democratically by organizing a series of manifestations in several cities with tens of thousands of participants. Besides all the evils of the political life in Romania, there was also the demagoguery. The changes entailed by the Great War and by the various reforms destroyed the old aristocracy, owner

*. This work was possible with the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/89/1.5/S/61104 with the title "Social sciences and humanities in the context of global development—development and implementation of post-doctoral research."

of large landholdings, and brought in the public life, by means of universal suffrage, new people, more modest, but still keen on seeking social elevation. The extinction of a world was accurately perceived by the memorialist G. Jurgea-Negrilești: seeing Al. Marghiloman and his brother on the Highway heading to the races (in 1924 or 1925), he got the feeling that he was seeing a ghost of a world that had already disappeared.²

Soon tensions emerged between Transylvanians and the inhabitants of the Kingdom, often in relation to the interests of those who, entitled or not, were keen to be in office. Thus came face-to-face two factions, those who maintained that the professors of the new university should be chosen from the Transylvanians and those who believed that respectable professors from Iași and Bucharest and from abroad should prevail, since the Transylvanians had very few intellectuals adequately educated for the university chairs. Sextil Pușcariu, one of the university's most important founders and its first rector, recalled that many professors, and not all of them great professors, wished to teach in Cluj,³ and on their part, the Transylvanians had the same claims.⁴ Finally, a compromise was reached: alongside several prestigious Romanian and foreign professors, the University of Cluj had also less prepared professors, who got their positions as a result of their friendship or kinship with the members of the Ruling Council. An example was the appointment of Maniu's brother, Cassiu Maniu, as professor of philosophy of law, and also of his nephew, Romulus Boilă, as professor of constitutional law, although they were just modest country lawyers.⁵ The unification of education at all levels raised fierce opposition, like that of the pedagogue Onisifor Ghibu, who considered that an immediate unification of the education system was an absurdity. For instance, Bessarabia needed 10 years to reach other provinces' level, he wrote in 1925.⁶

For the protagonists of the Romanian political and cultural scene after 1918, the following year, 1919, was the year of the Transylvanians. Many recalled, with melancholy or irony, the anticipation with which the Transylvanian politicians were expected within the first Parliament of Greater Romania. When it came to verify Maniu's mandate, "the whole Chamber, as touched by a magical wand, the deputies stood up everywhere, the party barriers came crushing down and a frantic and general exuberance pour under the immense cupola of the Atheneum."⁷ Argetoianu said bluntly: in 1919, the Transylvanian politicians were expected to work miracles. "We did not have a chance to closely assess them, and from far they seemed in the earnest. Many of us expected from them a moral purification, an improvement of the administration, a response against our oriental corruption. We all believed that, through the Transylvanians, we were going to be elevated from Balkanic to European. And there was the compassion for our long lost brothers we found again after much pain and humiliation . . ."⁸ Petru Groza, the future communist leader, then member of Maniu's party, sarcastically called the first Transylvanian members of Parliament "descălecători" [founders], continuously mocking their superiority complex, their claim of reforming everything they encountered in the Old Kingdom and of elevating the Balkanic Regățeni to the Western level the Transylvanians had already enjoyed.⁹ More critical was, for reasons of party attachment, I. Rusu Abrudeanu, Liberal sympathizer, hence of centralization. He spoke of the "1919 psychosis," when the Transylvanians were considered to be capable of bringing a new spirit in the politi-

cal life. "Almost all the intellectuals of the Kingdom were spellbound by this false belief. One was considered to be out of fashion, even one was deemed to be a bad Romanian, if one believed otherwise. Everyone wished for something new and asked for new people to come into power."¹⁰ O. Tăslăuanu, a Transylvanian intellectual and Octavian Goga's friend, who was living for many years in Romania, remembered that, after the 1919 election, the politicians of the Kingdom, exasperated by the liberal tyranny, seemed to hope and expect to be freed from slavery, and the former minister S. Mehedinți said that "Transylvanians will become the 'Archimedean point' of the Romanian politics."¹¹

After the first contacts, perplexity arises and, soon, the disillusion. The reciprocal distrust manifests itself even stronger, as well as the superiority complex, undoubtedly well consolidated by then. The National Party of Transylvania entered the Romanian Parliament with a long history of continuous opposition to the Hungarian government, therefore the spirit of opposition became for them a second nature. At the beginning, they were bewildered that nobody was opposing them in the new parliament. "It even appeared that everyone was paying court to us, to get into favor with us and into our good graces."¹² In Bucharest, a club was formed in the vicinity of the Majestic Hotel, and they spent their time there, without coming into contact with the political scene. The majority of the Transylvanians knew nothing about Bucharest and its political life. "The Bucharestians were in no hurry to gain them over to themselves, since the air of superiority assumed by the Transylvanians offended them, especially the Byzantine aristocracy who, in return, abhorred the Transylvanian peasantry."¹³

Iuliu Maniu, the leader of this parliamentary group, was held in high regard. The respect and the authority he enjoyed in his party were visible to everyone. Argetoianu remarked that king Ferdinand, seeing the attempts made by the various parties to win him over, used to say: "Maniu belongs to nobody, Maniu is mine!" Every party rushed to Maniu, admits Argetoianu, including himself, but the first meeting disappointed him.¹⁴

The vexation caused by the political life was increasing on both sides. Al. Vaida Voevod, experienced in the Kingdom's lifestyle, was so perplexed that he wondered what could understand the other new members of Parliament, if he was so disoriented in that chaotic environment after many years of dealings with the politics of Bucharest. The newcomers had the impression that they arrived in a "madhouse" and were regarded with condescension by the Bucharestian politicians like "some maniac peasants."¹⁵ Despite their air of superiority, wrote Argetoianu, the Transylvanians, like all newcomers, were rather afraid of responsibility.¹⁶ This was the reason for which Maniu urged Vaida-Voevod to form the government in the autumn of 1919. The real reason for his refusal to lead the government was his disillusion with the Bucharestian political customs.¹⁷ For a short period of time, general Averescu was part of this first government of the Transylvanians. He left annoyed the first government meeting because for three hours debates over the senators' and deputies' salaries went on and no resolution was made. The Transylvanians constantly provided examples from the Parliament of Budapest, and were bewildered and outraged when Averescu replied that this is not Hungary, but Romania, and there were many issues to discuss.¹⁸ The Transylvanians' manner to discuss and debate everything for hours without making any decision was beginning to exasperate the

others. Incensed, Iorga, the president of the Chamber, related to Argetoianu a significant incident: one evening, he burst upon them and told them bluntly: "For God's sake, gentlemen, do a foolish thing, but do something!" Unruffled, Șt. Cicio-Pop told him they did something: they were deliberating. Then they asked for beer and went on "to examine the situation," while Iorga, exasperated, left.¹⁹ Constantin Argetoianu, in connection with the deputies' lack of experience, wrote that "it was a Parliament where Iorga talked continually and was interrupted from time to time by some courageous speaker!"²⁰

The politicians of the Old Kingdom were resentful of the autonomy showed by the Transylvanians, a characteristic otherwise shared by all national minorities of the former Habsburg Monarchy, in the opinion of Șeicaru.²¹ Nevertheless, they were blamed for it, like heretics, the same way the journalist I. Rusu Șirianu did it in his book published in 1930, *Păcatele Ardealului față de sufletul Vechiului Regat* . . . [The Sins of Transylvania towards the Soul of the Old Kingdom . . .].

Around 1922 Maniu tried to merge with the Liberal Party and failed. Successively, he objected constantly against the Liberal reforms, including the 1923 Constitution.²² The boycott of King Ferdinand's and Queen Maria's coronation at Alba Iulia (October 15th 1922) earned him many politicians' antipathy. Maniu reproached Brătianu that he converted the coronation into a party demonstration, but king Ferdinand never forgave him,²³ while the liberals persecuted his political allies as if they were Huguenots, wrote Mihail Manoilescu.²⁴

Likewise, the Transylvanians were baffled by the Bucharestian politicians' manner. The election organized under the terror of government forces shocked them, stealing of the ballot boxes, preventing the voters to vote etc. were common practices used in Bucharest, but not in Transylvania.²⁵ At the 1921 election, Al. Vaida Voevod stood as candidate in a city of Banat and had the unexpected surprise to be escorted by the Romanian gendarmes' bayonets.²⁶ In the army, the first mentality clash was witnessed in 1919 at the time of its mobilization against bolshevized Hungary. The Transylvanian soldiers, unaccustomed to being treated with "hey, you," slaps and punches, with the pay withheld by the sergeants or even by the superior officers, protested and were considered rebels.²⁷ As it might have been expected considering his imperious and impulsive temper, Vaida-Voevod provoked various incidents, his words were exploited by other politicians, like his statement that the Romanians of Transylvania live worse under the liberal government than under Tisza.²⁸ His outbursts of contempt for the Balkanic civilization of the Old Kingdom were frequent.²⁹ In an interview given to "Patria" [Homeland], in December 1920, Vaida asserted "We will not tolerate anymore this oppression and pillage disguised under the placid façade of unification, but will ask: Transylvania for Transylvanians!" In 1922 he wrote the preface to Iancu Azapu's brochure entitled *Ardealul Ardelenilor [The Transylvanians' Transylvania]* which was published in Vienna and got a prompt and vehement reply from Goga in his article *Regionalismul [The Regionalism]*.³⁰ The adherents of centralization blamed him for a campaign of slander against Regățeni officials in Transylvania, whom he called "rascals" and accused of discrediting the unification policy.³¹

Further on I examine some aspects of Octavian Goga's literary and political career in Greater Romania. The difficulties he encountered resulted rather from the democra-

tization of political life and the difficult adjustment to new political practices. Later, in 1930, King Carol II, preparing his way for the personal dictatorship, proceeded to break up the political parties. The king's actions were favored by the international political situation, which was changing dramatically after Hitler's rise to power (1933) and was becoming even more difficult for Romania and restricting its options.

After his first book of poems was published in 1905, Goga enjoyed a great success in Bucharest, which, in addition to his marriage to the daughter of Albina bank president, P. Cosma, gave him access to Bucharest high society.³² Lovinescu remarked that the Transylvanian poet enjoyed what Eminescu, at the height of his career, never had.³³ Other aspect of his activity, as a journalist, brought him the glory as a guest of Hungarian prisons, who suffered for his oppressed nation. Gradually, the poet began to break away from the dominant group in the National Party, thus in 1911–1912 he came into conflict with the Iuliu Maniu-Al. Vaida-Voevod group. Goga started to write a series of articles in "Tribuna" [The Tribune] directed against the Habsburg dynasticism promoted by Vaida, A. C. Popovici and Maniu in "Românul" [The Romanian]. The conflict exacerbated and the two sides engaged in personal attacks and denigration so that the liberals of Bucharest sent C. Stere to Arad to attempt a reconciliation.³⁴

In 1918 Goga was not a member of the National Party except in name, wrote C. Argetoianu, for he alienated himself from the Transylvanian milieu. "Living in Bucharest where he arrived 10 years before the war, uprooted, early in his youth, from the local environment, Goga was a freed Transylvanian and, as such, he did not fit in with his brothers from the other side of Carpathians anymore, who, on return, deemed him a traitor in the pay of Regateni and did not love him." Goga took every opportunity to upbraid Maniu's lamentable intellectual mediocrity and "undeservedly so, because he was not taking in consideration the moral qualities to which Maniu owned his pre-eminence."³⁵ Soon after the Unification, Goga rose against Maniu, succeeding in luring those dissatisfied with Maniu's regionalism, those who believed that the National Party should merge with a party of the Old Kingdom and should not insulate itself in Transylvania. His allies were not numerous, and even his friend and godson, Onisifor Ghibu, considered the abolishment of the Ruling Council, the temporary government of Transylvania, in April 1920 to be a mistake, the result of personal ambition.³⁶

Some of his friends reckoned that Goga, after he contributed decidedly to Romania's decision to join the war on the side of the Entente and to the Unification of the Greater Romania, should return to his first calling. In this respect, Onisifor Ghibu confessed in his Memories that he insisted upon Goga's appointment to the chair of History of Romanian Literature at the newly founded University of Superior Dacia. However, he was refused, on the grounds that Goga did not have any doctoral degree, and his repeated insistences during the following years remained fruitless.³⁷ An almost pathetic appeal came from a friend and poet whom Goga respected, Ady Endre. By the end of 1918, at their final meeting, in Cluj, when the Hungarian poet was close to death, he begged Goga not to waste his literary talent on the political scene.³⁸ Goga was profoundly touched by his friend's death, which occurred some months after their meeting in Cluj, and the painter N. Tonitza, who was not personally acquainted with Goga, remembered seeing him one evening overpowered by a pronounced sadness.³⁹

His oratorical success (like the literary one) in the years of neutrality, influential in the decision of the Romanian army marching to Transylvania, represented a decisive stage in his subsequent evolution – the salon poet prepared himself for an important political career.⁴⁰ O. Ghibu, an enthusiast partner in the war years, later a stern critic, emphasizes that the two volumes of poetry published in 1915 (*Strigăte în pustiu [Callings in the Desert]*) and in 1916 (*Cântece fără țară [Countryless Songs]*) had an extraordinary response in the public sphere.⁴¹ The young people considered him like a prophet of their time, knew by heart his poems and recited them at various celebrations, so that “there was no other name better known in the entire country than the name of Octavian Goga, which had a profound echo in the hearts of all generations.”⁴² Nichifor Crainic said even more emphatically: Goga was the poet of the World War and Union generation.⁴³ His public success was at times so spectacular that succeeded to intimidate the poet, even if his contemporaries acknowledged that the priest’s son from Râșinari was at ease in every social milieu. Poetry reading became a means of propaganda between 1914 and 1916, to influence the public opinion in favor of an alliance of Romania with France and the Entente. *Oltul*, recited by Tony Bulandra at Athenaeum, was the climax of the evening, the audience applauded frantically and called for the author to come on stage. Intimidated, the poet slipped away with his friends, telling them about the revolutionary potential of his poetry.⁴⁴

The political integration into Greater Romania was less easy for Goga, and his options were rather limited, in spite of his earlier literary success. The most powerful party was the Liberal Party, but he was not in good terms with its leaders. In his memories, I. G. Duca believed that Goga’s aversion for the liberals was due to Vintilă Brătianu, minister of war in 1916, who bluntly refused his request to be accepted in the army at that time.⁴⁵ Argetoianu’s opinion about this issue seems more realistic: Brătianu adopted an air of condescension toward the poet, and Goga, with his bohemian attitude, could not accustom himself to iron discipline professed by the strong personalities of the Liberal Party. In addition, there was his brother’s resentment toward the entire Brătianu family for the disaster of Turtucaia where he lost the use of his arm. Goga was, until 1931, a member of The People’s League headed by the renowned general Averescu, which coincided more with his aspirations. The People’s League was also more popular than the unlikable Liberals were.⁴⁶

His political involvement left little space to literature. A young journalist paid him a visit in 1920 to ask for a literary collaboration. To his surprise Goga received him all dressed up in the morning, unlike other Bucharestian politicians who received their guests in pyjamas or robes. Later, he realized that the Transylvanians were very ceremonious. The poet admitted he wasted his time with friends and politicians, and made plans to spend one hour a day dealing with literature, but it was impossible for him to stick to his plan.⁴⁷ Although he was a success in Parliament (see the 1926 polemic, when, in his duel with Iorga, he appeared like a “very skillful debater in Parliament”),⁴⁸ although at the end of the war he was elected as member of the Romanian Academy replacing Coșbuc,⁴⁹ and in 1924 he received the National Poetry Prize, Goga was growing even more pessimistic, at least Onisifor Ghibu believed so and there are no reasons not to trust his judgment, taking into account that he knew Goga since his childhood. In Ghibu’s opinion,

his “extreme pessimism” clearly manifested itself in the article *După cinci ani de la Unire [Five Years after the Unification]* Goga published in “Țara noastră” [Our Country]⁵⁰ where he compared Romania to a machine that was broken and beyond repair. He was not the only Transylvanian leader disillusioned with the situation in the Greater Romania that did not seem to have changed for the better. Inspired by Goga’s article, Ghibu organized a series of conferences in Cluj, a kind of open inquiry, which allowed various Transylvanian figures to express their point of view and to talk things over with different politicians, trying to find a solution to the crisis. Many voices heard there were also critical and pessimistic.⁵¹

The political career did not seem enough to satisfy the poet. The political life of the Old Romania was familiar, but he had to adjust, like every politician, to the major differences caused by the introduction of universal suffrage, because the most significant changes had taken place at the social and the electoral levels of political activity. In the Old Kingdom, wrote Argetoianu, political activity consisted mostly in intrigues, but, after the introduction of universal suffrage and the increase of the deputies’ number thanks to the new provinces, the political life became acquainted with “temperaments, ways and violence we were not accustomed to” and the politicians formed after 1914 were compelled to face.⁵² Twice, Goga became member of the Averescu government for a short time (1920–1921 and 1926–1927), without the support of a powerful party, thanks only to the immense prestige acquired during the neutrality and the war; he was “beloved by the public . . . which afforded him a larger measure of impunity and indulgence than to other politicians!” During the time he was not member of the government, he was not able to get himself elected in the Parliament, because of laziness, his bohemian nature, and because he grew quickly bored with “organizational questions and any other aspects of the political kitchen.”⁵³ Șeicaru noticed the poet’s gradual loss of prestige. In the Averescu government (1926–1927), after the elections were won in the way they usually were in Bucharest, with “an unparalleled terror,” he was a “dilettante and administratively absent Minister of the Interior. One is left with the sad feeling that Goga had no notation about state issues.”⁵⁴ He left the press censorship to his bureau chiefs, who seized the newspapers, something not even the Liberals did, and in July 1927, after the government fall, Goga was attacked by the persecuted newspapers and had to pay “for the abuses of his entourage.”⁵⁵ He was also blamed for the large sum of money he gave M. Sadoveanu to publish the “*Comoara satelor*” [The Village Treasure] magazine,⁵⁶ and because he published, with money from the Ministry of Interior a collection of articles, *Mustul care fierbe [Simmering Must]*.⁵⁷ Șeicaru acknowledged almost exclusively his qualities as a journalist during the interwar period.⁵⁸ In the articles published in “Țara noastră,” beginning in 1923, he fought mostly the regionalism and separatism of the Transylvanian intellectuals.⁵⁹ “His polemical verve found in the National Party a subject that excited him like in the old times at ‘Tribuna’ . . . In the inkpot, Octavian Goga found an incentive the direct contact with the masses did not give him. His talent for journalism was clear, but writing did not give the same popularity as the direct contact, nor did it attract votes, and a politician is destined to remain isolated without them.”

V. Eftimiu wrote about Goga’s dissatisfaction during this time, too, in connection with a letter he received from the poet in 1924 in which he voiced his regret that he

got involved in politics. "I was enslaved by reality and got stuck in everyday mud." A few months later, they took part at the celebrations held at Țebea, dedicated to the 100 years anniversary of Avram Iancu's death, together with the politicians that accomplished the unification, headed by King Ferdinand and Queen Maria. "A paradisiac morning, a fairy-tale, a legend."⁶⁰

The attraction or the illusion of power was much too tempting for Goga to follow the advice received from Ady Endre. If he did not follow his advice, he nevertheless did much for his friend's memory. He bought from the poet's widow the castle of Ciucea and in 1924 he published several of Ady's poems in his own translation in "Cultura" [The Culture] from Cluj, and an enthusiastic article about Ady Endre's role in renewing Hungarian poetry, to commemorate his 5th death anniversary.⁶¹ He endorsed the Hungarian writers from Romania who popularized his friend's work, and as a politician, on his own initiative, a law passed in Parliament, which exempted from expropriation Ady's parents' property.⁶²

In 1928, when Maniu's National Peasants' Party won the democratic elections, and formed the government in a festive air, Goga was convinced that Maniu's popularity will dissipate once he comes into power. Witness of this assessment, Pamfil Șeicaru wondered if his envy for Maniu's fame caused it and he answered himself that the superiority complex Goga had was untouchable by envy.⁶³

Despite the eulogy that the Iorga government conferred him for his 50th anniversary,⁶⁴ the political diary he kept in that year (1931) does not show a serene state of mind, but sadness, disillusion and resentments toward many actors of the political scene: almost every one of them has labels attached to him, otherwise very funny (those about Iorga are published in the press or make the king laugh) and all are depicted with a malice, while the author seemed unaware of it.⁶⁵ Many of his political contemporaries became the victims of his dissatisfaction on the pages of his diary, but, in my opinion, nobody was granted so crushing pages (other scholars see them as "savory and incisive")⁶⁶ like the patriarch Miron Cristea. The disappointment the patriarch caused him during many years exploded in a harsh indictment in pages of the diary. With a merciless lucidity he points out the patriarch's lack of intellectual qualities and nobility and the protest of a conscience incapable to admit that at the head of the Church and of the country there are people without any ideals.⁶⁷ P. Șeicaru considered that Goga was living an unconfessed tragedy, generated by the loss of his poetic inspiration,⁶⁸ a possible explanation for his ever growing dissatisfaction, visible in the pages written after the Union.

The end of 1931 and the following year proved to be an important stage of his political career. Owing to the frictions concerning the relationship with King Carol II and to the evolution of Romanian monarchy,⁶⁹ the poet, together with a number of his allies, left general Averescu's party and founded his own party, in April 1932, the National Agrarian Party. During this time, Goga was more active: he travelled to various districts to organize branch offices for his party, and succeeded in winning a few mandates for the Parliament at the 1932 elections.⁷⁰ He began a more and more obvious evolution towards the right-wing and even the extreme right. Anti-Semitic tones increased in his speeches from this period, like the one in Cluj, in 1933, delivered to the students at the National Theater. He spoke about the establishment of concentration

camps for foreigners (those who came to the country between 1914 and 1919), and appealed to the League of Nations to make the foreigners leave the country.⁷¹ With the speech delivered in the Parliament on March 3rd 1934, he revived the fight against the foreigners (especially from the cities), considered, after the communists, the most dangerous people for Romania.⁷²

A compensation for his lack of success in the political arena could be regarded the translation and the publishing in 1934, of Madách Imre's work *Tragedia omului* [*The Tragedy of Man*]. He had been working on this translation since 1905, and during this time he announced repeatedly its publication, but he continually reworked and polished it.⁷³ The Hungarian literary criticism praised his translation, just like the Romanian critics, with G. Călinescu among them.⁷⁴ The Hungarian scholar Sámuel Domokos, author of a collection of essays about the students in Budapest and about Goga's translations from Hungarian authors, considered him "a great stylist and an exceptional translator."⁷⁵

The merge with A. C. Cuza's extreme right group, in 1935, and his short period in government (44 days, from December 1937 to February 1938) were the last convulsions of a personality that lived tragically the breach between his art and the dramatic evolution of the Romanian and European politics. In his refusal to cooperate in the establishment of king Carol II's dictatorship, P. Șeicaru saw "the most beautiful political victory" Goga had ever won, otherwise the only positive judgment concerning his political career he ever gave.⁷⁶

The poet left numerous testimonies about his fundamental creed, the national idea, about the impossibility of writing poetry that is not politically committed.⁷⁷ I believe that the poet's failure as a politician was foreseeable, because "the revolutionary lyre has few strings,"⁷⁸ his dream became a reality, but a reality dominated often by shadows.⁷⁹ Likewise, the politician who played one card, the national idea, was destined to fail.

□

Notes

1. His embroidered peasant shirt is constantly upbraided by Argetoianu as a symbol of a new type of politician, as well as his nomination as prime minister, a year after the war ended, 'in a day when everybody had gone mad'. See Constantin Argetoianu, *Memorii. Pentru cei de mâine. Amintiri din vremea celor de ieri*, Vol. VI, part VI (1919–1922) (Bucharest: Machiavelli, 1996), 224. Pamfil Șeicaru on the other hand, was touched by his modesty, by the sincerity of his convictions. See Pamfil Șeicaru, *Istoria partidelor Național, Țărănist și Național Țărănist* (Bucharest: Victor Frunză, 2000), 212–220.
2. Gheorghe Jurgea-Negrilești, *Troica amintirilor: sub patru regi* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 2007), 233–234.
3. Sextil Pușcariu, *Memorii*, ed. Magdalena Vulpe (Bucharest: Minerva, 1978), 447.
4. Pușcariu, *Memorii*, 449–450.
5. Șeicaru, *Istoria partidelor*, 152.
6. Irina Livezeanu, *Cultură și naționalism în România Mare 1918–1930* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1998), 55.
7. Octavian Goga, *Naționalism dezrobitor. Permanența ideii naționale*, pref., ed. Constantin Schifrenț (Bucharest: Albatros, 1998), 351.

8. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 30.
9. Petru Groza, *Adio lumii vechi! Memorii* (Bucharest: Compania, 2003), 213.
10. Ion Rusu Abrudeanu, *Încăteale Ardealului față de sufletul Vechiului Regat. Fapte, documente și facsimile* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1930), 469–470.
11. Octavian Tăslăuanu, *Valuri politice* (București: Bucovina, 1933), 172.
12. Groza, *Adio lumii vechi!*, 215.
13. *Ibid.*, 215–216.
14. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 30–31.
15. Alexandru Vaida-Voevod, *Memorii*, vol. II (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1995), 15–16.
16. Vaida-Voevod, *Memorii*, II, 92.
17. Apostol Stan, *Iuliu Maniu. Naționalism și democrație: Biografia unui mare român* (Bucharest: Saeculum I. O., 1997), 104.
18. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 96–97.
19. *Ibid.*, 99.
20. *Ibid.*, 100.
21. Șeicaru, *Istoria partidelor*, 147.
22. Ion Scurtu, *Iuliu Maniu. Activitatea politică* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1995), 36.
23. Stan, *Iuliu Maniu*, 142–143.
24. Mihail Manoilescu, *Memorii*, vol. I, ed., pref. Valeriu Dinu (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1993), 45.
25. For the violent elections, see *Reprivire asupra vieții. Memorii* (Arad: Vasile Goldiș University Press, 2009), 215; Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VII, 163; Pamfil Șeicaru, “Poezie și politică: Octavian Goga (1881–1938),” in *Scrieri din exil*, vol. I, *Figuri din lumea literară* (Bucharest: Saeculum I. O., 2002), 232–233; Manoilescu, *Memorii*, I, 93–94.
26. Coriolan Băran, *Reprivire asupra vieții. Memorii* (Arad: Vasile Goldiș University Press, 2009), 215.
27. Vaida-Voevod, *Memorii*, II, 14.
28. Pușcariu, *Memorii*, 665–666.
29. Vaida, among other things, told the catholic archbishop of Bucharest the following: ‘By no means, our Union with Old Romania did not imply that we, with our western culture, should become like them: a pile of Bucharestian dirt! . . . We, the Transylvanian politicians, were educated in a country with 52 million people, not in a Balkanic village with 7 million inhabitants.’ See Raymund Netzhhammer, *Episcop în România: într-o epocă a conflictelor naționale și religioase*, vol II, ed. Nikolaus Netzhhammer and Krista Zach (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2005), 1062. Vaida stated in Chamber in 1921 that he “fought the tigers of Budapest, not the bugs of Bucharest,” while in 1927 he wished devil would take the entire parliamentary majority. Rusu Abrudeanu’s book is an indictment and a scrupulous inventory of every regionalistic and unpatriotic gestures and statements of the “ungrateful” Transylvanians. See Rusu Abrudeanu, *Încăteale Ardealului*, 15.
30. The article is published in *Țara noastră* 2 (1922): 41–44.
31. Abrudeanu, *Încăteale Ardealului*, 480.
32. His first book was “a very well received visiting card, which opened every door for the conqueror. Maiorescu descended from Mount Olympus and spoke about him; other writers embraced him and listen to his Transylvanian ‘doine’ at the Kübler café; the Transylvanian colony, headed by Coșbuc and Bianu, member of the Romanian Academy, were proud of him, while Mrs. Marghiloman invited him in her salon and ordered 1000 copies of his *Poezii*.” See Sextil Pușcariu, *Călare pe două veacuri. Amintiri din tinerețe (1895-1906)* (Bucharest: Editura pentru Literatură, 1968), 314.
33. E. Lovinescu, *Scrieri*, vol II, *Memorii*, ed. Eugen Simion (Bucharest: Minerva, 1970), 75.

34. Groza, *Adio lumii vechi!*, 271–272.
35. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 222.
36. Onisifor Ghibu, *Oameni între oameni. Amintiri*, ed., introd. Ion Bulei, Octavian O. Ghibu, notes Ion Bulei, Octavian O. Ghibu, Șerban Polverejan (Bucharest: Eminescu, 1990), 98–99. V. Onisifor Ghibu, *Octavian Goga, Prietenie și luptă de o viață. Amintiri*, ed. Mihai O. Ghibu, Olga-Silvia Turbatu (București: Semne, 2010).
37. Ghibu, *Oameni între oameni*, 95.
38. Vintilă Rusu Șirianu, “De-a lungul multor ani în preajma lui Octavian Goga,” in *Octavian Goga în memoria și conștiința critică românească*, ed. Al. Husar, Ioan Șerb, pref. Mircea Zăciu (Bucharest: „Grai și suflet—Cultura Națională,” 2004), 235–237.
39. Nicolae Tonitza, *Cronici fanteziste neliterare*, short story *În beznă*, 89–94.
40. “The neutrality era discovers Goga the orator; the fighter finds a new way to express himself, and his militant sensibility enters a new phase of political activity, which Goga will anchor himself till the end.” See P. Constantinescu, “Octavian Goga (1881–1938),” in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 207.
41. Not all the literary critics are enchanted. G. Ibrăileanu, for example, criticizes merciless his poem *Latinitatea strigă din tranșee* from *Cântecul fără șanț*, and stated that only a few poems were at the same level as the early ones. See *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 400–403.
42. Onisifor Ghibu, “Amintiri despre Octavian Goga (fragment),” in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 90.
43. Nichifor Crainic, “În marginea unor sărbători (fragment),” in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 129.
44. Rusu Șirianu, “De-a lungul multor ani,” 233.
45. I. G. Duca, *Memorii*, Vol. III, *Războiul, Partea I (1916-1917)* (Bucharest: Machiavelli, 1994), 31–32.
46. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 223–224.
47. I. Peltz, *Amintiri despre N. D. Cocca, G. Ibrăileanu, M. Codreanu* (Bucharest: Editura Tineretului, 1967), 76–78.
48. Pamfil Șeicaru, “Poezie și politică: Octavian Goga (1881-1938),” in *Scrieri din exil*, vol. I, *Figuri din lumea literară* (București: Editura Saeculum I. O.), 2002, 231–232.
49. Dorina N. Rusu, *Membrii Academiei Române, 1866–1999. Dicționar* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1999), 221.
50. Ghibu, *Oameni între oameni*, 100.
51. Pessimist was V. Braniște when he blamed the Transylvanians letting themselves be influenced by the Bucharestian politicianism which “divided us, subjugated us, annihilated us. Any attempt to go back is in vain.” in Ghibu, *Oameni între oameni*, 106.
52. Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VI, 213.
53. Ion Bitoleanu, *Șefi de partide priviți cu ochii vremii lor* (Constanța: Ex Ponto, 2006), 202.
54. Șeicaru, *Poezie și politică*, 231–233.
55. Șeicaru, *Istoria partidelor*, 228–229.
56. Vezi Gheorghe Jurgea-Negrilești, *Troica amintirilor*, 84–86, where he recounted that Sadoveanu published a few issues of the magazine, and then appropriated the rest of the money, to the astonishment of Goga and Păstorel Teodoreanu.
57. Ioana Părvulescu, “JE EST UN AUTRE: ‘Justul’ care fierbe. Jurnal politic,” *România literară* 40 (2002).
58. His articles was well received by George Călinescu and Dumitru Micu, the former reproaching him the aggressive nationalism and the retrograde conception. See *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 451–500.

59. C. Argetoianu narrates how welcomed he was in the house of the National Party leader, Chirtop from Câmpeni. Chirtop hated fiercely the politicians of the Old Kingdom and invited him by way of exception in his house, after refusing to receive the visit of I. Brătianu și Al. Constantinescu on their way back from the Găina Mountain. See Argetoianu, *Memorii*, VII, 190–191.
60. Victor Eftimiu, “Octavian Goga,” in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 222–223.
61. Eftimiu, “Octavian Goga,” 118.
62. Eftimiu, “Octavian Goga,” 121.
63. Șeicaru, *Poezie și politică*, 235–236.
64. Lucan C. Marțian, *Octavian Goga omul politic* (Oradea: Editura Universității, 2010), 381.
65. Părvulescu, “JE EST UN AUTRE: ‘Justul’ care fierbe. Jurnal politic.”
66. Gheorghe Grigurcu, “Semn de carte. Cazul Goga (I),” *România Literară* 22 (2004).
67. Octavian Goga, *Scrieri memorialistice. Mărturisiri. Evocări. Discursuri. Jurnale*, pref. Ion Petrovici, ed. Ioan Șerb (Bucharest: Grai și suflet – Cultura Națională, 2004), 293–298.
68. Șeicaru, *Poezie și politică*, 240.
69. Marțian, *Octavian Goga*, 233–236.
70. *Ibid.*, 263–265.
71. *Ibid.*, 15–116.
72. *Ibid.*, 282.
73. Domokos Sámuel, *Octavian Goga. Studii* (București: Editura Kriterion, 1978), 124–125.
74. *Ibid.*, 129–135.
75. *Ibid.*, 155.
76. *Ibid.*, 240.
77. Octavian Goga, *Ancheta noastră: în ce cred*, in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 128.
78. Garabet Ibrăileanu, *Cântece fână fână de Octavian Goga*, in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 399.
79. See Cezar Petrescu, “Pentru Octavian Goga,” in *Octavian Goga în memoria*, 131.

Abstract

The Transylvanian Elite in Greater Romania and its difficulties of integration.
The Case of O. Goga

This study focuses on the new political and social realities in Greater Romania and on the Transylvanian Romanian elite in its effort to integrate itself in the new country. The process of uniformising the institutions, the legislation and the political practices is confronted with the major changes which occurred after 1918, when the agrarian reform and the universal suffrage mutate the country’s political and social structure, compelling the old politicians to adapt themselves to the new realities. The case of the poet Octavian Goga, who got involved in politics by taking advantage of the immense moral capital he amassed during his activities in favor of the Union of Transylvania with Romania, reflects the difficulties encountered by the poet and the failure of his career, both artistic and political, in which he played exclusively the nationalism card.

Keywords

Transylvania, Greater Romania, elite, integration, nationalism, O. Goga