

Emanuel CĂȘVEAN

**Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its
Philosophical Origins**

– Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism –

Emanuel CĂȘVEAN

Faculty of Orthodox Theology, "Babeș-Bolyai" University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Abstract. *This article tries to set the basis of a discussion regarding the link between Nichifor Crainic's philosophical, theological, and political thought & work (in view of his ethnographic state as a mandatory solution for the shaping of the interwar Romanian society) based on a Christian-orthodox fundamental belief, and the emergence of a powerful Romanian extreme right movement during same period of time – not excluding from the discussion Crainic's direct or indirect influence in this case. Our proposal is to pinpoint the link between the emergence of Crainic's philosophical and political convictions to a preexistent substratum of intertwining between fundamental nationalism, cultural, popular, or religious beliefs, a type of intolerance, and the acceptance of the foreigner among Romanian traditional communities.*

Keywords: Ethnocratic state, social Darwinism, gândirism (Romanian philosophical movement derived from the word "thinking" and the homonym magazine), autochthony, neo-orthodoxy, militant nationalism, militant orthodoxy, legionary movement.

The Romanian interwar period represents, to say the least, an "interesting" moment in the geopolitical, social, cultural and economic history of Romania and, all the more so, a period of ebullition/tumult at the level of the political and doctrinal beliefs of the freshly created Romanian national state (resized and realigned at the level the European geopolitical map following the unification of the three kingdoms after the 1919 Paris Peace Conference). Romania, as well as most European states, "adheres", volens-nolens, to the same political and socio-economic cycles/cyclicality that will inevitably lead to a global conflagration unprecedented in the history of humanity through dimension, violence, impact, destruction, material costs, and, most seriously, loss of human life? - a war which, to its end, would leave behind a number of victims, without exaggeration we could say, without precedent (dead, injured and crippled) among combatants and, as expected, collateral victims.

However, this pressure pot, as often called metaphorically, the "Old Continent", which was to explode on September 1st, 1939 by the invasion of independent Poland's troops of the Third Reich, is again caught in the crucible of an inevitable and inseparable self-destructive mechanism of the very human nature; a predictable cycle based on something that is historically and socially "validated" from the earliest stages of the development of human societies: ethnic-racial-religious segregation. It is difficult to counteract with arguments the fact that, despite the scale, implications, the number of people, the surface and the virtually limitless amount of resources used, World War II is and remains fundamentally a war of racial, ethnic, religious and implicitly ideological segregation; a conflagration directed against the strangers in terms of religion, ethnicity, and, to a certain extent, the strangers of race and kin - a war of divergent religions and doctrines, a clash of far left or right doctrinary-political preconceptions. If we can define the "pasoptist" period as one of nations, providing identity, of re-identification and regrouping

"Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its Philosophical Origins – Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism," *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 485-494

around the idea of a nation, then, to some extent, the concept of nation finds an interesting place (as a pseudo-identity nucleus) in the interwar period, however this time as a catalyst in view of ethnic-racial purification of Europe proposed by the far right movements which were strongly active in the period after the First World War.

In the wider context of these dynamic movements, sturdy polarized between the moderate policies and beliefs promoted by liberal democracies' platforms, which mainly aimed at post-war reconstruction of the nation states, the territorial administrative settlement of the newly formed or newly reorganized states, the social, educational, political, structural and industrial-economic development (to overcome the differences in local-regional development and to reduce gaps/disparity), or the inclusion and incorporation of ethnic and religious minorities as an integral part of community life and in political decision-making processes (main direction of great importance on the agenda of the great European powers, post Saint-Germain-en-Laye¹² and the Treaty on Minorities) on one hand, and, on the other hand, the nationalism deeply rooted in the collective mentality of the people for centuries-which could not easily be remodeled and refocused, even with such a major change as the Great War - racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, homophobia, and fear / rejection of the foreigners (in terms of nation, religion, culture, place) inherent in human societies from ancient times; the feeling of personal anxiety and turmoil, of profound socioeconomic uncertainty, both at the level of the family cell and at the level of the different social strata (especially among the nations who suffered the loss of war tribute, but not only), find their place in the far national (nationalist) movements. Obviously, coming in a whole package with all their theoretical, doctrinal, philosophical, social and political affinities - which are anchored in the fears of individuals, exacerbate pre-existing anguish, subvertly expand on all levels of societies and inevitably put pressure all the joints/junctures of communities until the moment of rupture - the emergence of the Second World War.

Romania does not make a discordant note either, and it is not "protected" by the scourge of ultra-nationalism, anti-Semitic extremism, chauvinism, ethnic-religious intolerance as well as xenophobia or racism that clutches/seizes Europe under the pressure of far right politics, movements and parties.

In this article we have chosen to approach, in a relatively narrow manner, only a facet of this Romanian nationalism which, in turn, is not at all less complex or simpler to understand or divide, but has strong political implications: *the Orthodox militant autochthonism*, better known as the *gândirist* current. A current of thought, whose main exponent and prominent figure is Nichifor Crainic, which can be connected with Nicolae Iorga's "*Sămănătorism*"/*sower current*, but which, while proving the same openness towards refinding the traditional national identity, the national unity and the nationalist streak, as opposed to the latter will generate, at

¹ <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/dfat/treaties/1920/3.html>, accessed 03. 03. 2018.

² http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Treaty_of_Neuilly, 03. 03. 2018.

the social and political level, a series of "inadvertences" inextricably linked to the far right ultra-nationalisms (very close and connected to the Italian fascism promoted by Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler's German Nazism) with the same dangerous implications in society, Romanian society in this case.

Nichifor Crainic's personality is as prominent and important for the Romanian culture, through the implications of his work, papers, publications (prose, poetic, essayistic, journalistic, or purely philosophical) and of his analysis in the purest humanist style - similar to Montaigne - on theology, philosophy, religion, myth and mysticism³, for the regaining of a spiritual and religious identity in the Romanian space, on the one hand; through his missionary-rescuing perspective directed towards the regaining of the authentic Romanian inter-war Orthodoxy⁴ on the other hand, or even by drawing important directions in the Romanian ethnography and folklore, and perhaps most importantly for Romanian Orthodoxy, by the assiduity by which he tames the spiritual energy in re-sketching an autochthonism, a self-styled and regrouped autochthonism as a result of a fervent socio-cultural work having as central pillar the Orthodox faith with its Romanian specificity, as his image in the public space is controversial and questionable, by virtue of his involvement on the Romanian political scene, of the questionable results of his implication and his association with the international or Romanian far-right politics.

As stated above, the Romanian interwar period is an effervescent period, as was to be expected from a "first" total war, but perhaps even more than in the West of Europe, it is marked by profound contradictions and divisions. It is a period of unforeseen and repeated changes of governance and governments, a period of socio-doctrinal extremes, of rupture of visions concerning the direction that Romania, as a national state (for some nation-state), must follow, and of a profound state of economic uncertainty (especially as a result of the effects of the world war, but also of the reverberation of the American economic crisis, which is strongly felt in Europe, especially in the countries destabilized by the reconstruction effort and great losers of the First World War, such as Germany or Italy, as well as among the states with a "young" state of "equilibrium acquired" such as Romania – which to a certain extent, we can say, was also a loser and also in full process of compensation, integration, construction and development following the post-Paris 1919 territorial expansion, but which still had an agricultural economy to a large extent), and of political uncertainty - especially due to a lack of a "state-owned" history of a form of constitutional democracy with all the obvious implications for the mechanisms of thinking and reference that this has on the individual or collective mentality of the citizens, whether they are "freshly accepted" and formally integrated, such as the co-inhabiting, ethnic and minority nations (even considering its bicameral constitutional monarchy specificity

³ Where we can easily connect him to some preeminent figures such as Lucian Blaga, Ion Petru Culianu, or Mircea Eliade.

⁴ Thing which, inevitably, will represent the "breaking" and deviation point.

"Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its Philosophical Origins – Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism," *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 485-494

according to the "Romanian Constitution of March 29th, 1923"⁵⁶ of the Great Romania). It is, therefore, in this context that the extreme political movements make their presence felt, the citizens intensify their anguish and frustrations about the "other", the "stranger", surrendering themselves to socially, intellectually and politically destructive and self-destructive concepts.

We will not go into detailed aspects regarding Crainic's biography⁷, but his perspective on his providential role as a savior, on his heroic mission as to the Romanians as a nation, as well as his "tough", theological, religious thinking (gândirist) streak, centered on the Christian-Orthodox spirituality as a focal point of the Romanian culture's development (an approach for which we can only appreciate the irreplaceable value and importance) will, unfortunately, designate him as the "ideal candidate" for the political adherence to the anti-semitic, xenophobic, chauvinist, homophobic, and racist convictions that were being inoculated, at the beginning subversively, and then visibly, in all the layers of the Romanian society.

Crainic defines himself as a nationalist-Christian⁸, but as Gabriel Hasmațuchi also notes in his work *Philosophical Structures in the writings of Nichifor Crainic*: "*The theologian was not limited to writing about the internal and external political events of his time but also elaborated a political doctrine, it is the ethnocentric state theory, an "alternative" of the state governed by democratic principles. [...] a political project to save the Romanian interwar society.*"⁹, however, relatively quickly, he engages in a far right argumentation, rejecting the moderate views of liberal and peasant historical parties, although he maintained close relations with the P.N.Ț.¹⁰ (Romanian Peasant Party) and with the Romanian Royalty, at least until the early thirties. One of the main reasons for this change is that of his Messianic, even prophetic, vision on the direction the Romanian nation had to take to rediscover its national identity through culture (mainly traditional-Romanian) to the central nucleus of Romanianism, that indigenous inherent element of the Romanian people: Orthodoxy. An Orthodoxy, which, in his view, had to escape the tare weight of the

⁵ Because of obvious reasons we will not approach the question of this somehow immaturity of the political and government system of Romania, even if it being monarchical or democratic but it is important to point out that this is an important factor in the political instability of the interwar period, and also a negative catalyst for the extreme right and left movements from this period.

⁶ http://www.cdep.ro/pls/legis/legis_pck.htm_act_text?id=1517, accessed 03. 03. 2018.

⁷ For a detailed chrono-biography we recommend the following book: Nichifor Crainic, *Teologie și Filozofie Publicistică (1922-1944)*, edited by Adrian Michiduță, Craiova, Aius Printed, 2010, p. 7-29. Cf. Emanuel Cășvean, "'Nichifor Crainic and the Romanian Orthodox Mystique'", in *Astra Salvensis*, III (2015), Supplement no. 1, p. 46-53; Iuliu-Marius Morariu, "Nichifor Crainic și Gândirea", in *Tabor*, IX (2015), no. 3, p. 29-32.

⁸ See Gabriel Hasmațuchi, *Structuri filosofice în scrierile lui Nichifor Crainic*, Sibiu, Press of "Lucian Blaga" University, 2014, p. 149, note 719.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 149. Cf. Iuliu-Marius Morariu, "'An Orthodox perspective on political theology," in *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, XVII (2018), no. 49, p. 153.

¹⁰ Vasile Goldiș names him in 1926 secretary general of the Cults and Arts Ministry, and in 1929 he is elected independent deputy for the P.N.Ț. party, proposed by Iuliu Maniu,

past, to give up the typical passivity and to become radical, militant, guerrier (battleful), combative and directed against the "alien" of kin, race, religion and place, but not as a purpose in itself, but rather as a means of discovering and releasing/setting free/liberating the entire hidden potential of the Romanian nation and of the Romanian people - although obviously his humanism, despite his potentially good intentions, concealed a fundamental error of positioning on the interwar political and ideological stage.

Before embarking on the issue of his "political solution", *the ethnocratic state*, it would be important to point out an aspect of how Crainic regards, as a whole, the Romanian democracy through the way of being of the authentic Romanian in relation to the co-inhabitant nations, to "strangers" and, inevitably, to the focal point of the entire right party "emancipatory movement" of the interwar period: *the Jews*. As Andrei Oișteanu observes, starting from a rather rhetorical interrogation, in his work *The image of the Jew in Romanian culture*: "Especially since the middle of the nineteenth century, Romanian intellectuals and politicians preferred to talk about tolerance rather than practice it. Thus, there was a strong insistent discussion and on various tones about a "proverbial" tolerance of the Romanian towards other ethnicities and confessions, a virtue inscribed in a sort of a "genetic code" of the people. Is this a real feature of the Romanian or just one of the many clichés that compose the schematic portrait of the Romanian, in turn, "imaginary"?¹¹ The authentic, true Romanian nurtures an aversion to the image of the "stranger" and, to a certain extent, its anti-Semitism is not assumed, but always present in individual and collective mentality and imagination.

Therefore, this position with regard to a possible inherent religious intolerance, strongly inoculated in the collective identity, which political or cultural discourse rejects, either due to political interests or due to pure cultural-personal conviction, seems to be rather legitimate and valid with regard to the Romanian ethos of the late 19th century and beginning of the 20th century. As Iancu again observes, there is a stereotype of the people that repeats itself at the high levels of society and influences, to a certain extent, the culture and the politics of the time. A stereotype of the good / gentle Romanian, ethnically and religiously tolerant, generous, welcoming, hospitable¹², and pacifist / non-belligerent, open to the new,

¹¹ Andrei Oișteanu, *Imaginea evreului în cultura română. Studii de imagologie în context est-central-european*, 3rd edition, Iași, Polirom, 2012. Cf. Iuliu-Marius Morariu, "Aspects of political theology in the spiritual autobiographies of the Orthodox space? New potential keys of lecture," in *Astra Salvensis*, V (2017), no. 10, p. 131.

¹² Hospitality is a natural derivation of the Christian orthodox tradition which involves the pre-existence and the accomplishment of a rite to passage, but, not always, this hospitality, is one altruistic and in complete acceptance of the „foreigner" in the community and nor does it involve a non-egoistic generosity towards it. Xenophobia remains a possibility in the equation of hospitality – the foreigner gives meaning to the secularized community and to co-shared traditions, accepted within the midst of the archaic or modern communities through the simple fact that it is an assimilation of the foreigner as factor of instability. It is in the human nature to fear what we do not know and we fully or partially accept or understand, thus the foreigner becomes our most feared enemy, and not because he would be, but because his participation to the community's affairs can lead to a re-shaping of the rules and pre-established structures.

"Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its Philosophical Origins – Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism," *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 485-494

cosmopolitan and desirous of European integration and beyond its borders¹³, however, this stereotype is far from the essence of the Romanian. Nationalism, even in its aggravating forms, falls under the same duality. Constantin Rădulescu-Motru supported the same "pseudo-edenic purity" of the Romanian ethos¹⁴ and its spirituality, which is ideologically defined precisely: by naturally rejecting the extreme nationalism with all its derivatives such as anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia, etc.. Political-historical facts would prove to the contrary, denigrating this somewhat false vision of national spirituality "stripped" of any inference of far right nationalism, of a militant political and social theology that would convert a religion into the spearhead of an active and combative militancy. Crainic, on the other hand, was to sense this latent war state more accurately. For the latter, Romanianism as native and customized nationalism must be xenophobic and anti-Semitic¹⁵, and here, unfortunately, he was not mistaken, the emergence of legionaryism, far-right parties and extremist groups, the high adherence of the intellectual elite and young scholars to warlike and extreme socio-political ideas, beliefs and platforms during the interwar period, unfortunately were to be the tangible proof of his perspective.

Hospitality and tolerance, and more precisely the absence or suspension thereof, make Romania a sure prey for anti-Semitism become state policy. Oișteanu points out: "I believe there is a difference between "hospitality" and "tolerance", at least for the Romanian collective mentality of the modern age. Hospitality is a kind of "frivolous tolerance", a feeling of sympathy that does not imply obligations of principle (legalized or institutionalized) and which only manifests itself from time to time for short periods of time. [...]. Hospitality is perceived by Romanians as a great national quality. Instead, tolerance itself is seen as a serious weakness that would allow "aliens" to disobey the Romanians, as an act of foolish kindness, therefore as a serious national flaw." ¹⁶ Crainic plays a magistral role in instrumenting the paths needed to achieve this political apogee, being himself as part of the intellectual elite of interwar times, in accord with this view according to which the "stranger" represents a danger to national identity and sentiment, and tolerance, means acceptance "as a vice"¹⁷. An intolerance, mainly towards Jews, based on racial and religious criteria - religious antisemitism as a state policy - the ethnocratic state, anchored in a "fundamentalist" Christianity, using a radicalized

¹³ Vasile Alecsandri, 10 octombrie 1879, speech held in front of the Senate, apud. Andrei Oișteanu, *Imaginea evreului în cultura română. Studii de imagologie în context est-central-european*, p. 24: "kind, generous, hospitable, intelligent, loving of progress, capable of resembling to the most civilized nations, tolerant regarding the religion".

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 111.

¹⁵ Crainic Nichifor, *Ortodoxie și etnografie*, ed. Constantin Schifirneț, Bucharest, Albatros, București, 1997, p. 111. Cf. Emanuel Cășvean, "'Nichifor Crainic and the Romanian Orthodox Mystique", în *Astra Salvensis*, III (2015), Supplement no. 1, p. 48.

¹⁶ Andrei Oișteanu, *Imaginea evreului în cultura română. Studii de imagologie în context est-central-european*, p. 37.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 38.

and belligerent (reactive) orthodoxism as means of dissemination and "indoctrination". The ethnocratic state comes as a binding solution to counterbalance a highly fallacious system and dangerous for the Romanian national ethos: the democracy. "The idea of tolerance, as the Jews claim on our part, is not Christian, but democratic [...] This is democratic tolerance"¹⁸, tolerance embodied in the Judeo-Freemasonic doctrine"¹⁹ which Crainic sees as a threat to the national identity structured around its Christian-Orthodox nucleus. The tolerated, becomes unaccepted / intolerable, hospitality turns into dissension and racial and religious hatred, the "alien" can no longer be accepted and must be uprooted, limited in actions, removed to the outskirts of society, and even expelled.

According to Crainic, the tolerance of his period is one purely formal at the political, religious or structural level of society, or the state, and is not supported by the popular beliefs deep-rooted from ancient times, nor does it respect the Christian-Orthodox identity of the Romanian people - a "nominal Christianity" - nor does it represent the direction to which the interwar youth, or the interwar society *per se*, should aspire²⁰, in this context the state policy must align with the fundamental essence of the nation, which is in a period of identity loss and moral, religious and functional lethargy, reviving and recovering what democracy had eluded: the authentic Christian faith and national autochthonous identity, in accordance with the teachings of the Holy Scripture, of the Holy Fathers, and observing that simplicity of closed Christian (without immixture) intra-community practical life.

Christian mysticism, as an alter ego of the Romanian people, is emphasized by Crainic in the same article as follows:

„[...] It is rather a vague mysticism in which, in addition to the national element, the Christian element comes as a prestigious title from the remote and ancient historical past. This nominal Christianity is not, in other words, a consciousness but rather a glorious memory. However unquestionably, he will from now on remain a constant suggestion for the ebullition of the youthful soul inclined towards a metaphysical sense of existence.[...]"²¹

From the early 30's, Crainic puts into political practice his theoretical beliefs regarding his mystical-religious missionary activity in order to absolve the individual and the Romanian nation through Christian-Orthodox nationalism²², however, as we have previously said, a racist, xenophobic and antisemitic nationalism, for is it not so, said Crainic later: "[...] Christian nationalism, in the authentic sense of the word, has but one great poet: George Coșbuc, and one great thinker: Nicolae

¹⁸ A-religious, global, permissive and lax.

¹⁹ Nichifor Crainic, *Ortodoxie și etnocrație*, p. 145.

²⁰ Nichifor Crainic „Tineretul și Creștinismul", in *Gândirea*, XIII (1934), no. 3, p. 66. Cf. . Cf. Emanuel Cășvean, ""Nichifor Crainic and the Romanian Orthodox Mystique", în *Astra Salvensis*, III (2015), Supplement no. 1, p. 50.

²¹ Nichifor Crainic „Tineretul și Creștinismul", p. 68.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 68-69.

"Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its Philosophical Origins – Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism," *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 485-494

Paulescu²³, on which he fully founds himself. The nationalism of the brilliant Eminescu is profoundly racist, but the Christian side only preoccupies him tangentially and only in terms of the conservative view²⁴.

Crainic continues to say about Paulescu: "[...] Nicolae Paulescu is an authentic nationalist, like all the others, but he is also an authentic Christian."²⁴ Nevertheless, although the latter does not identify himself as a Darwinist, but on the contrary, by rejecting the specific spontaneity of Darwinism, he is - as Crainic will be, following his steps (from a wider perspective) - a social Darwinist speciesism based on criteria and considerations of religious origin, of selection of the dominant species in general and of one or more "chosen people" in particular. The 4 fundamental social instincts²⁵ that define the human individual are: *family, paternal domination, ownership and affiliation to the nation*. Nationalism (see Christian nationalism) is "a natural instinct of love, rooted in the human being"²⁶ and it is an instinct amply demonstrating the "love of nation"²⁷. We see, therefore, how the refined but dangerous derivation of the Christianity - instinct - nation / nationalism triad is configured and profiled. At this point, the tacit and subversive acceptance of all the possible dangerous implications of Crainic's ethnocentric ultranationalist socio-political project occurs, as well as its "mandatory" theoretical foundation of any such approach.

Behind the Christian love of kin - seen in terms of the aforementioned substratum of the "instinctual evolutionism" – the far right ultranationalist Romanian vindictive movement will hide and justify itself, with all its "destructive" attributes in terms of society and individuals. Although Crainic militates, in our opinion, much too weakly and only superficially, against those potentially dangerous slippage that confuses the Christian love of kin with hatred against the "stranger", respectively against the eugenic derived social and political abominations, demarcating the social bestiality against the instinct²⁸; yet he is not at all as detached and categorical as he would have wanted to seem, continuing by saying, only a few lines below: "[...] Conscious and true nationalism is one that assures the normal functioning of social instincts, which aim at the preservation and perfection of the natural, biological unity of a bloodline"²⁹ - raising questions

²³ Crainic being a fervent follower of the political and social-national Christian convictions, extreme right, of Prof. Dr. Nicolae Paulescu, with an opening toward social Eugenia and social Darwinism, even though he rejects Darwinism as a theory of species, there is nevertheless a mechanism of selection based on instinct, proposed by Paulescu, and for which Crainic congratulates him, which eventually leads to social Eugenia. An evolutionism]n a Darwinist equation, but, this time, on creationist criteria – in the name of God – true, not spontaneously but directed and governed by the hand of the holly "selection", even so with such a similar result. Cf. Nichifor Crainic, *Ortodoxie și etnocrație*, p. 130.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 128.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 132.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 131

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 132-133.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 133.

by the simple manner by which he relates, defining the relation between nationalism and social instincts, as well as their goals on a supra-individual level and, unfortunately, much less uninvolved (as we have explained above). Crainic, by praising Paulescu, further maintains his own perspective regarding the vices of dominant political theories such as liberalism, socialism and communism, connecting them with the biologic-Christian moral conception of vices or passions, of "deviated natural instincts". Liberalism is assimilated to drunkenness; socialism, to lust; Bolshevism, to the passions of property³⁰.

Liberalism, through individualist and extortionist capitalism, went beyond the limit of the normal instinct of ownership, accumulating, on behalf of some, riches in absurdity.

Socialism and communism, pursuing the destruction of the sense of individual property, only tend in reality to expropriation of Christian people and the appropriation of Israel to the whole earth. The role of this anti-Christian nation [of the Jewish people A/N] in the formation of modern anarchist ideologies and revolutionary initiatives is shown by Paulescu with dates, with doctrinal extracts, with illustrations of own names, with an abundance of elements and a limited judgment, to which nothing can withstand."³¹

Following the above, in replying to Motru, Crainic emphasizes his radicalized view of the main weakness of democracy (implicitly of Western capitalism that he promotes) as follows: "... capitalist egoism is indeed a totally modern emergence in Romanian life. It is contemporaneous with the pașoptism (fourtyeight – ideology of participants to the 1848 Revolution). Pașoptism is a collapse of Romanianism from the ecumenical spirituality. It is nationalist, but it is no longer Orthodox. Capitalist egotism, politicianism or everyone's sacrifice in the interest of oligarchy, cultural pornography, simulation in political and social institutions are now emerging. This era is an eruption of evil impulses unleashed from the discipline of the Christian spirit."³² - ergo, because it is the engine and promoter of the loss of identity of the Romanians defined by a loss of the "purity" characteristic, orthodoxy with its autochthonous character, because this (identitary and native) nationalism is inextricable and indissociably from Christianity and it is a mark of the Romanian people³³. This loss, implicitly in Crainic's opinion, entails a moral, cultural, ethnographic and socio-political degradation, respectively a lethargic impassibility "dangerous" for the nation and people. Orthodoxy is, according to Crainic, the generating and self-regenerative force, the primordial principle³⁴.

All these arguments that we have given here are just the tip of the ice-berg regarding a very complex debate upon the link between Crainic's work and the

³⁰ *Ibidem*. Emanuel Cășvean, "Nichifor Crainic and the Romanian Orthodox Mystique", în *Astra Salvensis*, III (2015), Supplement no. 1, p. 46-53; Iuliu-Marius Morariu, "Nichifor Crainic și Gândirea", in *Tabor*, IX (2015), no. 3, p. 31.

³¹ Nichifor Crainic, p. 134.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 124.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 128.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 128.

"Social and Political Nationalism of the Romanian Interwar Period and its Philosophical Origins – Nichifor Crainic in the Light of Far-Right Ultra-Nationalism," *Astra Salvensis*, VI (2018), no. 12, p. 485-494

extreme right movement, but we have probably, at least partially, shown that the emergence of his philosophical and political convictions are by no means random and they show proof a ripening of a long history of intertwining between nationalism and the acceptance of the foreigner among romanian traditional communities.