

Uncovering Romania by Geography

A Study on How Geography in Romania Cultivated Lands and Romanians

COSMINA PAUL

This work contributes to the understanding of how the institutionalisation of geography as a science and discipline empowered the Romanian elites' nationalist discourse before World War Two. Far from being an objective, neutral and value-free science, geography invented new worlds and served to the expansion of imperialist powers. By the same token, with the same colonial instruments, it served to legitimise the Romanian nationalist elite in its state building endeavour. Older than time, geography overcame history and, closely following the German model, proved that borders are primarily ethnic. More permanent than historicity, geography proves that the Romanian state was authentic, natural and organic and justified the pursuit of the only Romanian colonial project, Dobrogea, as it deplored irredentist processes in Transylvania, Bukovina and Bessarabia. Dismissed as descriptive and non-intellectual since the 19th century, geography ended up playing a significant role in supporting the successful story of Romanian nation building.

Introduction

“To take the country out from the unknown,” were the words Carol I – the would-be king of Romania – used to address various Romanian scientists of the time (1875) for the foundation of the National Geographic Society, following the model of royal societies at the time. Putting geography into the light was to take people, and land, out of

the darkness, to discover them, to describe them, to represent them. Simply, it was about embodying a nation. The United Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia were recognised in 1859 by the Western powers, and in the years that followed, Romania incorporated Dobrogea (1878), Transylvania, Bukovina and Bessarabia (1918). Greater Romania materialised within its *natural borders and so nationalism had to be pursued to consolidate these borders*.

Cosmina
Paul

Greater Romania came to be seen as a natural body and, consequently, its hygiene and redemption were looked for. 'To take the country out from the unknown' was, first of all, a geographical endeavour and it came to have a twofold meaning: showing the Western powers that Romanians are a nation in the full sense of the term historically: people connected to their land since time immemorial, and simultaneously, showing Romanians that their immemorial being is sacred. The religious ritualisation of nationalism educated the interwar generation of the Legion of the Archangel Michael, the largest social mass movement from Central and Eastern Europe, supported by the father of Romanian geography, Simion Mehedinti-Soveja, a geographer and pedagogue. This is the first work inquiring into the relationship between geography, nationalism and extremism in Romania¹.

This work focuses on how the institutionalisation of geography, as an academic discipline, has been a strong impetus in the construction of the modern Romanian nation. Typically, when scholars look at the nation-building process through discourse theory, they tend to see the manifold ways through which history has been instrumentalised for creating a nationalist collective imagery but scant attention has been given to geography. Scholars continue to look at geography as the stepsister of history; a sub-discipline in nation building discourses. But it was geography and not history that was the science that formed the first and foremost cultural prerequisites in building the national imagery, and it is the discipline of history which comes secondary to these nationalistic endeavours.

This article opens discussion over the centrality played by geography in building the Romanian nation since the beginning of the 20th century until WWII. It first discusses how mapping land and people substantially helped in the legitimisation of colonial expansion and how, by the same token, such techniques empowered nationalism: it was with these same colonial tools that Romania constructed its nation, envisioned a "homeland," and further carried out its colonial and irre-

dentist projects in the aftermaths of 1878 and 1918. The second part of this work discusses how geography entered academia at the end of the 19th century, how it was politically instrumentalised to result in evolutionary theories, and how it has since been contested as an object of study². The paper then explores Romanian geographical textbooks as well as geographers' works in order to understand how they both construct the imaginary homeland and establish the discourse on the Romanian ethnic ontology, going beyond history while proving the Romanian ancestral nature and uniqueness. The last part focuses on the biographies of the Romanian geographers in order to emphasise their intellectual genealogy into the German school of geography.

The emphasis on different layers of the institutionalisation of geography – as an academic discipline – has the wider relevance of showing that they actually mirror the imperial discourses and practices at the time. And so, this work advances Arendt's proposal of looking at the domestic policies as being on a continuum with the imperial practices, but not of being two merely distinct ways of doing politics³. So, if we can now look now at the German imperial politics of ordering, racialisation and purification as a way to inform and to also understand more about domestic German politics, we can take the thesis further and see that the well-educated Romanian petite bourgeoisie from the universities of imperial Germany, were coming back home to build a sacred Romanian race through the learned tools of or discriminating between nations and creating a class of others.

The most prominent scholars investigating the idea of the nation and national identity (e.g. Kedourie, Anderson, Gellner, Hobsbawm and Smith) bifurcate the debate along the question of whether the idea of the nation is a natural manifestation or a cultural construction. Whatever the case may be, instrumentalism overcame the debate by emphasising nationalism's relation to modernisation such as the new national states of the 19th century which lacked the nation but not the elites to construct it. The Romanian university establishment, inspired by the Western model, is part of the process of building a national elite, and by the turn of the 20th century the marriage between politics and intellectuals in constructing the nation was cemented. Nationalism was also intimately connected to religion⁴ in Romania and here again, the role of intellectuals, was to become more poignant. How geography contributed to the study of the relationship between nationalism, religion and modernity, received far less attention than its more pres-

tigious bedfellow, history. If, one century ago, geography was seen as adjacent to the study of history and relegated to the status of a gymnasial discipline (indeed to never fully prove its academic status ever since), the study of nationalism did not pay close attention to geography. However blunt and contested the process of institutionalising geography was, it brought people and lands to the table of power and contributed to how modernity started.

*Uncovering
Romania by
Geography*

Theorising on Nations and Nationalism in Europe and Romania

Winichakul revitalised the studies on nationalism producing the idea that the geo-body was constructed closely to the advance of geography at the time and, progressively, replaced traditional ways of envisioning belonging and difference.⁵ A reflexive reading of colonialism in Western Europe had shown the importance of geography in the project of colonial expansion⁶ and Anderson, who coined the concept of nation as an “imagined community,” recognised the importance of mapping these processes in the nationalist imagination. Liulevicius’s recent work on the transition from geography as imagining ‘land and people’ to geography as imagining ‘space and race’ shows the permeability of geography to political projects and equally how geography may bring out political projects. Specifically, he referred to Germany’s eastern expansion, and argued that the process of evolution from German nationalism to eastern colonialism is what brought on WWII⁷. Nonetheless, one should not forget that Germany in the last three decades of the 19th century became an imperial power and that it was also the time when most of European colonies’ land was appropriated. Therefore, mapping was used both for colonising and for nationalising projects; they are different sides to the same coin.

Yet, another insufficiency in studying Central, Eastern and Southern European nationalism is borne out of the projected cleavage between colonialism and nationalism although both processes centre on empowering an elite over a land. In the case of Romania, it was a nationalist elite educated in the West who carried out the nationalist project and gradually inflicted the national sentiment over Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman mille—now the subjects of the Romanian state. I argue that the Romanian elite, at that time, was also using colonial instruments in order to construct the Romanian nation and to look to its people, while the map became one of the most powerful tools in

defining the people and inspiring patriotic education. Mapping borders and people came to be seen as a first tool in empowering land expansion and legitimising power over the land. The only Romanian colonial land, Dobrogea, had been undertaken afterwards and Romania exited WWI with its land redrawn and almost doubled.⁸ There was nothing more to hope for than retaining its achievements. During such dramatic changes, geography remained constant in representing the homeland of the Romanians. The geography textbook at the turn of the century was entitled *Romania and the Land Inhabited by Romanians* therefore bearing from its very inception the irredentist dream.

Soon after the fulfilling of the irredentist dream, Simion Mehedinti published a work on the Romanian people and his relation to the alien elements (*Vechimea poporului român si legătura cu elementele alogene*, Bucuresti 1924) revealing the unity of the Romanian nation and showing contempt towards the others, especially the Jews and the Gypsies as corrupting biological and social forces. From its inception, the work of Mehedinti, who chaired the Department of Geography at the University in Bucharest from 1900 until the end of the interwar period, bore the same conception over the racial unity of the Romanian people as an historical mission.

In the second half of the 19th century, geography was seen as a mistress of history in the process of university institutionalisation in Europe and its colonies. The same was the case of Romania, which closely followed Western models, and so, reluctance and distrust towards geography might be read even in the relegation of delegating textbook writing to a woman though later on, when geography entered the university, men took over. Its institutionalisation remains a contested process from its inception, to be further discredited when Ivy League members, faithfully following Harvard University's 1948 decision, closed their Departments of Geography in the immediate post-war period to reopen later (Harvard was never to reconsider its initial decision).⁹

Answering the question of how old geography is was thought to be the legitimisation of a discipline. There was a presumed continuity in studying geography since antiquity but, at that time, it was only a device to help with the localisation of historical events. New land discoveries and travellers contributed to the advance of geographical knowledge but they were not the reason for academic geography's foundation; they wrote stories and descriptions without claiming to

lay the foundation for a discipline. There were stories and descriptions to be told at Geographical Royal Societies meeting or carried out by the Societies' members themselves, in order to advance knowledge of cultures, flora and fauna, but not geography as a work of synthesis over land and people, as it was defined later.

Neither was it the tradition of cosmography since the 17th century, which was taught in universities and concerns the study of the earth placed in the universe but not of the earth in itself, the very reason for geography's foundation. Actually, geography constitutes an academic discipline following the advance of evolutionary theories in the second half of the 19th century, which brought along the comparative perspective and the work of synthesis. The linkages between land and people were following other universal laws, which were found in nature, geo-nature and in the universe. The first work seen as geographical was Humboldt's "Cosmos" that shows similar laws between universal and terrestrial worlds and Ritter's work on the connections between geography and human history. They switch the focus, revealing how land and its history might help understand human history. The Romanian National Geographic Society emulates the tradition of travelling and expeditors have been encouraged to travel for stories since its foundation in 1875.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it was only later, in 1892, when Mehedinti was sent westward to study geography, and he ended up in Leipzig, under Ratzel's supervision, the author of anthropogeographie and political geography.

*Cosmina
Paul*

The Advent of Political Geography

The short interlude between the process of naming and defining geography and its academic establishment showed that discovering new worlds and colonial expansion of Germany in the last three decades of the 19th century played an important role, but I argue that the final stroke was the theory of evolution developed at the time. In just one world, different worlds evolved and land, nature, and people seemed to follow the same rules. Starting from that, geography reclaimed the right to synthesis and universality, which enables any science to exist and be recognised as such. Its object of study was still debated at the time, when Mehedinti returned to Romania (1900) and assumed chairmanship of geography; he played a fundamental role in defining the discipline's object. His work was not translated and he patronised the discipline until 1942 when he retired, and his work remains crucial for

geography's institutionalisation.

Mehedinti pleaded for a universalist understandings of the science of geography with different branches but emphasised that a synthesis of geographic knowledge is possible. He was also an advocate of anthropogeography in Romania, a term and a discipline coined by Ratzel, and a vision born out of the presumed connection between land and people, with perilous similarities in the laws of biological and zoological species. Geography adopted the instruments of colonialism to nationalism, by the objectification of the land and people. In the case of Romania, anthropology and ethnography were much embedded in the geographical research. It was not Darwinism as much as Lamarckianism (explaining adaptation in nature) which became the chosen theory of Mehedinti in his arguments for the continuity and authenticity of the Romanian people, but not for their influences or incorporation by others.

Anthropogeography was so ambitious that it encompassed ethnography, Christian religion and history on the one hand, and also the mapping, naming and locating, on the other hand. Dobrogea, the only Romanian colony, became one of the first projects. Crucial importance was seen in bringing geographical knowledge to Transylvania, Bukovina, Dobrogea and Maramures, as another way of possessing land. Ethnogeography and ethnopedagogy were employed in order to discover people and represent them through means of colonial knowledge production. Therefore, how Romanian geography became a science with which to cultivate both lands and people until the end of WWII was a forgotten history.

It was not only that the education became national, multiplied at a scale as never before, but it was also that the new education radically changed the very traditional way of understanding 'who are we?' First of all, the sensitive words of seeing and hearing, i.e. seeing the horizon of the village and hearing the church bells of the community, were replaced by maps' representations: building an abstract mode of thinking of belonging and difference, taking the same world to a larger scale. If the traditional world used to be represented through *here* and *there*, where *here* was the community and *there* was everything over the village margin, now the world became that of a *here* which means a country and a *there* which means everything over the national border. When the peasants' children started going to school, their whole old imagery was transformed. Now they could see, by the power of

representation, the maps of the living Romanians, a language community, which proved for the case of Romania how singular this country was. By representing the nation as being of Latin origin surrounded by Slavic languages, the singularity and the estrangement of the others was revealed.

The abstract representation of the map was maybe the most powerful instrument in creating the new home, the new national identity and strangers. Representing Romania through people and not by the country's borders, the irredentist dream became present for the first time in the imagery construct of the world of the children, the future soldiers. Nevertheless, the superstitious repertoire had also been transferred onto a larger scale as the religious mind-set had not been shaken, but rather empowered, as we may analyse further; there was indeed no need to give up religion in becoming national. All the same, if history gives the right to a nation over the land, there is geography that gives to that right an allure of a sacred nature. Therefore, the geography textbooks did not distance people from religion but enforced the mystical vocabulary of land, the world's beginnings, borders, strangers, here and there, and catastrophe. Mehedinti, also published geographical works and educational books to guide the new generation in the values of church and nationalism: *To the New Generation* (Pentru noua generatie, 1912), *Other Growth: the Work School* (1919); *The Romanian School and the biological capital of the Romanian people* (Scoala romana si capitalul biologic al poporului roman, 1927), *For our Church* (Pentru biserica noastra, 1911).

The Body, the Geo-Body and Romanian National Identity

The metaphor of the body expresses a collective identity, being it race, species, or ethnicity; 'the body was of one blood, one race and one will; it could allow no foreign contamination, no impurities or mixes.'¹¹ Therefore, I take on the metaphor of the body as it appears in the intellectual construction of the Romanian national identity in order to emphasise on the ethnic unity and to show the multiple ways in which the metaphor was used. Here, the debate can be reconceptualised when we see the nation through the lens of the Christian idea of body. This concept illuminates mutability when we follow its occurrences through incarnation, Eucharist and resurrection. That was the way of becoming or re-becoming truly Romanian for all people who lived in the Romanian territories, except for the Jews and the Gypsies. The first

are refused the belonging as not being Christian as Article 7 from the 1866 Constitution stated, and both are excluded for their blood. I also inquire about the unmovable assumptions of static ethnicity that the Romanians have always shared, closer to the German discourse of race given by the “rational” discourse of modernity. The Christian identity Romanian elites, in the discursive construction of collective identity, represent nation through Christianity and ethnicity—as an exclusive way of being Romanian, an exclusive way of belonging. Consequently, much of the state elite and popular discourses in Romania pivoted on corporeal assertions about being national. As everyone was suffering, Romania had a heart; as interests were the same, Romania had a mind; as everyone was Christian, Romania had to be redeemed. And, as everyone was part of a whole, Romania had a body (trup).

The body means unity and so does the geo-body. There is always a double reading of the intention and so is the case of drawing borderlines. When politicians set national borders they were meant to unite. The same thought the geographers. De Martonne completed the Wilsonian principle of ethnic borders, with the principle of territorial viability, geographical and infrastructural unity. De Martonne, a leading international geographer enamoured of Romania ever since the beginning of his career, who commenced his career with a doctoral thesis, *La Valachie* (1902), and continued working and defending the right of the Romanians over Transylvania as well as the Romanian intervention in WWI, helped in drawing-up the frontiers after the war.¹² Even though the national borders drawn were meant to unite, they were dividing as never before. Therefore, if the imperial borders were passable, the national ones were not. Geographical borders are as much natural as they are ethnic and as much ethnic as they are natural. The Romanian maps drawn in the textbooks represented Romania not by its state borders but by its ethnic borders.¹³ Here, Romanian irredentism might be read. The river Prut borders the Romanian state on the East but ethnic Romanians live up to the river Nistru, which marks its natural/ethnic border, and so are the margins of the imagined map. In the West there are the Carpathians Mountains, seen by the Hungarians as naturally dividing Romania and Hungary but it was Romanian geographers who argued that they are not a natural border but the very spine of Romanian lands. It was the river Tisa that marked the natural westward border of the Old Kingdom as the national poem goes: ‘From Tisa to the Nistru’s tide / All Romania’s people cried / That they could

no longer stir / For the rabbled foreigner.¹⁴ Therefore, the map became the most powerful tool in imagining the country and the nation, and so the authors of the geographical textbooks concluded that ‘we travelled in our minds the land inhabited by Romanians.’¹⁵

But one should not overlook that a map representation is just one of many other possible representations and yet also a metaphor. The introduction of the textbook refers to the introduction to the belonging to Europe’s superiority:

Europe is entirely situated in the temperate area, meaning exactly there where the climate influences at its best on people, making them diligent and smarter. Situated above in the middle of the continental hemisphere, near the all other continents, made more easier the communication with the other continents and led to their subjugation by Europeans.¹⁶

Political, ethnic, national, demographic and religious maps are ways of representing the body of the nation and therefore they institutionalise belonging and loyalty. To help pupils read the map, the authors of textbooks compared the country to a sun and the ‘oppressed people living under the rule of foreigners are like the radiuses of the sun.’¹⁷ Comparing Romania to the sun became another everlasting image in the nationalist discourse; ‘I vow to God that I shall make Romania in the likeness of the holy sun in the sky,’ was the oath taken by extreme right legionnaires of the First World War generation. The natural borders also constructed natural enemies, the Russians and the Hungarians – those who cannot be trusted, cannot be befriended and who oppressed, at that time, the Romanian people and prevented national fraternity to be materialised.

The borders are ethnographic and anthropological units. Every branch of geography created regions, biological, geodesic, hydrographic units, and consequently, by using the same methodology, people became categorised. The categorisation and stereotypification of people encouraged racism, chauvinism and the colonial expansion in the second part of the 19th century; inasmuch as people are mapped, discovered and taught, people are objectified and the discourses on the “other” versus “us” are constructed on the immutable differences of blood and land. In the work of Mehedinti, Eskimos, Australians, and Romanians are represented based on immutable differences born out of a land and of genetics, which also illuminates on the character of the people.¹⁸ Difference was meant to explain one’s unity as the nationalist

*Cosmina
Paul*

discourse strongly relies on the image of the stranger inasmuch answer to the question “who are we?” They also bring the theme of the internal traitors, here the Gypsies and the Jews in the United Principalities and Greek-Catholics in Transylvania during the interwar period, which spoiled the authentic character of the Romanians and were feared of betrayal. Homeland is an imagery concept as powerful as the nation, since the country land may be grasped only in one’s mind. The land was to bear the ontology and the unity of the people and their rural roots should not be betrayed by Western emulation, seen as ‘forms without roots.’

As geography was born out of the nationalist discourse, it also draws heavily on religious vocabulary. The chosen people, the chosen book, the chosen land, and martyrdom are present in any nationalist endeavour. The national poet Mihai Eminescu was the mind that thinks for all Romanians and, and the heart that suffers for all Romanians. His poems ‘are the Scripture meant to heal the pains of his people.’¹⁹ From this perspective, three theses are found in the memoirs and anthropogeography work of Mehedinti: ‘We are Christians before Christianity,’ ‘None can be a full human being if he is not Christian,’ and ‘Who does not appreciate Eminescu is not a truly Romanian.’²⁰ Both advancing knowledge and myth-making builds the national imagery. And so geography progressed.

As geography was older than history, it could add pre-historical settings by and through itself. The Romanian pre-historicity is an everlasting theme in the Romanian nationalist discourse and continued during the early post-Communist years. Geography issued a birth certificate to Romanians showing the continuity of the Dacians, who survived the Roman Empire colonisation processes, but were not born out of colonisation, as the historians had believed. Therefore, even though lacking documents and just imagining the land, the geographer could assert permanence of the Romanians from pre-historical times within their territory. And it is that which gives the promise of eternity to the people. Since geography owns the ancestral, primordial and immemorial times with a force only granted to folklore, ethnographic work was pursued arduously. Mehedinti, George Valsan, Ion Concea, Constantin S. Nicolaescu Plopsor, were geographers and ethnographers as well. Moreover, anthropogeography goes further than history because it shows not only the past, but the living past. Permanence and unity, the authenticity of the Romanian people, are

the same forever and will stay the same forever; 'We, the Romanians, want to be what we are: sons of our parents, followers of our forefathers.'²¹ Changes in time were overcome and it was only geography that could go beyond them.

Another key shift from history to geography was given by replacing the thesis of a nomadic people to the one of a trans-human people and so establishing the centrality of the relationship between man and nature helped transfer a mystical connection to the land. Equally, nationalistic portrayals of nomadic Hungarians, Tatars, Gypsies and Jews, became everlasting images of the stranger in the Romanian collective imagery, while Germans were merely guests. The state is seen as organic and the natural consequence of becoming Romanian. The Jews and the Gypsies were considered incapable of reaching the momentum to become neither a people nor a nation and therefore they were denied a state.

While the German discourse became radicalised so did Romanian nationalism and the pre-eminence of geographical discourse over people. It follows closely the eugenics project as the only way to redemption. The curve of ethnic values (infra-homines, sana mediocritas, super homines) is constructed by Mehedinti at the end of his work, 'Premises and Conclusions to Terra' where he states that

We all know well today that if we watch "the pure lines", the return to an inferior type, recessivity, is no longer possible. And the curve of the ethnic values shows us the way to select creatures [...] the deformed and infirm individuals are a kind of trash of the specie, rejected by the healthy crowd [...] here is the key to progress, to wipe out the trash, then to select out of the crowd the best developed sample in order to assure the inheritance of the traits worth to be praised.²²

Conclusion

Three filiations contributed to the formation of the geographers in Romania. They are all, in themselves, phenomena of estrangement and return; the leaving of home and the coming back home, would have bear profound symbolical meanings. The first one is the journey of studying abroad, an intellectual endeavour having Paris, Berlin and Leipzig²³ as centres where geography was about to be institutionalised and professors were lecturing on geography. Lebensraum, organic state, geopolitics, anthropogeography and ethnogeography were

invented and manipulated *avant la letter*. The latter conceptualisation of their work will always draw from this genealogy. From Paris, Mehedinti reached Leipzig where Ratzel was teaching. Valsan studied in Paris and Berlin, Bratescu also chose Leipzig, Popescu, was also a student of Ratzel and von Richthofen.²⁴ The first one chaired geography in Bucharest until the end of the WWII, Valsan came to Transylvania to chair the Department of Geography after WWI and Popescu taught, starting from 1908, at the University of Iasi, antropogeography and the geography of continents.²⁵ Another key moment is the returning home which awoken conscience. Mehedinti, before graduating from Leipzig, spent two years in Soveja, his birth village, and in his later memoirs that will be seen as 'the return of the lost son.' Merutiu immigrated to Romania in 1905 just to return in Transylvania in 1918 to contribute to the establishment of the geography in university. The last one will be the symbolical return to a symbolical home: the homeland. In the 1990s, homage was given to Mehedinti-Soveja equally by new extreme right movement, by geographers and by pedagogues as a Romanian Christian scientist. As his prestige was restored along the lines of other nationalist historians, his work celebrated for its present relevance in teaching the new generation in Christian nationalist values. In 1992, he was reburied in a funeral ceremony in Soveja. His geographical works continue to be mentioned but much more attention has been giving to his works on religion and pedagogy, which were largely republished, and inasmuch attention was giving to his biography (Victor Tufescu, Luminita Draghicescu, Costica Neagu, Aurel Popescu).²⁶

Romanian geography, as a discipline and science, shares along its intellectual filiations an ambiguous genealogy: while serving to modernise culture, it simultaneously acted as an anti-moderniser in promoting formations of ethnicity and Christian spirituality; while serving to emancipate people it ended up in an eugenic ethno-pedagogical endeavour. So far, no critical study of Romanian geography – and its founders – as a nationalist project, *per se*, has been conducted and no explicit links to Romanian colonialism (i.e. Dobrogea) and its irredentism have been revealed. It is hoped that this work inspires such research.

Cosmina Paul is affiliated to the National School of Political and Ad-

ministrative Science in Bucharest and Babes Bolyai University, in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration. She may be reached at: cosmina.paul@fspac.ro

** Author's note: This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-RU-PD-2011-3-0176.

Cosmina
Paul

Notes

- 1 Works dealing with the concepts of 'national essence' and 'ethnic ontology' were drawn (until the end of WWII) from historical writings but not geographical works. See Liviu Neagoe (2010), 'De la "esență națională" la "ontologie etnică:" fundamente filosofice ale naționalismului românesc,' *Series Historica*, pp. 357-366; Sorin Antohi (1999), *Civitas imaginalis. Istorie și utopie în cultura română*, Iasi: Polirom.
- 2 Alan Dingsdale (2002), *Mapping Modernities: Geographies of Central and Eastern Europe, 1920-2000*, Routledge: London (UK) and John A Mathweys and David T. Herbert (2008), 'Geography: The World is our Stage,' in *Geography, A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford UP.
- 3 Hannah Arendt (2004 version), *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, London: Harcourt, pp. 123-158.
- 4 Rogers Brubaker (2011), 'Religion and Nationalism: Four Approaches,' *Nations and Nationalism*, 18, pp. 2-20.
- 5 Thongchai Winichakul (1994), *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geobody of a Nation*, University of Hawai'i Press.
- 6 John Solomos and Les Back (1997), *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 1-33.
- 7 Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius (2004), *War, Land on the Eastern Front: Culture National Identity and German Occupation in World War I*, Cambridge UP.
- 8 Constantin Iordachi (2001), "'The California of the Romanians:" The Integration of Northern Dobrogea into Romania: 1878-1913," in Balazs Trencsealnyi, Drago Petrescu, Cristina Petrescu, Constantin Iordachi and Zoltan Kalntor (eds) (2001), *Nation Building and Contested Identities: Romanian and Hungarian Case Studies*, Budapest and Iasi: Polirom, pp. 121-153.
- 9 Richard Wright and Nathalie Koch (2009), 'Geography in the Ivy League,' available at: www.dartmouth.edu/~geog/IvyGeog.pdf (accessed 12 April 2012).
- 10 The first explorers sponsored by the SRS. were Iuliu Popper in Patagonia, Assan in northern Canada, Ghica in Somalia, Racovita in Antarctica. See Vintila Mihailescu (1967), *Simion Mehedinti: Opere alese*, Bucuresti: Stiintifica, p. 31.

- 11 Erik Ringman (1998), 'Nationalism: The Idiocy of Intimacy,' in *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49:4, pp. 534-549.
- 12 Gavin Bowd (2012), *Un géographe français et la Roumanie: Emmanuel de Martonne (1873-1955)*, Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 85-167.
- 13 Murgoci and Burca (1905), *Romania si tarile locuite de romani cu o introducere generala asupra Europei si notiuni de cosmografie. Manual pentru clasa a IV-a secundara*, Bucuresti: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Gobl.
- 14 Mihai Eminescu, *Doina*, a well-known melancholic Romanian folk song.
- 15 Murgoci si Burca, *Manual pentru clasa a IV-a secundara*, p. 260.
- 16 Murgoci si Burca, *Romania si tarile locuite de romani cu o introducere generala asupra Europei si notiuni de cosmografie. Manual pentru clasa a IV-a secundara*, p. 1.
- 17 Ibid, p. 22.
- 18 Simion Mehedinti (2007 version), *Antropogeografia. Pentru clasa a VI-a secundara*, Focsani: Terra.
- 19 Simion Mehedinti (1946), *Premise si concluzii la Terra: Aminitiri si Marturisiri*, Bucuresti: Monitorul Oficial si Imprimeriile Statului, p. 237.
- 20 Simion Mehedinti (1995 version), *Crestinismul Romanesc: Adaos la caracterizarea etnografica a poporului roman*, Anastasia, Bucuresti; Simion Mehedinti (1929), *Parabole si Invataturi pentru clasa a II-a secundara. Carte aprobata de Ministerul Culturii Nationale si al Cultelor si de Sf. Sinodi*, Editia a VIII-a (cu o harta), Bucuresti: Cugetarea – Georgescu Delafras, Fd. Libreriei Socec.
- 21 'Noi romanii vrem sa fim ceea ce suntem: fii ai parintilor, urmasi ai stramosilor,' Simion Mehedinti (1912), *Catre noua generatie*, Bucuresti: Minerva.
- 22 Mehedinti (1912), p. 244.
- 23 Grigore P. Pop (1999), *Geografia la Universitatea din Cluj in perioada 1919-1947*, Cluj Napoca, p. 31.
- 24 Victor Tufescu, *Simion Mehedinti: Viata si Opera*, Bucuresti: Enciclopedica, 1994.
- 25 Alexandru Ungureanu (2010), 'Scoala de geografie umana de la Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iasi, *Geograful: Revista de informare, analiza, cultura si opinie geografica*, 3, pp. 3-15.
- 26 A doctoral dissertation centered on the benefits of developing a Christian national education, as it was conceptualised by Simion Mehedinti and Luminita Draghicescu (2009), *Simion Mehedinti, teoretician al educatiei*, Bucuresti: Editura Didactica si Pedagogica.