



Fairy-tale prince or voivode? Royalist propaganda and theories of monarchy under Carol II of Romania

Philippe Henri Blasen

To cite this article: Philippe Henri Blasen (24 Mar 2024): Fairy-tale prince or voivode? Royalist propaganda and theories of monarchy under Carol II of Romania, History of European Ideas, DOI: [10.1080/01916599.2024.2332840](https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2024.2332840)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2024.2332840>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 24 Mar 2024.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Fairy-tale prince or voivode? Royalist propaganda and theories of monarchy under Carol II of Romania

Philippe Henri Blasen

Université du Luxembourg, Luxembourg, Germany

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the self-portrayal of the 'Royal Dictatorship' of Carol II of Romania and analyses four theories of monarchy produced or published under his regime. It shows that the Romanian 'Royal Dictatorship' relied on leitmotifs targeting the multiparty system, territorial revisionism, and the Iron Guard, but that it lacked a coherent official doctrine. The article argues that this void allowed for Romanian theorists of monarchy to draw divergent, Western or (pseudo-)autochthonous genealogies for the regime. To this effect, it examines theories of monarchy by Mihail Fărcășanu, Paul Negulescu, Cezar Petrescu, and Theodor Vlădescu.

KEYWORDS

Romania; monarchy;
parliamentarism;
nationalism; antisemitism;
maurassianism

This article examines the self-portrayal of King Carol II of Romania's personal regime, the so-called 'Royal Dictatorship' (February 1938–September 1940),¹ and discusses four theories of monarchy produced or published during this period in Romania. It argues that the absence of a coherent official doctrine allowed for Romanian theorists of monarchy to draw divergent, Western or (pseudo-)autochthonous genealogies for the regime, with different roles for both the king and parliament.

Carol II imposed a regime change at a time when other monarchs had already done the same or were considering doing so. There was a transnational flow of ideas, themes, theories, laws, and structures, among authoritarian regimes, parties, and movements.² In Romania's case, an obvious model was the 6 January Dictatorship in neighbouring Yugoslavia. Romanian theorists of monarchy used the same theme as King Aleksandar I Karađorđević concerning an unmediated connection between king and nation.³ In Aleksandar's case, however, 'nation' meant a united Yugoslav nation as opposed to the distinct nations of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, etc.,⁴ while in Romania's case, 'nation' stood for the demographically and politically predominant Romanian ethnicity, as compared to the large Hungarian, German, Jewish, Ukrainian, etc. minorities.⁵ Similarly, Carol II's regime played the anti-'politicianism' card against the political parties, as did King Leopold III of the Belgians, who claimed to fight against the self-interested parties.⁶ Yet, in Carol's case, the chief problem was his conflict with the head of the main opposition party (the National Peasants' Party), as well as with the leader of the far-right Iron Guard. Themes to justify a 'royal dictatorship' could thus be formally identical, but semantically different. This article aims at contributing to the general discussion about themes and theories common to authoritarian monarchic regimes by uncovering their peculiarities in the Romanian context.

CONTACT Philippe Henri Blasen  philippe.blasen@uni.lu  University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg, C2DH Germany

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

1. The origins of Carol II's regime

Carol was the eldest child of Ferdinand of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, who had succeeded his uncle King Carol I of Romania as Ferdinand I in 1914. On 12 December 1925, Prince Carol renounced his rights to the throne,⁷ which resulted in a regency for his underage son Mihai upon the death of his father Ferdinand on 20 July 1927. Carol returned to Romania on 6 June 1930 and, on 8 June, was proclaimed King Carol II by parliament,⁸ an event which became known as the 'Restoration'.

Carol's 'dynastic authoritarianism'⁹ eventually led to a personal regime. After the ruling National Liberal Party lost the elections in December 1937, the king appointed a minority government on 28 December¹⁰ – the antisemitic Octavian Goga cabinet¹¹ – to enable the transition to personal rule.¹² On 10 February 1938, the king staged a coup, appointing a national unity government under the premiership of the Orthodox Patriarch Miron Cristea.¹³ This cabinet signed off a new constitution on 20 February¹⁴ to replace the 1923 one. Unconstitutionally 'approved' in an open-ballot¹⁵ and manipulated¹⁶ plebiscite, the 1938 constitution increased the king's prerogatives. After Carol had dissolved parliament on 18 January 1938,¹⁷ the new constitution allowed the king to rule by decree – to be ratified later – while parliament was dissolved,¹⁸ and to adjourn parliament for one year.¹⁹ It restricted parliament's right of legislative initiative to 'laws in the common interest of the state', while keeping the king's rights intact,²⁰ and made the ministers politically accountable only to the king.²¹

On 30 March, Carol disbanded the political parties.²² However, his new constitution did not abolish the parliamentary system, yielding perhaps to the political establishment and popular demand. According to a police report, on 23 February, a peasant from northeastern Romania had declared: 'I'd just like us to have voting rights, we don't need parties any longer';²³ another, referring to rumours, said: 'They say in our village that not all of us will keep our voting rights. We'd like to vote.'²⁴

On 15 December, the king created a single party, the Front of National Rebirth (FNR)²⁵ and, on 9 May 1939, he decreed a new electoral law²⁶ and scheduled elections for 1–2 June.²⁷ The resulting parliament's role was limited, as the king did not submit crucial laws to its vote.²⁸ After the catastrophic cession of the Eastern Romanian territories – Bessarabia and northern Bukovina – to the USSR on 28 June 1940,²⁹ Carol ended this sham of parliamentarism on 5 July, when he shut down parliament.³⁰ On 30 August 1940, Germany and Italy made Romania cede yet another large territory, northern and eastern Transylvania, to Hungary through the Vienna Award.³¹ During the night of 4–5 September, General Ion Antonescu, at the behest of the German envoy,³² extracted dictatorial powers from the king³³ and, one night later, forced him to renounce his throne,³⁴ replacing him with Carol's son Mihai.³⁵

Carol II's rule from 10 February 1938–5/6 September 1940 is usually called 'Royal Dictatorship'. This expression was used by the National Liberal newspaper *Viitorul* [Future] on 19 February 1938³⁶ and the far-right newspaper *Curentul* [Current] shortly after the collapse of the regime.³⁷ It was popularised by the communists after the Second World War,³⁸ especially through Al. Gh. Savu's homonymous book (1970).³⁹ Outside Romania as well as in post-communist Romania, a debate has been going on whether Carol II's regime was indeed a dictatorship. In 1970, sociologist Juan José Linz included the Romanian 'Royal Dictatorship' among what he defined as authoritarian regimes.⁴⁰ One of the first historians to adopt Linz' categorisation was Armin Heinen in 1986.⁴¹ Since Carol II repeatedly reshaped his regime, a single classification seems difficult, even more so as there is no consensus among historians on the scope of the terms 'dictatorship' and 'authoritarian regime'. If one broadens the meaning of 'dictatorship', one may even claim that absolutist monarchy was a political dictatorship, as Sheri Berman did in the context of the ancien régime.⁴² However, in order to assess Carol II's regime, it is less important to brand it as a 'dictatorship' or an 'authoritarian regime' than to establish which liberties and rights it still granted, and to which groups.⁴³

2. Popular and political support of Carol II's regime

Until the summer of 1940, Carol could rely on the peasant class (comprising 13 million of Romania's 18 million inhabitants in 1930⁴⁴) and the political establishment.⁴⁵ As anthropologist Răzvan Roșu pointed out, 'kings or emperors were viewed [by premodern European 'average people'] as holding their office by divine right, as representatives of God's power on earth, destined to do justice to their subjects and to re-establish order in times of crisis'.⁴⁶ This belief continued in interwar Romania,⁴⁷ implying that monarchy was rarely called into question and monarchy-related issues barely discussed. Instead, their belief made peasants accept Carol II's new regime. In March 1938, a peasant from north-eastern Romania stated: 'We all voted for the Constitution as it's made by the king and the king only wants what's best for us'.⁴⁸

The political establishment largely supported and participated in the new regime. One exception was National Peasants' leader Iuliu Maniu, Carol's long-time opponent.⁴⁹ The Goga government's populist measures – many of which were antisemitic – had degraded Romania's economy and security. The ruling National Christian Party's paramilitary had clashed with its popular rival, the equally antisemitic and nationalist Iron Guard (or 'Legion of the Archangel Michael').⁵⁰ This situation – which Carol himself had caused by appointing the cabinet – pushed the political establishment to rally around the king to re-establish order.⁵¹ Because of the notorious corruption of Carol⁵² and of his influential partner⁵³ Elena Lupescu,⁵⁴ politicians probably did not fear for their own interests. The support of the former prime ministers – apart from Maniu and Goga⁵⁵ – allowed for the 10 February 1938 coup and national unity government, in which said prime ministers obtained portfolios.⁵⁶ After a change of government, top politicians from various parties still held high offices. A new, corporatist-minded electoral law⁵⁷ brought many new faces into parliament, but pre-1938 parliamentarians stayed on (the ratio was 144–114 in the Lower House and 86–143 in the Senate⁵⁸).

3. The regime's self-portrayal

Feeling safe and maybe lacking intellectual ambition, Carol II's regime dispensed with a coherent official doctrine.⁵⁹ Royalist organisations used slogans – Carol's Youth Organisation, The Sentinels (*Straja Țării*): 'Faith and work for Country and King'⁶⁰ and the FNR: 'King and Nation – Work and Faith'.⁶¹ As the regime's newspaper *România* shows, these slogans were used randomly and often awkwardly in official contexts, without any explanation.⁶² The words of the slogans were interchangeable; thus *România*'s director, the famous novelist Cezar Petrescu, announced an editorial on 'King and Nation',⁶³ but published it as 'King and People'.⁶⁴ This suggests that the slogans were viewed as mandatory, but that they were not given much importance.

Carol II's regime also relied on leitmotifs, especially anti-'politicianism', territorial integrity, and nationalism. The term 'politicianism' spread in Romania beginning in the 1890s.⁶⁵ In 1904, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, professor at the University of Bucharest, defined it as the attempted or effective misappropriation of public institutions, services, and resources for one's personal use.⁶⁶ In 1933, a certain M.I. Costian claimed that Carol had renounced the throne in 1925, 'disgusted by the politicianism in the country'.⁶⁷ Yet during his reign, Carol II himself embezzled Romanian resources worth billions of US dollars.⁶⁸

Carol and his wingman Armand Călinescu, who held crucial portfolios during the Goga cabinet and the king's regime until his assassination by the Iron Guard in September 1939, connected the idea of 'politicianism' to the multi-party system. Already in a May 1937 interview, the king mentioned 'his work' for the peasants. He said that they were 'manipulated according to the political parties' needs',⁶⁹ thereby implying 'politicianism' and hinting at a complicity between himself and the peasants against the parties.⁷⁰ On 31 January 1938, Călinescu depicted political parties as 'associations that count on the profits of power', thus implying that they revolved around 'politicianism'. He suggested that the Crown withhold power from the parties and dismiss them to

monopolise public visibility and authority,⁷¹ which Carol did on 30 March, at a time when the Romanian press associated partyless elections in Bulgaria⁷² with the elimination of ‘politicianism’.⁷³

Carol and Călinescu’s idea of ‘politicianism’ was recurrent in official discourse during the king’s regime, although it was mostly implicit. In the regime’s main propaganda publication, *Enciclopedia României* [The Encyclopaedia of Romania], Paul Negulescu, professor of law at the University of Bucharest, claimed that the 1926 electoral law had ‘strengthened the politicianism of the parties by granting them a leadership monopoly’ and that this, *inter alia*, prompted Carol to change the constitution.⁷⁴ In a constitutional anniversary issue of *România*, an undersecretary of State declared that ‘our fundamental institutions had been undermined by politicianism’, but that ‘now the tyranny of party politics has been eliminated’.⁷⁵

Romania’s foreign policy had revolved around territorial integrity since the end of the war, which had left it with huge territorial gains ($\pm 157,000$ km² as compared to $\pm 138,000$ km² in 1914) and revisionist neighbours (Hungary, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria). The Crown was directly associated with the territory: Carol’s father Ferdinand was called the ‘Unifier’ because the ‘Romanian’ lands had been ‘unified’ in 1918 under his rule and supreme military command; his cult continued during Carol’s regime. *România* reported on the inauguration of Ferdinand’s statue in Chişinău, Bessarabia’s main city, under the headline: ‘On the Country’s Eastern Border the Likeness of King Ferdinand the Unifier Stands Guard’.⁷⁶

On 8 June 1930, in accordance with the 1923 constitution, Carol had sworn to ‘preserve [...] territorial integrity’.⁷⁷ He did not publicly repeat his oath in 1938–1940, but his regime continued to associate the Crown with territorial integrity. A propaganda biography of Carol stated that ‘when we say King, we mean the Country and perpetuity of national unity’.⁷⁸ *România* quoted a *Daily Telegraph* article as stating that preserving territorial integrity was part of Carol’s political thought,⁷⁹ as well as a *Laatste Nieuws* article as saying that ‘Monarchy is [...] the symbol of internal unity and territorial integrity’.⁸⁰ *România* printed a statement by a Romanian cabinet minister that ‘without the king’s action, our national unity and territorial integrity risked collapsing’.⁸¹ It also repeatedly recalled how Carol had declared on 8 June 1930 his decision ‘to keep the integrity of the territory unscathed’.⁸²

On 17 August 1939, *România*’s front page headline was a quote by Carol: ‘What is Romanian cannot be yielded. What is Romanian will be defended’.⁸³ After the king visited Chişinău in a combat helmet on Epiphany 1940, *România* misquoted *La libre Belgique*, turning the original ‘King Carol Visits the Romanian-Russian Border. The Sovereign thus Shows the Will of *His Country* to Defend the Integrity of Its Territory’⁸⁴ into ‘the visit of the sovereign shows *his decision* to defend the integrity of the Romanian territory’.⁸⁵ This suggested that the king assumed responsibility himself. Eventually, Carol did the contrary. In his diary, he blamed the Crown Council, a consultative body, for the decision to accept the Soviet ultimatum demanding Bessarabia and northern Bukovina for the USSR.⁸⁶

Carol’s regime brandished ‘nationalism’, which was meant to distract from Iron Guard antisemitism.⁸⁷ Already on 11 February 1938, the national unity government promised to promote the ‘national idea’, ‘granting Romanian ethnicity its rightful place’.⁸⁸ In a 20 February proclamation, Carol declared that the new constitution established ‘the primacy of the Romanian Nation’,⁸⁹ which stood for ‘Romanian ethnicity’.⁹⁰ Negulescu explicitly stated that the constitution instituted ‘Romanian ethnic primacy’.⁹¹ After the king transformed the FNR into a ‘single and totalitarian party called the Nation’s Party’ under his own leadership on 21 June 1940,⁹² and after Jews were banned from it on 26 June⁹³ and again, on 12 July,⁹⁴ Petrescu wrote a *România* editorial entitled ‘The Nationalism of Eminescu Won’,⁹⁵ a reference to nineteenth-century writer Mihai Eminescu, the Romanian national poet and a notorious antisemite.⁹⁶

After the December 1937 elections, Carol believed that ‘in Rumania [*sic*], [the public] spirit tends towards nationalism’.⁹⁷ More importantly, he entered a murderous competition with the popular Iron Guard.⁹⁸ The final split between Carol and the Iron Guard leader Corneliu Zelea-Codreanu had resulted from the Iron Guard’s demonstration of power in February 1937, on the occasion of the

funeral of two of its members who were killed in the Spanish Civil War, Ion Moța and Vasile Marin.⁹⁹ For the December 1937 general elections, Codreanu even signed a non-aggression pact with Maniu, which was directed against the king.¹⁰⁰ Consequently Carol did not involve the Iron Guard in the government despite its outstanding election results (almost 16% according to official figures¹⁰¹). Instead, Codreanu was arrested and sentenced to jail in April 1938¹⁰² and to forced labour in May.¹⁰³ After Iron Guard sympathisers carried out terror attacks throughout Romania in November, the regime assassinated Codreanu and other Guardists during the night of 29–30 November.¹⁰⁴ When Iron Guard sympathisers later assassinated Călinescu on 21 September 1939, the regime retaliated by executing his assassins and two to three Iron Guard leaders per county.¹⁰⁵

In June 1938, the king noted down his conviction that his regime had to pursue a nationalist policy to show that its measures against the Iron Guard were not due to the latter's nationalism.¹⁰⁶ Thus, after a wave of repression against the Iron Guard, the regime adopted antisemitic measures. These only exacerbated the antisemitic climate inherited from the Goga cabinet to the advantage of the Iron Guard, and caused socio-economic problems. The regime's alliance with Iron Guard leader Horia Sima in May–June 1940 and its unilateral rapprochement with National Socialist Germany in June–July eventually led to the creation of the above-mentioned antisemitic Nation's Party in June and the first explicitly antisemitic laws in August 1940.¹⁰⁷ The regime also appropriated tropes and structures from the Iron Guard.¹⁰⁸ However, the Iron Guard was not its only source of inspiration. The regime was deeply syncretic, copying for instance the August 1940 antisemitic laws from Italian, Hungarian, and German legislation.¹⁰⁹

Furthermore, the regime's propaganda masterfully mobilised the press, radio, cinema, and other visual arts to produce royal kitsch.¹¹⁰ In an attempt to develop a cult of personality,¹¹¹ it promoted the image of Carol as a fairy-tale prince. For instance, when he had to make an emergency landing on 6 June 1930 on his way to Romania, Carol asked a peasant girl, Maria Modura (or Mudura), for water, and she brought him a jug.¹¹² The 'Royal Dictatorship' exploited this story ad nauseam. On various occasions, Modura had to hand Carol a jug of water,¹¹³ a plane made of flowers,¹¹⁴ a sheepskin coat, and an alpenhorn.¹¹⁵ Her story was republished in *România*.¹¹⁶ The regime's newspaper also printed a melodramatic telegram, in which she repeated her story and stated that, despite her modest means, she was sending 500 lei for army equipment.¹¹⁷ A 'Modura fountain' recalling the story was erected in Bucharest¹¹⁸ and a jubilee gold coin showing her offering Carol the jug was minted.¹¹⁹

4. Theories of monarchy during the 'Royal Dictatorship'

Theories of monarchy were absent from the writings of Romania's most famous intellectuals. Rădulescu-Motru, now the head of the Romanian Academy, ignored the topic even in the 1939 edition of *Românismul: Catehismul unei noi spiritualități* [Romanianism. Catechism of a New Spirituality] published by the King Carol II Foundation for Literature and Art. Nor did Dimitrie Gusti – professor of aesthetics, ethics, and sociology at Bucharest University, and Carol's main man for the uplifting of the peasant class¹²⁰ – theorise monarchy, despite eulogising Carol in *Cunoaștere și acțiune în serviciul națiunii* [Knowledge and Action at the Nation's Service], which the Prince Carol Cultural Foundation printed in 1939.

Known and lesser-known Romanian authors who theorised monarchy during Carol's regime were, in the chronological order of their works, the National Liberal Mihail Fărcășanu (1907–1987), who had just finished his doctorate on this topic at the Friedrich-Wilhelm University in Berlin, the above-mentioned Paul Negulescu (1874–1946) and Cezar Petrescu (1892–1961), and the journalist Theodor Vlădescu (dates unknown).

5. Mihail Fărcășanu

Fărcășanu's PhD thesis on *The Evolution of the Concept of Monarchy from the Perspective of Intellectual History* was not written for Carol's regime, but happened to be well-timed.¹²¹ The examiner,

Carl Schmitt, submitted his report on 12 February 1938.¹²² Fărcășanu defended his thesis on 6 December 1938 and published the original German version that year.¹²³ A Romanian version called *Monarhia socială* [Social Monarchy] appeared in 1940 at the King Carol II Foundation for Literature and Art,¹²⁴ suggesting that the regime embraced Fărcășanu's thesis.¹²⁵

As was generally the case of interwar National Liberalism,¹²⁶ Fărcășanu's thesis was hardly liberal. On the contrary, the author proved to be a male chauvinist,¹²⁷ nationalist,¹²⁸ eurocentrist,¹²⁹ misogynist,¹³⁰ endosexist,¹³¹ anticommunist,¹³² antisemite,¹³³ antiasian,¹³⁴ racist,¹³⁵ geographical determinist,¹³⁶ anti-vetero-testamentary,¹³⁷ authoritarianist,¹³⁸ antirepublican,¹³⁹ antiparlimentary,¹⁴⁰ antidemocrat,¹⁴¹ antiegalitarian,¹⁴² antihumanist,¹⁴³ anti-Cartesian,¹⁴⁴ antimodernist,¹⁴⁵ and fascist.¹⁴⁶

Fărcășanu's text was more so a political science essay than a law thesis. It lacked academic rigour: Fărcășanu ignored empirical historical evidence and falsified history. For instance, he claimed that '[Occidental monarchy] on its own initiative submitted to so-called *leges fundamentales*'.¹⁴⁷ This argument did not reflect his source, French jurist Léon Duguit's *Traité de droit constitutionnel* and it did not withstand historical facts like the origin of the *Magna Carta*.¹⁴⁸ Fărcășanu also falsified quotes. Thus, a sentence by Austrian economist and sociologist Friedrich von Wieser, 'in order to be truly free, the nation does not necessarily need to be organised on a republican basis',¹⁴⁹ became 'in order to be truly free, the nation must not be organised on a republican basis'.¹⁵⁰

Fărcășanu regarded monarchy as the panacea for all political and social issues. While featuring a large range of thinkers – mostly from the Counter-Enlightenment – he mainly relied on Danish-Austrian political scientist Lorenz von Stein (1815–1890), German antiliberal constitutional jurist Carl Schmitt (1888–1985),¹⁵¹ as well as French antidemocratic and monarchist politician and ideologue Charles Maurras (1868–1952). Fărcășanu originally dedicated his thesis to Maurras,¹⁵² whom he called 'the greatest modern theoretician of the monarchic idea'.¹⁵³ This admiration was not unique to Fărcășanu. Maurras was a reference for many far-right Romanians, including Iron Guard members.¹⁵⁴ Guardist Vasile Marin appealed for Maurras' support in the winter of 1934, following the repression of the movement after it murdered prime minister I.G. Duca.¹⁵⁵ There is no evidence that Maurras reciprocated the Guardist admiration. His newspaper *L'Action française* was not unsympathetic to the Iron Guard, and after Codreanu's assassination, Léon Daudet even wrote that this was comparable to José Calvo Sotelo's murder (which contributed to sparking the Spanish Civil War).¹⁵⁶ However, after Călinescu's assassination, *L'Action française*, drawing on a Havas bulletin, eulogised Carol's wingman, calling him 'the energetic man who, at the peril of his life, had suppressed Romania's Iron Guard and blown to smithereens Germany's attempts to gain control over the country'.¹⁵⁷

In a classical introduction, Fărcășanu described egalitarianism, parliamentarism, and republicanism as a failure. In contrast, he portrayed monarchy based on the principles of authority/hierarchy, unity, and continuity as natural, realistic, productive, and constructive, the foundation of the organisation of nations and the model for the totalitarian state. In his words, 'monarchy was able to provide for balance without oppression and liberty without anarchy'.¹⁵⁸

Fărcășanu's first chapter bore the title 'The Apparition of Monarchy in the Oriental Civilisations', which sounded Herderian, but Fărcășanu never cited Herder. Here, he tried to prove that occidental and oriental monarchies were essentially different. He pictured oriental monarchies as God-given, with a top-bottom relation between God and human, subordinated to the religious, messianic, and passive. Citing Carl Schmitt, Ernest Renan, and Voltaire, Fărcășanu claimed that Judaism was the worst: 'Embodying the hopes of a political rise of Israel', the Messiah had become 'metahistorical and universally transcendent'.¹⁵⁹ Judaism purportedly ruined authority and fostered anarchic individualism, 'the Judaic religion represent[ing] the practical programme of a proletariat with communist propensities'.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, Christianity allegedly had to purge its Judaic heritage.

In his second chapter, 'The Monarchic Idea among the Greeks', Fărcășanu praised the 'Greek miracle' leading to the 'occidental miracle'.¹⁶¹ He pictured an idyllic Homeric monarchy, resulting

from the heroisation of a human, with a bottom–top relation between human and God, not despotic, and active. He claimed that a prolonged monarchy would have led to Greek national unity, and he eulogised Sparta ‘which showed a healthy conservative spirit’,¹⁶² as well as tyranny, which he deemed constructive.¹⁶³ Citing Plato, Aristotle, Isocrates, Plutarch, and others, Fărcășanu maintained that ‘the true Greek thought is monarchic’.¹⁶⁴ He alleged that the Greeks expected monarchy to be morally and politically competent. He also outlined the idea of a cycle leading from monarchy to oligarchy, then to democracy, and back to monarchy.

The third chapter, ‘The Monarchic Idea in the Roman World’, was dedicated to royal and republican Rome. Fărcășanu regarded Roman monarchy as similar to, but more authoritarian than Homeric monarchy, as productive and unifying, ‘incorporating the productive classes of the people in the activity of the state’, and aiming at establishing ‘the union of king and nation’.¹⁶⁵ However, he criticised that it lacked a national basis. Throughout the republican period, the main principles of monarchy purportedly survived and gave Rome strength. The Roman democracy was allegedly the antithesis of democracy and the republican constitution a mere variation of the monarchic one, comparable to the constitution of Sparta. According to Fărcășanu, when the Roman republic was to become democratic, it lost support and the principate emerged.

The fourth chapter, ‘Monarchy and Hellenism’, covered the whole timespan from Alexander the Great to Frederick II of Hohenstaufen. Fărcășanu discussed oriental influences on Alexander’s and the Diadochs’ monarchies. He claimed that the Ptolemaic dynasty was marked by orientalism and cosmopolitanism and that these were not true monarchies. He alleged oriental influences on Caesar and the Roman emperors, maintaining that these influences and the republican appearance of the empire prevented the emergence of an occidental monarchic idea. He ascribed the crisis of the empire to the lack of a rule of succession and criticised succession by adoption. He claimed that the Byzantine Empire, while exposed to stronger oriental influences, established a hereditary and caesaro-papist system. He argued that the Roman idea of empire underwent changes under Charlemagne and his successors, due to the influence of Christianity, and that the imperial tradition completely declined under Frederick II. Fărcășanu’s anti-Orientalism put him in opposition with influential Romanian authors who praised ‘the immutable Byzantine perenniality’.¹⁶⁶

In the fifth chapter, ‘Theological Transformations and their Monarchic Repercussion’, Fărcășanu returned to lambasting Judaism. He claimed that ‘Jewish materialism transformed religion into a contract, and wealth into a holy sign of Divine Grace’.¹⁶⁷ He possibly drew on German economist and sociologist Werner Sombart, whom he sometimes cited, or on general Romanian stereotypes.¹⁶⁸ He pictured Christianity as ‘a reaction against the materialist Judaic spirit’,¹⁶⁹ arguing that it had had to get rid of ‘Biblical’, revolutionary, and communist elements in order to reach its European form. European Christianity or Catholicism, Fărcășanu alleged, separated politics from religion. He attributed the pope’s claim to political power to Judaic, vetero-testamentary influences, styling it ‘Judaic Catholicism’.¹⁷⁰ Fărcășanu called the resulting clash between the pope and the council ‘the first parliamentary and democratic experience seen in Europe’ and claimed that ‘all the related democratic phenomena surfaced: low level, confusion, material interests, tendency towards tyranny’.¹⁷¹

In the sixth chapter, ‘Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment, and Monarchy’, Fărcășanu claimed that the Renaissance was inspired by Antiquity and was therefore non-democratic, authoritarian, and monarchic. He alleged that, during this period, monarchy evolved from the universal to the national. While Fărcășanu regarded the Reformation as a ‘revival of Biblism and the old Jewish ideas’,¹⁷² he argued that both the Renaissance and the Reformation led to the independence of the state from the Church, that monarchy became secularised, centralised, and based on primogeniture. According to Fărcășanu, this new monarchy contributed to a unitarian European thought. In his view, monarchy and the state were and had to be identical. He criticised Montesquieu for negating the unity of the state and Frederick II of Prussia for regarding the monarch as a ‘primus inter pares’.¹⁷³ Nonetheless, he stated that, just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, the ideal occidental monarchy had emerged, free of Judaic influences. He defined this monarchy’s principles

as follows: 'unity produced by the balance and hierarchy of social categories, order based on upholding liberties, a real continuity in state leadership, authority directing social change'.¹⁷⁴

In the last chapter, 'The Monarchic Idea in the Nineteenth Century. Lorenz von Stein and Social Monarchy', Fărcășanu unsystematically discussed more recent concepts of monarchy. He continued his attacks against the French Revolution, which he pictured as influenced by freemasons, communists, and Jews: 'Deductive politics, the social contract, human rights, sovereignty of the people, and mass assassination were its main ideas. Provoked by a minority with a low moral level, it was implemented against the will of the people, which, not being organised, was unable to react'.¹⁷⁵ Equality before the law, as established by the French Revolution, allegedly substituted juridical with economic inequality. Fărcășanu claimed that, during the French Revolution, 'the only resistance of the monarchy was directed against the dictatorial claims of the new oligarchy'.¹⁷⁶ He criticised the French Restoration and the July Monarchy for protecting instead of restraining the dominant bourgeoisie. He also portrayed the monarch as the supreme power and source of all power in a parliamentary monarchy.

Furthermore, Fărcășanu elaborated on his 'social monarchy' theory. He quoted French right-wing journalist – and future Vichy government minister – Lucien Romier: 'Since the High Middle Ages, the king ruled against the privileged, forming an alliance with the people from the communes and, later, the Third Estate'.¹⁷⁷ According to Fărcășanu, these were 'historical facts, which nobody can question anymore'.¹⁷⁸ He claimed that 'in its characteristic moments, monarchy appears as the protector of the lower class',¹⁷⁹ and stated that 'maintaining social balance by providing support to the productive classes was the historical strength of monarchy'.¹⁸⁰

In this last chapter, Fărcășanu in particular relied on two posthumously published works by Lorenz von Stein: *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage* [History of the Social Movement in France from 1789 until today] (1850, published 1921)¹⁸¹ and, to a lesser extent, *Staat und Gesellschaft* [State and Society] (1934).¹⁸² From the first volume of Stein's *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung*, Fărcășanu essentially drew on the chapter 'Der Übergang zur demokratisch-kommunistischen Periode' [The transition to the democratic-communist period], in which Stein claimed that the sovereignty of the people inevitably led to social conflict,¹⁸³ theorised 'the kingship of the Germanic-European world',¹⁸⁴ and insisted that monarchy must not get involved in class struggle.¹⁸⁵ From the second volume of *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung*, Fărcășanu particularly relied on the subchapter 'Das konstitutionelle Königtum' [Constitutional Monarchy], in which Stein developed his idea of a hereditary monarchy that stood above social conflict, and depicted constitutional monarchy as the creation and instrument of one class.¹⁸⁶ From the third and last volume of *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung*, Fărcășanu mainly used the chapter 'Das Wesen des Königtums' [The nature of kingship], in which Stein systematised his theory of monarchy and outlined a history of monarchy that contradicted Fărcășanu's. For instance, Stein claimed that 'Greek science [...] had never been able to grasp the true idea of kingship'.¹⁸⁷

Stein's theory of monarchy, based on the aforementioned ideas, was not Hegelian. On the contrary, Stein deemed Hegel's idea of monarchy insufficient.¹⁸⁸ While Fărcășanu's examiner Carl Schmitt had mentioned Stein before,¹⁸⁹ there is no evidence that he had been interested in Stein's theory of monarchy and that he was the missing link between Fărcășanu and Stein.

From start to finish, Fărcășanu praised the Italian monarchy – or, rather, fascism. He called Mussolini 'one of the greatest statesmen of our times',¹⁹⁰ arguing that 'Mussolini views the state as a permanent institution, and the party as a temporary one', the state being 'embodied by the monarch'.¹⁹¹ Fărcășanu's praise passed over the difficult relation between King Vittorio Emanuele III and Mussolini¹⁹² and omitted historical facts that disproved his 'social monarchy' theory, such as Umberto I's approval of the Bava Beccaris massacre in 1898.¹⁹³ Fărcășanu also incorporated National Socialism into his thesis, picturing Führertum as a first step towards monarchy.¹⁹⁴

Fărcășanu anticipated the leitmotifs of Carol II's regime, but he did not rely on Romanian thinkers or apply his theory to Romania, which only appeared by name in a list of contemporary monarchies.¹⁹⁵ Maurras' newspaper *L'Action française* surmised that the thesis was meant for France.¹⁹⁶

(not for Romania). Only in a September 1938 article, ‘Social Monarchy and the Royal Students’ Teams’, did Fărcășanu apply his theory to Romania. He claimed that ‘the attitude of our King historically represents the social moment in the evolution of Romanian monarchy’¹⁹⁷ and he referred to the Royal Foundations’ practice of sending students’ teams to villages, as a 1934 communiqué stated, ‘to bring there the benefits of culture and civilisation’.¹⁹⁸ Thus, Fărcășanu opportunistically adopted Carol II’s self-portrayal.

The idea of a ‘social monarchy’ had existed in Romania prior to Fărcășanu, as shown by a homonymous 1931 anti-multi-party system, pro-peasant, and pro-royal dictatorship editorial in the far-right newspaper *Curentul* [Current].¹⁹⁹ Nevertheless, Carol II’s regime helped Fărcășanu gain some notoriety. In April 1940, his thesis was promoted in *România*²⁰⁰ and other popular papers,²⁰¹ and in June 1940, cabinet minister Mihail Ralea referred to ‘social monarchy’ in a broadcast speech.²⁰² However, this came too late for the regime,²⁰³ and for Fărcășanu himself, as an anonymous author sarcastically noted in 1950.²⁰⁴

6. Paul Negulescu

Paul Negulescu’s interpretations of monarchy were clearly commissioned by the regime. They were included in his general exegesis of the 1938 constitution published in *Enciclopedia României*, and a law treatise promoted by *România*.²⁰⁵ Negulescu was then a professor at the chair of constitutional and administrative law of Bucharest University.²⁰⁶ He had discussed monarchy before,²⁰⁷ in particular in the second volume of his *Treatise on Romanian Administrative Law*, which appeared in 1930, purportedly four months after the ‘Restoration’.²⁰⁸

In 1930, Negulescu demanded a strong and apolitical executive:

We consider that the solution is to be found in the government’s liberation from the tyranny of parliament and the political parties. This would give [the government] the possibility to focus only on the supervision and the control of the administration of general interests. Meanwhile, parliament – whose remit would be limited to legislation and which would consist of the representatives of the great national interests and of universal suffrage – would be completely banned from interfering in any way in the administration.²⁰⁹

Inspired by a romantic nationalism focused on the peasant class, and hostile to industrialisation and foreigners or Jews, Negulescu joined the Romanian critics of the appropriation of Western models, in particular the Belgian constitution, the blueprint for the 1866 Romanian constitution. Negulescu quoted an 1871 letter by King Carol I, in which the latter complained that ‘Romanians could not boast the civic virtues pertaining to a quasi-Republican state system’.²¹⁰ He thus subscribed to Carol I’s view that the king was lacking political power.

In Negulescu’s opinion, Romania should have had a German or Japanese-style system based on Romania’s purported political reality of those days. This system would consist of a ruler (*domnitor*), ministers appointed and dismissed by the latter and only accountable to him, a state council to submit proposals for the ruler to decide upon together with the ministers, and a parliament – of at most 100 representatives of the landowners (10), peasants (30 + 10), merchants and industrialists (10), as well as intellectuals (number not mentioned) – to study and vote on draft laws prepared by the state council together with the council of ministers. Meanwhile, decree-laws would be issued solely by the executive.²¹¹

Negulescu suggested a similar system for contemporary Romania:

[...] the nefarious influence of the political [parties] needs to be removed. To this end, our fundamental law needs to be changed, establishing (a) a government appointed by the King, made of competent people, accountable only to Him; (b) a unicameral parliament, consisting of (1) a number of MPs elected by universal suffrage, for instance one per county; (2) a number of MPs being the elected representatives of the great economic and intellectual interests; [...] (c) a state council.²¹²

Again, parliament was meant to focus on legislation, but could complain to the sovereign about individual ministers. Negulescu concluded that there was no other escape from ‘politicianism’

but through a system.²¹³ His vision of a powerful executive and a corporatist-like parliament, as well as his rejection of the political parties matched the views of the architects of Carol II's regime. It might have paved Negulescu's way to official exegete of the 1938 constitution.

In his *Enciclopedia României* article, Negulescu justified the unconstitutional constitutional change, even calling it 'perfect'.²¹⁴ He deemed his vision largely fulfilled. First, he wrote:

The King, [...] who collaborates with his ministers in his governance, acquires a preponderant role since the ministers, who no longer have a parliamentary basis as representatives of the majority, become simple secretaries of the King, similar to the ministers of the President of the United States, who can be dismissed *ad nutum* and who are politically accountable only to the King.²¹⁵

Second, he stated that the constitution established 'the primacy of the executive' and the 'organisation of the electorate on a professional and corporative basis'.²¹⁶

In accordance with official propaganda, Negulescu emphasised these points in a treatise entitled *The Fundamental Principles of the 27 February 1938 Constitution*. He claimed that the 1938 constitution, with the nation's plebiscitary agreement, concentrated the political powers – or, alternatively, the complete executive power – in the hands of the king, reduced the influence of the political parties, swept away the representative parliamentary system, and made the king the centre of political life and the people's leader.²¹⁷ He portrayed the king as 'a symbol, a concrete reality that denotes and represents social and political ideas or concepts'.²¹⁸

Negulescu specified the relationship between the king and the cabinet ministers, noting that the king required their support,²¹⁹ but that he could choose the persons he thought most fit to enact the policies which he deemed most appropriate to the country's interests.²²⁰ He again pointed out that ministers were not politically accountable to parliament,²²¹ which he depicted as 'limited to legislation only, with a corporative-professional character, [having] chiefly the task of preparing laws, which the King gives a mandatory character by sanctioning them'.²²²

Thus, Negulescu interpreted the 1938 constitution fully in favour of the king, whom he put at the heart of Romanian politics, and he referred to the unconstitutional 1938 plebiscite to justify the king's new powers. His interpretation made Carol II's regime sound like the Second French Empire, which had also originated from a plebiscite that introduced a similar constitution.²²³

7. Cezar Petrescu

In connection with the German and Soviet invasion of neighbouring and allied Poland, Cezar Petrescu published a series of editorials in *România* to rally the Romanians around the king, whom he associated with the voivodes, the medieval rulers of the Romanian principalities. Petrescu was a longstanding Carlist propagandist, supporting Carol after the latter renounced his rights to the throne,²²⁴ working towards the prince's return,²²⁵ and eulogising him after his enthronement,²²⁶ which probably explains his subsequent appointment as director of *România*.²²⁷ Since he wrote as such in *România*, his editorials can be regarded as an interpretation of monarchy by the regime itself, albeit one lacking authority since it was not adopted by the regime's leading figures.

In an *Enciclopedia României* article on Carol II's reign, Petrescu had already claimed that 'from the beginning [the king] had restored the rhythm of rulership in its ancient voivodal form'.²²⁸ In his *România* editorials, entitled 'Our Voivodal Policy', he repeated and developed this idea. In an article that preceded the editorials, he stated that King Carol was 'executing the will of our Voivodes'.²²⁹ In Romania, this connection had often been made in writing and visual arts – especially royal kitsch – already for King Ferdinand. For instance, in 1929, a postage stamp featured Ferdinand surrounded by the voivodes Stephen the Great, Matthias Corvinus, Michael the Brave (who had briefly ruled the 'Romanian' lands in 1600), and Constantin Brâncoveanu. However, calling Carol a voivode was slightly ridiculous, since his son Mihai had been given the title 'Great Voivode of Alba Iulia' upon his father's return in 1930.

In his first editorial, Petrescu claimed that rallying around the king had historical roots in what he called ‘the tradition of the voivodal policy’,²³⁰ which was merely a projection of the regime’s self-portrayal into the past. Petrescu described it as ‘a tradition that, on the domestic front, spared us the frightening rift of class conflict’, as well as ‘divisions, idle temerity, adventures, and humiliating compromises’. He historicised the regime’s slogans by stating that the ruler symbolised ‘Faith and Soil, Law and Nation’. He portrayed Carol as ‘the guarantor of this voivodal policy, on the domestic and the international front, seeing to internal peace in order to secure our external peace’.²³¹

In his second editorial, Petrescu connected the kings of the ancient Dacians – the ancestors of the Romanians according to nationalist historiography – to the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, which was another long-standing association since King Carol I already appeared alongside the Dacian King Burebista or Decebalus on postcards from 1906. Petrescu praised both Carol I as the reviver and expander of the ‘voivodal policy’ after the Ottoman period, and Ferdinand I as the unifier of Romania on the battlefield and at the negotiating table. Petrescu claimed that Carol II executed the political will of his predecessors and continued the ‘voivodal policy’ in complete agreement with the country, which identified with the dynasty. The newspaper director even gave Carol II’s rule a – discursive – religious dimension by calling the 1930 ‘Restoration’ ‘redemptive’²³² and the king a ‘voivodal incarnation’.²³³

In his third editorial, Petrescu criticised the appropriation of Western models and idealised monarchy. He claimed that petitions to the voivodes reflected ‘the Romanian people’s idea of the [formers’] high spiritual, political, juridical, and executive role’. He stated that Carol II put Romania back on the right – autochthonous – track and that the 1938 Constitution ‘restored the basis of our voivodal policy which protected us in the past from the rift between social classes, prioritised work, and established not only rights, but also duties for the citizens’.²³⁴

In his fourth editorial – the aforementioned ‘King and People’ – Petrescu declared that, via the plebiscite, ‘the people vowed itself to the King [...], returning to the origins of our voivodal policy of the times when the Ruler of the Country was not a ghostly constitutional equation, but a real Ruler, with plenary power and full responsibility before the people, God, and the Judgement of History’. He depicted the FNR as the ‘political instrument’ ‘between King and People, King and Nation’.²³⁵

In his final editorial, Petrescu, purportedly in response to readers’ letters, specified that ‘our voivodal policy was never a policy of absolute monarchy’, but that ‘the voivodes from the past directed the fates of the people together with counsellors and authorised representatives who were elected according to certain criteria among the nation’. He claimed that the peasants in the principalities could complain to the ruler, that the voivodes were close to the people, and that they chose and dismissed his counsellors based on their actions. Once more, Petrescu criticised ‘Western reforms’ and depicted Carol II as the one who had brought back the ‘voivodal policy’. He claimed that the FNR would end ‘electoral, secondary criteria that falsified the hierarchy of values’ and promised that ‘energies will be disciplined to serve the nation, not a party’.²³⁶

Despite having graduated in law,²³⁷ Petrescu did not attempt to construct a proper theory of monarchy. Instead, he dismissed ‘doctrinaire abstractions’²³⁸ and ‘all the learned apparatus of library doctrinaires’,²³⁹ drawing a tabloid fairy-tale picture of medieval voivodeship. He did not explain how the new constitution could revive a constitutionless system or what medieval institution the FNR corresponded to. His interpretation was a cheap historicisation and autochthonisation of the regime. He brought the voivodal analogy out again just before the 1940 Vienna Award, when Romania and Hungary were having tough negotiations regarding possible territorial concessions by Romania,²⁴⁰ subtitled an editorial ‘Gathered around the king, as once upon a time under the shield of the Voivodes, let’s first save the existence of the nation and of the State’.²⁴¹

8. Theodor Vlădescu

In 1939, a certain Theodor Vlădescu published a book *Frontul Renașterii Naționale: Origina și doctrina* [The Front of National Rebirth: Its Origin and Doctrine]. Little is known about the writer. He

reportedly was the brother of Ovidiu Vlădescu,²⁴² who would serve as secretary general of the PM's office and head of the Civil Cabinet under Ion Antonescu. Although the book bore the Front's emblem, it was not published by the party, which issued a communiqué requesting people who were asked to buy it to report this.²⁴³

Vlădescu's text was largely unintelligible. Still, it is clear that he regarded the 1938 Constitution as a top-down 'Monarchic Revolution',²⁴⁴ which established an authoritarian, ethnic Romanian, Orthodox, Dacian state that connected the king, the nation, and the Church. The connector was the FNR, which allegedly fostered a sense of duty towards the three. Vlădescu viewed this system as quintessential to the Romanians. He rejected Western ideology, democracy, liberalism, and Catholicism, which he felt were all connected.²⁴⁵ He criticised political parties.²⁴⁶ He mentioned parliament in relation to the Front, but did not elaborate intelligibly on this topic.²⁴⁷ He also referred to the 'ruler's apostolate' (*apostolat domnesc*), without defining it in an understandable way.²⁴⁸

Vlădescu visibly wanted to portray Carol II as the reviver of an ancient – and fictional – Dacian tradition. However, he did not mention any Dacian king, but referred instead to Voivode Michael the Brave and the leaders of the 1784 rebellion in Transylvania.²⁴⁹ Disowned by the FNR and barely intelligible, his book likely had no major impact during Carol's regime.

In a 1944 book dedicated to Antonescu, Vlădescu expressed his reusable ideas much more clearly, ascribing them to Antonescu. He described the monarchic state as organic, in comparison to the republican state, which he saw as abstract and failing, his examples being France, Austria-Hungary, and Russia.²⁵⁰ Vlădescu depicted monarchy as a Dacian and Roman heritage, originating in the Dacian king Decebalus, and portrayed the Romanian nation as intrinsically monarchic, convinced that monarchy was God-given, that God ruled the world through the kings, and that the king was 'located at the very top, in a halo of divine apotheosis' and 'mythos'. Vlădescu claimed that the idea of 'monarchy's grandeur, splendour, and power' had remained unchanged since the Middle Ages. As shown above, there was some truth to Vlădescu's depiction of the Romanian popular belief about monarchy. Vlădescu concluded that monarchy guaranteed continuity and stability.²⁵¹

Vlădescu emphasised the connection between king and nation. Referring to king Mihai, he wrote: 'In the heart of our young and pure King beats today the heart of the entire Romanian Nation, and in the heart of the Nation we all feel the confident and at the same time worried beat of the heart of our young King. [...] The King rejoices and despairs together with the Nation'.²⁵² Vlădescu claimed that the nation had saved both the state and monarchy through its proxy, Antonescu,²⁵³ and that Mihai I had re-established the connection between king and nation.²⁵⁴

Vlădescu's interpretation of Mihai I's reign was deeply religious. He called the 1940 events 'God's punishment' for the sins of the Romanian nation, committed by its leaders,²⁵⁵ thereby retracting his earlier praise of Carol II. He declared that, 'through King Mihai I, monarchy experienced a restoration in the moral sense',²⁵⁶ thus superseding the Carlist meaning of 'Restoration'. He stated that 'perhaps, King Mihai I is Providence's chosen'²⁵⁷ and that 'in the people's mind, our King, handsome and young, embodies the Archangel Michael [Romanian: Mihai(l)] himself'.²⁵⁸ Finally, in accordance with war propaganda and soldiers' beliefs,²⁵⁹ he described the ongoing – and already lost – war as the fight of the Romanian nation against the army of the Antichrist, as the nation's expiation, in which the Archangel Michael stood with the king.²⁶⁰

While Vlădescu's book was already in print in late 1943,²⁶¹ its publication in 1944 – the year Antonescu would be removed on 23 August in a royal coup that re-established the 1923 constitution – made his theory unusable for the short remainder of Mihai's reign.

9. Conclusion

Carol II's regime, the so-called 'Royal Dictatorship', did not adopt a coherent official doctrine. Rather, it relied on slogans, leitmotifs, and royal kitsch. It thus left space for parallel theories of monarchy, which it granted a semi-official status by publishing them (Mihai Fărcășanu's PhD

thesis), commissioning them for its main propaganda publication, *Enciclopedia României* or promoting them in its newspaper *România* (Paul Negulescu's article and treatise), or by producing them itself (Cezar Petrescu's editorials in *România*). Other theories were disowned by the regime (Theodor Vlădescu's book).

The authors of these theories had very different standings: Fărcășanu was a law PhD student known in the National Liberal milieu, Negulescu a distinguished law professor, Petrescu a famous novelist, and Vlădescu an obscure journalist. Their texts were also of quite different nature: Fărcășanu's PhD thesis was political science, Negulescu's article and treatise were legal theory, and Petrescu's editorials and Vlădescu's book were popular literature.

The core of the four theories was similar: their authors rejected the Western democratic model and shared the idea of a strong monarchy and a connection between king and nation. However, the genealogies they established for the regime diverged. To Fărcășanu, who only later made the connection between his theory and Carol's regime, the model of monarchy was Western and secular. Negulescu's model was at the same time autochthonous, Japanese, and German, and resembled the Second French Empire. Petrescu made up an autochthonous voivodal tradition and Vlădescu invented a Dacian heritage. As opposed to Fărcășanu, who rejected the Byzantine empire as Oriental, Negulescu, Petrescu, and Vlădescu, by referring to the times of the voivodes, implicitly perpetuated the Byzantine tradition. In contrast to Fărcășanu, Petrescu and Vlădescu also included religious accents in their theories.

The central difference between Fărcășanu on the one hand and Negulescu, Petrescu, and Vlădescu on the other was the role of the king in connection to parliament. Fărcășanu believed that the monarch had an intrinsic virtue – independent of his individual character, apparently – that could make him yield a part of his power. However, in line with *L'Action française*, Fărcășanu was deeply antiparliamentary. Instead, Negulescu, Petrescu, and Vlădescu each attacked the multi-party system in accordance with the regime's anti-'politicianism' leitmotif, but Negulescu advocated a parliament limited to legislation, Petrescu envisaged some kind of parliamentarism, and Vlădescu at least acknowledged the existence of the single party parliament.

Nonetheless, these theories were mostly art for art's sake. Carol II's regime made its decisions based on its interpretation of the domestic and the international situation rather than on theory. However, when the king decided to shut down parliament on 5 July 1940 – coincidentally, shortly after Fărcășanu's *Monarhia socială* was published – Fărcășanu's vision factually prevailed over Negulescu's.

Notes

1. In-depth studies on Carol II's regime include Al. Gh. Savu, *Dictatura regală (1938–1940)* (Bucharest: Editura politică, 1970); A. Simion, *Dictatul de la Viena* (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1996); Rebecca Haynes, *Romanian Policy towards Germany, 1936–40* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 2000); Florin Grecu, *Construcția unui partid unic: Frontul Renașterii Naționale* (Bucharest: Editura enciclopedică, 2012); Doru Adrian Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste dans la Roumanie des années 1930: autoritarisme, nationalisme et modernisation' (PhD diss., University of Paris Sciences et Lettres, 2018); Philippe Henri Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine » et les « étrangers ». Les minorités et leur libearté du travail sous le cabinet Goga et la dictature royale (décembre 1937 – septembre 1940)* (Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2022).
2. Transnational studies that (also) focus on Romania are Paul Hanebrink, *A Specter Haunting Europe: The Myth of Judeo-Bolshevism* (Cambridge/London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018); Roland Clark, 'Both Form and Substance. Romanians and Political Antisemitism in a European Context', *Holocaust: Studii și cercetări*, 1 (2021): 41–68.
3. See Cody James Inglis, 'The Languages of Monarchism in Interwar Yugoslavia, 1918–1941: Variations on a Theme', *History of European Ideas* (2023).
4. Ibid.; Christian Axboe Nielsen, 'Policing Yugoslavism. Surveillance, Denunciations, and Ideology during King Aleksandar's Dictatorship, 1929–1934', *East European Politics and Societies* 23, no. 1 (February 2009): 34–62.
5. For instance *Monitorul Oficial. 1st Part* (hereafter MO), 42 (20 February 1938): 954.
6. See Jan Willem Stutje, 'Toward an Authoritarian and Populist Monarchy in Belgium: Leopold III and Hendrik de Man during the 1930s Crisis', *History of European Ideas* (2021). For the bigger picture, see Michel Dumoulin, Mark Van den Wijngaert, and Vincent Dujardin (eds.), *Léopold III* (Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 2001).

7. The letter was printed in 'Repetatele renunțări la tron ale prințului Carol', *Adevărul*, 14 November 1927, 5.
8. *MO*, 124 bis (8 June 1930): 4360–61: no. 2130; no. 2132.
9. Stephen Fischer-Galati, *Twentieth Century Rumania* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 46; quoted in Hans-Christian Maner, 'König Carol II. Der Anfang vom Ende der rumänischen Monarchie', in *Die Hohenzollern in Rumänien 1866–1947. Eine monarchische Herrschaftsordnung im europäischen Kontext*, ed. Edda Binder-Iijima, Heinz-Dietrich Löwe, and Gerald Volkmer (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 159.
10. *MO*, 299 (28 December 1937): 9665–9666: no. 4321; no. 4322.
11. Regarding the Goga cabinet, see Dov B. Lungu, 'The French and British Attitudes towards the Goga-Cuza Government in Romania, December 1937–February 1938', *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 30, no. 3 (September 1988): 323–41; Paul A. Shapiro, 'Prelude to Dictatorship in Romania: The National Christian Party in Power, December 1937–February 1938', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 45–88; Philippe Henri Blasen, 'De la nomination du cabinet Goga au coup d'État du roi Carol II (28 décembre 1937–10 février 1938)', *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai Historia* 63, no. 2 (December 2018): 111–57.
12. Carol II, *Între datorie și pasiune. Însemnări zilnice. Vol. I* (Bucharest: Silex, 1995), 234.
13. *MO*, 33 bis (10 February 1938): 797–98: no. 854; no. 855.
14. *MO*, 42 (20 February 1938): 962: no. 900.
15. *MO*, 42 (20 February 1938): 962: no. 901.
16. Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 33–4, 8 n.
17. *MO*, 14 bis (18 January 1938): 245.
18. *MO*, 48 (27 February 1938): 1117: art. 46.
19. *Ibid.*: art. 45.
20. *MO*, 48 (27 February 1938): 1114: art. 31.
21. *MO*, 48 (27 February 1938): 1121: art. 65.
22. *MO*, 75 (31 March 1938): 1641: no. 1422.
23. Serviciul județean Botoșani al Arhivelor Naționale, fond Poliția Jud. Dorohoi (inv. 165), folder 2/1938, 45: Ion Foca, statement, 23 February 1938; see Philippe Henri Blasen, 'Rural Residents on King Carol's New Regime: Voices from Mihăileni, Northern Moldavia (1938)', *Journal of Romanian Studies* (forthcoming).
24. *Ibid.*, 46: Gheorghe N. Bârsei, statement, 23 February 1938.
25. *MO*, 293 (16 December 1938): 5972: no. 4321.
26. *MO*, 106 bis (9 May 1939): 2951–2956: no. 1923.
27. *MO*, 107 (10 May 1939): 2960: no. 1924.
28. *Monitorul Oficial. 3rd Part*, 16 (10 January 1940): 326–28 (sitting of the Lower House on 16 December 1939); 12 (26 April 1940): 538–41 (sitting of the Lower House on 23 March 1940); Hans-Christian Maner, *Parlamentarismul în România* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2004), 388–89.
29. Philippe Henri Blasen, 'L'évacuation de la Bessarabie et de la Bucovine du Nord (juin – juillet 1940): la création d'un cliché antisémite roumain', *Revista de Istorie a Evreilor din România*, 4–5 (2019–20): 271–310; Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 213–18.
30. *MO*, 154 (6 July 1940): 3422: no. 2302.
31. See *Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918–1945. Series D. Volume X* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957), 582–7.
32. *Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918–1945. Series D. Volume XI* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 22; 24–5; 28.
33. *MO*, 205 (5 September 1940): 5058: no. 3053.
34. Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 265.
35. *MO*, 206 bis (6 September 1940): 5274: no. 3064.
36. 'Svonurile alarmante', *Viitorul*, 19 February 1938, 1.
37. Pamfil Șeicaru, 'Regăsirea echilibrului în Stat', *Curentul*, 13 September 1940, 1.
38. See for instance Ilie Zaharia, 'Noui apărători ai libertății', *Scântea*, 15 January 1945, 1.
39. Savu, *Dictatura regală*.
40. Juan J. Linz, 'An Authoritarian Regime: Spain', in *Mass Politics: Studies in Political Sociology*, ed. Erik Allardt and Stein Rokkan (New York: The Free Press, 1970), 253.
41. Armin Heinen, *Die Legion 'Erzengel Michael' in Rumänien. Soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1986), 365–66.
42. Sheri Berman, *Democracy and Dictatorship in Europe: From the Ancien Régime to the Present Day* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2019), 15.
43. Regarding ethnic minorities' access to work during Carol II's regime, see Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*.
44. *Anuarul statistic al României 1939 și 1940* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1940), 404.

45. This fact was even implicitly acknowledged by an Iron Guard member in 1983: Ion Halmaghi, 'Cartea lui Bobango IV', *Drum. Revistă de cultură românească* XIX, 2–4 (April–December 1983): 36: 'In Romania [...] the whole Romanian people was royalist'.
46. Răzvan Roșu, 'Kulturelle Enklaven in Siebenbürgen als Bewahrerinnen des Mythos vom "guten Kaiser". Eine Fallstudie im Motzenland', *Spiegelungen* 14, no. 1 (2019): 48.
47. *Ibid.*, 50.
48. Serviciul județean Botoșani al Arhivelor Naționale, fond Poliția Jud. Dorohoi (inv. 165), folder 2/1938, 61: Ion V. Butnariuc, statement, 1 March 1938.
49. See Rebecca Ann Haynes, 'Reluctant Allies? Iuliu Maniu and Corneliu Zelea Codreanu against King Carol II of Romania', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 85, no. 1 (January 2007): 105–34.
50. See Shapiro, 'Prelude to Dictatorship'; Blasen, 'De la nomination du cabinet Goga'.
51. See Heinen, *Die Legion*, 361–2.
52. R.G. Waldeck, *Athene Palace* (New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1942), 136.
53. Even in academic historiography, the misogynistic view that Carol's relationship with Lupescu was merely sexual still prevails. However, Carol's diary shows that he relied on Lupescu for advice and thus also appreciated her intelligence.
54. See Constantin Argetoianu, *Însemnări zilnice. Volumul III: 1 iulie–31 decembrie 1937* (Bucharest: Machiavelli, 2001), 30.
55. Constantin Argetoianu, *Însemnări zilnice. Volumul IV: 1 ianuarie–30 iunie 1938* (Bucharest: Machiavelli, 2002), 121, 1 n.
56. *MO*, 33 bis (10 February 1938): 797–98: no. 855.
57. *MO*, 106 bis (9 May 1939): 2951–2956: no. 1923; Regarding corporatism during Carol's regime, see Florin Grecu, 'Critical Analysis of National-Populist Rhetoric of Mihail Ralea, Labour Minister, about Guilds and Corporatism', *South-East European Journal of Political Sciences* 2, no. 1 (2014): 249–72; Constantin Iordachi, 'Mihail Manoilescu and the Debate and Practice of Corporatism in Romania', in *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Europe and Latin America*, ed. António Costa Pinto and Federico Finchelstein (Abingdon-on-Thames and New York: Routledge, 2019), chapter 5; Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 266–76; Philippe Henri Blasen, 'Corporatismul lui Mihail Manoilescu – un model pentru dictatura regală? (1938–1940)', in *România interbelică: modernizare politico-instituțională și discurs național*, ed. Sorin Radu and Oliver Jens Schmitt (Iași: Polirom) (*forthcoming*).
58. Maner, *Parlamentarismul*, 382–4.
59. See Radu Florian Bruja, *Carol al II-lea și partidul unic: Frontul Renașterii Naționale* (Iași: Junimea, 2006), 121.
60. *MO*, 272 (24 November 1934): no. 3.069, art. 34; *MO*, 292 (15 December 1938): 5942: 4078, art. 6. Regarding The Sentinels, see Anca Filipovici, 'Healthy Young Bodies of an (Un)healthy Nation: Physical Education and Discipline in *Straja Țării* (1934–1940)', *Plural* 9, 1 (2021): 115–40; Anca Filipovici, "'Faith and Work for King and Country!'" Nationalization and Covert Romanianization through the Youth Organization *Straja Țării* (1934–1940)', *National Identities* 23, no. 4 (2021): 349–67.
61. *MO*, 5 (5 January 1939): 35: no. 1, art. 35.
62. *România* published two attempts to explain the Sentinels' slogan. Bishop Nicolae Colan, then a cabinet minister, stated that the faith and work stood 'at the King's service because He cares for us. He teaches us. He is our heart. From this heart pumps the life-bearing blood through the whole body of the country.' A journalist also mentioned 'the faith in the one who embodies homeland: the Sovereign': N. Colan: 'Educația străjerească prin Biserică, Familie și Națiune', *România*, 4 November 1938, 5; R.B., 'Domnia Regelui Carol al II-lea', *România*, 9 June 1939, 4.
63. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală', *România*, 13 October 1939, 1.
64. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală. Regele și Poporul', *România*, 14 October 1939, 1. An editorial 'King and Nation' appeared on 12 July 1940: Cezar Petrescu, 'Regele și națiunea', *România*, 12 July 1940, 1.
65. The earliest occurrence we could find dates from 13 January 1890: 'Darea în judecată a lui I. Brătianu în Cameră', *Lupta*, 13 January 1890, 1.
66. C. Rădulescu-Motru, *Cultura Română și politicianismul* (Bucharest: Librăria Socecă & Co., 1904), III.
67. M.I. Costian, *Regele Carol II și partidele politice* (Bucharest: Tipografia 'Lupta' N. Stroilă, 1933), 12; Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 12.
68. See Robby Arnold, 'King Carol II's Personal Fortune and its Effect on Romania's Economic Negotiations with Germany 1937–1940' (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2009).
69. Charles Oulmont, 'Avec le roi Carol, « père du peuple, père de son peuple »', *Paris-Midi*, 18 May 1937, 6.
70. Rather than parliamentarism, as Doru Adrian Lixandru wrote, with whom I otherwise agree on this point. See Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 232.
71. Armand Călinescu, *Însemnări politice 1916–1939* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1990), 372–3.
72. General elections in Bulgaria (6–27 March 1938) were held according to a 22 October 1937 electoral law that barred the candidates from being politically affiliated. See Tatiana Kostadinova, *Bulgaria 1879–1946. The Challenge of Choice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 73; 75.

73. 'Experiența politică din Bulgaria', *Opinia*, 13 March 1938, 1; 'Alegerile din Bulgaria', *Viitorul*, 14 March 1938, 3; 'Alegerile din Bulgaria', *Universul*, 24 March 1938, 5.
74. Paul Negulescu, 'Constituția României', in *Enciclopedia României. Volumul I* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938), 195.
75. D. V. Țoni, 'După un an de la noua Constituție', *România*, 27 February 1939, 9.
76. 'La granița răsăriteană a țării străjue imaginea regelui Ferdinand Întregitorul', *România*, 7 March 1939, 1; see also pages 5, 7, and 9.
77. 'Proclamarea Principelui Carol Rege', *Universul*, 11 June 1930, 2.
78. Teofil Gh. Sidorovici, *Carol II. Din culmea unui deceniu de glorioasă domnie* (Bucharest: Ateliere Luceafărul, [1940]), 69.
79. 'Regele Carol II a dat României independența politică și menținerea integrității teritoriale, combinate cu o dezvoltare maximă a țării', *România*, 29 October 1938, 20. The original sentence did not involve the king explicitly: A.H.T. Chisholm, 'Rumania's New Problems', *Daily Telegraph*, 27 October 1938, 16.
80. 'Înțelepciunea monarhului a asigurat ordinea și liniștea ...', *România*, 20 October 1939, 10.
81. 'Structura statului român', *România*, 30 July 1939, 7.
82. Ilariu Mureșan, 'Frontul Renașterii Naționale ca expresie politică ...', *România*, 27 February 1939, 19; Cezar Petrescu, 'Națiunea unită în jurul Regelui, sub scutul Regelui', *România*, 20 March 1939, 1; Cezar Petrescu, 'O oaste tare ...', *România*, 14 May 1939, 1; R.B., 'Pagini de istorie', *România*, 9 June 1939, 4; Cezar Petrescu, 'Sceptrul Regelui profilat pe zonă', *România*, 9 June 1940, 21; J. Paleologu, 'Documente istorice', *România*, 16 June 1940, 4.
83. 'Ceeace este românesc nu se poate da. Ceeace este românesc se va apăra', *România*, 17 August 1939, 1.
84. 'Le roi Carol visite la frontière roumano-russe. Le souverain montre ainsi la volonté de son pays de défendre l'intégrité de son territoire', *La libre Belgique*, 6 January 1940, 4 (emphasis added).
85. 'Importanța cu totul excepțională ...', *România*, 10 January 1940, 13 (emphasis added).
86. Dorin Dobrinu, 'Cedarea Basarabiei, a nordului Bucovinei și a ținutului Herța (iunie 1940). O relectură a unui moment istoric controversat', in *Catalogul expoziției 'Cedarea Basarabiei, a nordului Bucovinei și a ținutului Herța (iunie 1940) între neputință și iresponsabilitate. O perspectivă românească* (Bucharest, [2010]); Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 214.
87. See Călinescu, *Însemnări politice*, 400.
88. 'Manifestul guvernului către țară', *Universul*, 14 February 1938.
89. *MO*, 42 (20 February 1938): 954.
90. Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 28–9.
91. Negulescu, 'Constituția României', 198.
92. *MO*, 142 (22 June 1940): 3122: no. 2056.
93. 'Normele de înscriere în «Partidul Națiunii»', *România*, 26 June 1940, 16.
94. 'Noui norme generale pentru înscrierile în Partidul Națiunii', *România*, 13 July 1940, 1.
95. Cezar Petrescu, 'A biruit naționalismul lui Eminescu', *România*, 13 July 1940, 1.
96. Regarding Eminescu's antisemitism, see Teodor Al. Munteanu, 'Eminescu și Evreii', *Convorbiri literare* 72, 6–9 (June – September 1939): 891–903; Leon Volovici, *Nationalist Ideology and Antisemitism: The Case of Romanian Intellectuals in the 1930s* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1991). Eminescu's fundamental antisemitism remains a taboo. While he has been a key model for Romanian antisemites, the topic is for instance largely avoided in Alexandru Florian and Ana Bărbulescu, *Elita culturală și discursul antisemit interbelic* (Iași: Polirom, 2022).
97. A.L. Easterman, 'King Carol Tells His Plans. Only Jews "Who Came By Fraud" to Suffer', *Daily Herald*, 10 January 1938, 6.
98. Concerning the Iron Guard, see Heinen, *Die Legion*; Traian Sandu, *Un fascisme roumain. Histoire de la Garde de fer* (Paris: Perrin, 2008); Roland Clark, *Holy Legionary Youth. Fascist Activism in Interwar Romania* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2015); Oliver Jens Schmitt, *Căpitan Codreanu. Aufstieg und Fall des rumänischen Faschistenführers* (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2016); Constantin Iordachi, *The Fascist Faith of the Legion 'Archangel Michael' in Romania, 1927–1941. Martyrdom and National Purification* (London and New York: Routledge, 2023).
99. Heinen, *Die Legion*, 314.
100. 'Acordul pentru apărarea libertății alegerilor', *Românul* (Arad), 1 December 1937, 2; Haynes, 'Reluctant Allies?', 105–34.
101. *MO*, 301 (30 December 1937): 9717.
102. CNSAS, file P11784, vol. 3, 40: detective corps, report, 19 April 1938.
103. 'Condamnarea lui Corneliu Z. Codreanu', *Universul*, 29 May 1938, 10.
104. Sandu, *Un fascisme roumain*, 170; Philippe Henri Blasen, 'Terrorisme légionnaire et ordonnances antisémites. La Région Suceava d'octobre 1938 à septembre 1940', *Archiva Moldaviae* X (2018): 309–10.
105. Carol II, *Între datorie și pasiune. Însemnări zilnice. Volumul 2* (Bucharest: Șansa, 1996), 6.
106. Carol II, *Între datorie și pasiune I*, 248.
107. See Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 208–45; 326–32.

108. See Constantin Iordachi, 'A Continuum of Dictatorships: Hybrid Totalitarian Experiments in Romania, 1937–44', in *Rethinking Fascism and Dictatorship in Europe*, ed. António Costa Pinto and Aristotle Kallis (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 244–53.
109. Blasen, *La « primauté de la nation roumaine »*, 222–45.
110. See Daniel Dieaconu (ed.), *Carol al II-lea și sfârșitul democrației. Un rege, un cult, o camarilă*, (Piatra-Neamț: Cetatea Doamnei, 2018); Daniel Dieaconu, 'Carol al II-lea – un cult pentru un rege', *Muzeul Național* 31 (2019): 229–40.
111. See Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 222–26; 280–95.
112. See, for instance: 'O țărancă despre Rege', *Dimineața*, 26 June 1931, 8.
113. *Ilustrațiunea Română*, 15 June 1938, 3.
114. 'În prezența M.S. Regelui și a Marelui Voevod Mihai a avut loc eri, deschiderea Expoziției muncii culturale la sate, a Fundației regale "Principele Carol"', *România*, 8 June 1938, 3.
115. 'Ziua sporturilor', *România*, 11 June 1939, 9.
116. 'La locul unde a coborât în 1930, Suveranul', *România*, 9 June 1939, 9.
117. 'Telegrama Mariei Modura', *România*, 20 May 1939, 9.
118. 'Luna Bucureștilor 1939', *Realitatea ilustrată*, 16 May 1939, 16. The original statue now adorns the Baraschi tomb in the Lutheran Cemetery of Bucharest.
119. *MO*, 128 (4 June 1940): 2583: no. 1775.
120. See Dragoș Sdrobiș, *Limitele meritocrației într-o societate agrară. Șomaj intelectual și radicalizare politică a tineretului în România interbelică* (Iași: Polirom, 2015), 15.
121. Born on 10 November 1907 in Bucharest, Fărcășanu had obtained his bachelor's degree at the faculty of law at University of Bucharest in January 1931 and had started his studies in Germany in November 1935: *Anuariul Universității din București 1930–1931* (Bucharest: Tipografia 'Bucovina' I.E. Torouțiu, 1932), 48; Mihail Farcasanu, *Über die geistesgeschichtliche Entwicklung des Begriffes der Monarchie. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der juristischen Doktorwürde an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin* (Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1938), back cover.
122. Reinhard Mehring, *Carl Schmitt. Aufstieg und Fall. Eine Biographie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2009), 681, 11 n.
123. Farcasanu, *Über die geistesgeschichtliche Entwicklung*.
124. Mihail Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială* (Bucharest: Fundația pentru literatură și artă 'Regele Carol II', 1940).
125. See Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 275.
126. Regarding National Liberalism in interwar Romania, see Ovidiu Buruiană, *Construind opoziția. Istoria politică a Partidului Național Liberal între anii 1927 și 1933* (Iași: Editura Universității 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza', 2013); Ovidiu Buruiană, *Liberalii. Structuri și sociabilități politice liberale în România interbelică* (Iași: Editura Universității 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza', 2013). Buruiană's portrayal of Fărcășanu overlooks the content of Fărcășanu's thesis. Buruiană noted that *Monarhia socială* quoted Alexis de Tocqueville, Lucien-Anatole Prévost-Paradol, and Benjamin Constant. Fărcășanu quoted Tocqueville several times, but in support of his antidemocratic ideas. Prévost-Paradol features with a single, minor quote about the July Monarchy, and Constant is included among the 'false theories': Buruiană, *Liberalii*, 37 footnote 6; 83; Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 48 footnote 77; 272–73.
127. E.g. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 89; 134, 15 n.
128. E.g. *ibid.*, 8; 18; 47, 70 n.; 102–04; 106; 108; 152–3; 178; 228–29.
129. E.g. *ibid.*, 13–4; 62; 86–7; 242; 330.
130. *Ibid.*, 173.
131. *Ibid.*, 240.
132. *Ibid.*, 9; 13–4; 26–8; 34–5; 55, 124 n.; 266; 276; 308; 311; 325–6; 333; 351, 126 n.
133. *Ibid.*, 9; 12; 27; 31; 37, 5 n.; 44, 47 n.; 62; 68–74; 78 14 n.; 81, 34 n.; 82–3, 37 n.; 84, 43 n.; 85, 45–46 n.; 196–99; 201–4; 207–12; 219–20, 36 n.; 242; 266; 363, 230 n. In particular, Fărcășanu quoted antisemitic texts by Ernest Renan and Charles Maurras.
134. *Ibid.*, 31; 34; 59; 62; 84, 43 n.; 103; 133, 12 n.; 166; 175–77.
135. *Ibid.*, 59; 68; 84, 43 n.; 87; 88.
136. *Ibid.*, 59; 87; 96; 98; 133–34, 15 n.; 146, 129 n.; 155–6; 159.
137. *Ibid.*, 72.
138. E.g. *ibid.*, 9; 13–16; 20; 26; 34; 105–06; 129–31.
139. E.g. *ibid.*, 7–12; 14; 16; 22; 24–28; 30.
140. E.g. *ibid.*, 10–11; 15; 209; 286–90.
141. E.g. *ibid.*, 9–17; 22; 27–30; 34.
142. *Ibid.*, 8–10; 17; 50, 90 n.; 51, n. 98; 105; 110; 128; 160; 174–75; 238–39; 276; 294; 305–08; 333.
143. *Ibid.*, 239.
144. *Ibid.*, 9; 239; 274.
145. *Ibid.*, 12; 17.
146. *Ibid.*, 8; 325–26.

147. Ibid., 291.
148. Jacques of Orléans ridiculed this argument after it had been used by his father, the Count of Paris: Jacques d'Orléans, *Les ténébreuses affaires du comte de Paris* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1999), 85–86.
149. Friedrich Wieser, *Das Gesetz der Macht* (Vienna: Julius Spengler, 1926), 365.
150. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 322.
151. Regarding Schmitt's thoughts on monarchy, see Joshua Smeltzer, 'To represent a people: Carl Schmitt and the monarchical principle', *History of European Ideas* (2023).
152. Farcasanu, *Über die geistesgeschichtliche Entwicklung des Begriffes der Monarchie*, 3.
153. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 122.
154. As early as 1925, two years before the Iron Guard was founded, the future Guardist leader Ion Moța corresponded with Maurras. Two letters by Moța were published in Florin Țurcanu, 'Aux origines de la "Garde de Fer". Deux lettres de Ion Moța à Charles Maurras', *Romanian Political Science Review* 2, 2 (2002), 542–44; Gavin Bowd, 'Charles Maurras et la Roumanie', *Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană*, 1 (2014), 206–07. For more information about the Iron Guard's connection to Maurras, see Traian Sandu, 'Droite française, fascisme italien: influences croisées sur la Garde de fer', *Analele Universității din București. Seria Științe Politice*, 6 (2004): 63–66; Valentin Săndulescu, 'Revolutionizing Romania from the Right: The Regenerative Project of the Romanian Legionary Movement and Its Failure (1927–1937)' (PhD dissertation, Central European University, 2010), 118–21.
155. The letter was printed in Vasile Marin, *Crez de generație* (Bucharest: Tipografia 'Bucovina' I.E. Torouțiu, 1937), 95–100.
156. Léon Daudet, 'Un succès réactionnaire', *L'Action française*, 2 December 1938, 1.
157. 'Assassinat à Bucarest du président du Conseil roumain M. Armand Calinesco', *L'Action française*, 22 September 1939, 3.
158. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 20.
159. Ibid., 69.
160. Ibid., 70.
161. Ibid., 86.
162. Ibid., 101.
163. Ibid., 104.
164. Ibid., 109.
165. Ibid., 156.
166. N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance. Considérations générales pour le congrès d'études byzantines de Sofia* (Bucharest, 1934), 4.
167. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 197.
168. Andrei Oișteanu, *Inventing the Jew: Antisemitic Stereotypes in Romanian and Other Central-East European Cultures* (Jerusalem: Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, 2009), 56–7; 149.
169. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 197.
170. Ibid., 208.
171. Ibid., 209.
172. Ibid., 229.
173. Ibid., 241.
174. Ibid., 242.
175. Ibid., 265.
176. Ibid., 305.
177. Lucien Romier, *Explication de notre temps* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1925), 195.
178. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 269.
179. Ibid., 278.
180. Ibid., 305.
181. Lorenz von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage. Band I-III* (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921).
182. Lorenz von Stein, *Staat und Gesellschaft* (Zürich: Rascher & Cie, 1934).
183. Lorenz von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage. Erster Band* (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921), 248.
184. Ibid., 258.
185. Ibid., 261.
186. Lorenz von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage. Zweiter Band* (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921), 48–55.
187. Lorenz von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage. Dritter Band* (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921), 13.
188. Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung I*, 49–50.

189. See Carl Schmitt, 'Was bedeutet der Streit um den "Rechtsstaat"?', *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 95, 2 (1935): 190, 1 n.; 191; 199; 200; Carl Schmitt, 'Die Stellung Lorenz von Steins in der Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reich* 64, 2 (1940): 641–46; Dirk Blasius, 'Zeitdiagnosen: Carl Schmitt und Lorenz von Stein', *Der Staat* 43, 1 (2004): 23–34.
190. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 8.
191. *Ibid.*, 326.
192. See Paolo Colombo, *La monarchia fascista 1922–1940* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2010); David D. Roberts, 'The Monarchy and the Fascist Regime in Italy', *History of European Ideas* (2023).
193. See 'Il telegramma del Re al generale Bava-Beccaris', *La Stampa*, 10 June 1898, 1.
194. Fărcășanu, *Monarhia socială*, 281.
195. *Ibid.*, 57, 139 n.
196. Gaston Baur, 'À l'Université de Berlin. Une thèse roumaine sur la monarchie', *L'Action française*, 12 January 1939, 5.
197. M. Fărcășanu, 'Monarhia socială și echipele regale studentești', *Viitorul*, 17 September 1938, 1–2.
198. 'Echipe de studenți misionari la sate', *Adevărul*, 3 July 1934, 5; regarding the programme, see *Cartea Echipelor* (Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală 'Principele Carol', 1937); Sdrobiș, *Limitele meritocrației*; Zoltán Rostás, 'Contextul cristalizării școlii sociologice de la București în anul 1936', *Revista română de sociologie* 27, 5–6 (2016): 387–401.
199. Ion Dimitrescu, 'Monarhia socială', *Curentul*, 13 December 1931, 1.
200. 'Mihail Fărcășanu: "Monarhia Socială"', *România*, 9 April 1940, 4.
201. "'Monarhia socială" de Mihail Fărcășanu', *Universul*, 26 April 1940, 2; 'M. Fărcășanu: Monarhia socială', *Neamul Românesc*, 7 April 1940, 1.
202. 'Munca în Restaurație', *România*, 8 June 1940, 5.
203. The journal of the Royal Foundations published its review of *Monarhia socială* only in September 1940: Ion Frunzetti, 'O remarcabilă istorie ideologică ...', *Revista Fundațiilor Regale* 7, 9 (1 September 1940): 706–07.
204. Doctor Seringa, 'Cocainomanie și spanachidism', *Chemarea* (Paris), 30 January 1950, 12.
205. M.C. Panaite, 'Paul Negulescu: "Principiile fundamentale ale Constituției din 27 Februarie 1938"', *România*, 23 October 1939, 4.
206. Born on 12 January 1874 in Bucharest, Negulescu had written his bachelor thesis on deposit law (Bucharest faculty of law, 1895) and, while attending the historical and philological section of Paris École pratique des hautes études in 1895–1899, dedicated his PhD thesis to 'Roman Institutions in Dacia' (Paris faculty of law, 1898). On 11 September 1899, he was made a supply for the course of administrative and constitutional law at the University of Bucharest, and on 13 May 1906, appointed professor at the chair of history of public and private law at the same university, being successively transferred to the chair of administrative law in April 1915 and to the chair of constitutional and administrative law on 1 March 1927: *Anuarul Universității din București pe anul școlar 1894–1895* (Bucharest: Tipografia 'Gutenberg', Joseph Göbl, 1895), 52; École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques, *Annuaire 1897* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1896), 127; idem, *Annuaire 1898* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1897), 138; idem, *Annuaire 1899* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1898), 132; idem, *Annuaire 1900* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1899), 125; Paul Négulesco, *Les institutions romaines en Dacie. Thèse pour le doctorat présentée et soutenue le 21 décembre 1898, à 9 heures* (Paris: Jouve et Boyer, 1898); *Anuarul Universității din București pe anul școlar 1899–1900* (Bucharest: Carol Göbl, n.d.), 3; *Anuarul Universității din București pe anul școlar 1906–1907* (Bucharest: Carol Göbl, n.d.), 18–19; *Universitatea din București 1926–1927* (Bucharest: Tipografiile romane unite, n.d.), 106; 109.
207. See Paul Negulescu, *Tratat de drept administrativ român* (Bucharest: Tipografia 'Gutenberg', Joseph Göbl, 1906), 217–21; Paul Negulescu, *Curs de drept constituțional român ținut la universitatea din București* (Bucharest: Alex. Th. Doicescu, [1927]).
208. Negulescu, 'Constituția României', 193, 1 n.
209. Paul Negulescu, *Tratat de drept administrativ român. Vol. II: Organizarea administrativă a României* (Bucharest: Fundația culturală 'Voievodul Mihai', 1930), 9.
210. *Ibid.*, 31–32; 'Ein Brief des Fürsten Karl von Rumänien', *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg), 27 January 1871, 438.
211. *Ibid.*, 54–56.
212. *Ibid.*, 106.
213. *Ibid.*
214. Negulescu, 'Constituția României', 191; 196.
215. *Ibid.*, 198; cf. Paul Negulescu, *Principiile fundamentale ale Constituțiunei din 27 Februarie 1938* (Bucharest: Zanet Corlăteanu, 1939), 110.
216. *Ibid.*
217. Negulescu, *Principiile fundamentale ale Constituțiunei*, 28; 47; 89; 76; 243.
218. *Ibid.*, 88.

219. Ibid., 87.
220. Ibid., 111.
221. Ibid., 129.
222. Ibid., 35.
223. See Gérard Unger, *Histoire du Second Empire* (Paris: Perrin, 2018): La nouvelle Constitution: retour au Consulat.
224. Cezar Petrescu, 'Cel care a plecat', *Cuvântul*, 6 January 1926, 2.
225. Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 167.
226. See Cezar Petrescu, *Cei trei regi* (Bucharest: Fundația culturală regală 'Principele Carol', 1935).
227. Lixandru, 'Le monarchisme carliste', 348.
228. Cezar Petrescu, 'Domnia Regelui Carol al II-lea', in *Enciclopedia României. Volumul I* (Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938), 963–63.
229. Cezar Petrescu, 'Cu rândurile strânse', *România*, 6 October 1939, 2.
230. A similar expression, 'voivodal tradition of the Romanian people', had appeared in February 1939 in an article on the 1938 Constitution, which cited Negulescu: Emil Botiș, 'Principiile generale ale Constituției din 27 Februarie 1938', *Administrația Română. Organul Asociației G-rale a Notarilor Comunali din România* 19, 2 (February 1939): 27.
231. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală', *România*, 12 October 1939, 1.
232. This idea appeared already in his 1935 book, in relation to King Ferdinand: Petrescu, *Cei trei regi*, 117.
233. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală', *România*, 13 October 1939, 1; 5.
234. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală', *România*, 14 October 1939, 1.
235. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală. Regele și Poporul', *România*, 15 October 1939, 1.
236. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală. Regele și organizarea politică a națiunii', *România*, 16 October 1939, 1–2.
237. 'Noi licențiați în drept', *Opinia*, 17 February 1915, 1.
238. Cezar Petrescu, 'Cu rândurile strânse', *România*, 6 October 1939, 1.
239. Cezar Petrescu, 'Politica noastră voevodală', *România*, 12 October 1939, 1.
240. See Simion, *Dictatul de la Viena*, 262–97.
241. Cezar Petrescu, 'Ceasul care venea ... Strânși în jurul Regelui, ca altădată sub scutul Voevozelor, să mântuim înaintea de toate ființa neamului și existența Statului', *România*, 20 August 1940, 1.
242. Larry L. Watts, *Romanian Cassandra. Ion Antonescu and the Struggle for Reform, 1916–1941* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1993), 319 footnote 63.
243. 'Un comunicat al F.R.N.', *România*, 2 February 1940, 5.
244. Theodor Vlădescu, *Frontul Renașterii Naționale. Origina și doctrina* (Bucharest: Adevărul, 1939) 17–8.
245. Ibid., 18; 29.
246. Ibid., 15.
247. Ibid., 37; 47–8.
248. Ibid., 28; 49; 53.
249. Ibid., 18.
250. Theodor Vlădescu, *Mareșalul, Națiunea, Statul, Monarhia* (Bucharest: Dacia Traiană, 1944), 61.
251. Ibid., 53–5; 59; 62.
252. Ibid., 56.
253. Ibid., 62.
254. Ibid., 65.
255. Ibid., 57.
256. Ibid., 65.
257. Ibid., 68.
258. Ibid., 68. Regarding the Archangel Michael in the Romanian popular belief of that period, see Roland Clark, "'Latent Archangels": The Archangel Michael in Romanian Fascism', in *The Archangel Michael Beyond Orthodoxies: Here – There – Everywhere*, ed. Alexandros Tsakos and Marie Steine von der Lippe (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming).
259. See Grant T. Harward, *Romania's Holy War. Soldiers, Motivation, and the Holocaust* (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 2021).
260. Vlădescu, *Mareșalul, Națiunea, Statul, Monarhia*, 69.
261. 'Theodor Vlădescu', *Curentul*, 30 November 1943, 2.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Roland Clark and Bronwyn Cragg for their contributions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Bibliography

- Anuarul statistic al României 1939 și 1940. Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1940.
- Argetoianu, Constantin. *Însemnări zilnice. Volumul III: 1 iulie–31 decembrie 1937*. Bucharest: Machiavelli, 2001.
- Argetoianu, Constantin. *Însemnări zilnice. Volumul IV: 1 ianuarie–30 iunie 1938*. Bucharest: Machiavelli, 2002.
- Arnold, Robby. 'King Carol II's Personal Fortune and its Effect on Romania's Economic Negotiations with Germany 1937–1940'. PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2009.
- Berman, Sheri. *Democracy and Dictatorship in Europe: From the Ancien Régime to the Present Day*. New York, Oxford: University Press, 2019.
- Blasen, Philippe Henri. 'Corporatismul lui Mihail Manoilescu – un model pentru dictatura regală? (1938–1940)'. In Sorin Radu and Oliver Jens Schmitt (eds.). *România interbelică: modernizare politico-instituțională și discurs național*. Iași: Polirom (forthcoming).
- , 'De la nomination du cabinet Goga au coup d'État du roi Carol II (28 décembre 1937–10 février 1938)'. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai Historia* 63, 2 (December 2018): 111–57.
- , 'L'évacuation de la Bessarabie et de la Bucovine du Nord (juin – juillet 1940): la création d'un cliché antisémite roumain'. *Revista de Istorie a Evreilor din România*, 4–5 (2019–2020): 271–310.
- , 'Rural Residents on King Carol's New Regime: Voices from Mihăileni, Northern Moldavia (1938)'. *Journal of Romanian Studies* (forthcoming).
- , 'Terrorisme légionnaire et ordonnances antisémites. La Région Suceava d'octobre 1938 à septembre 1940'. *Archiva Moldaviae* X (2018): 301–40.
- , 'La « primauté de la nation roumaine » et les « étrangers ». Les minorités et leur liberté du travail sous le cabinet Goga et la dictature royale (décembre 1937 – septembre 1940)'. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, 2022.
- Blasius, Dirk. 'Zeitdiagnosen: Carl Schmitt und Lorenz von Stein'. *Der Staat* 43, 1 (2004): 23–34.
- Botiș, Emil. 'Principiile generale ale Constituției din 27 Februarie 1938'. *Administrația Română. Organul Asociației G-rale a Notarilor Comunali din România* 19, 2 (February 1939): 26–30.
- Bowd, Gavin. 'Charles Maurras et la Roumanie'. *Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană*, 1 (2014): 205–09.
- Buruiană, Ovidiu. *Construind opoziția. Istoria politică a Partidului Național Liberal între anii 1927 și 1933*. Iași: Editura Universității 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza', 2013.
- , *Liberalii. Structuri și sociabilități politice liberale în România interbelică*. Iași: Editura Universității 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza', 2013.
- Călinescu, Armand. *Însemnări politice 1916–1939*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 1990.
- Carol II. *Între datorie și pasiune. Însemnări zilnice. Vol. I*. Bucharest: Silex, 1995.
- , *Între datorie și pasiune. Însemnări zilnice. Volumul 2*. Bucharest: Șansa, 1996.
- Cartea Echipelor*. Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală 'Principele Carol', 1937.
- Clark, Roland. "'Latent Archangels': The Archangel Michael in Romanian Fascism'. In Alexandros Tsakos and Marie Steine von der Lippe (eds.). *The Archangel Michael Beyond Orthodoxies: Here – There – Everywhere*. London: Bloomsbury (forthcoming).
- , 'Both Form and Substance. Romanians and Political Antisemitism in a European Context'. *Holocaust: Studii și cercetări*, 1 (2021): 41–68.
- , *Holy Legionary Youth. Fascist Activism in Interwar Romania*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Colombo, Paolo. *La monarchia fascista 1922–1940*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2010.
- Costian, M.I. *Regele Carol II și partidele politice*. Bucharest: Tipografia 'Lupta' N. Stroilă, 1933.
- Dieaconu, Daniel (ed.). *Carol al II-lea și sfârșitul democrației. Un rege, un cult, o camarilă*. Piatra-Neamț: Cetatea Doamnei, 2018.
- , 'Carol al II-lea – un cult pentru un rege'. *Muzeul Național* 31 (2019): 229–40.
- Dobrințu, Dorin. 'Cedarea Basarabiei, a nordului Bucovinei și a ținutului Herța (iunie 1940). O relectură a unui moment istoric controversat'. In *Catalogul expoziției 'Cedarea Basarabiei, a nordului Bucovinei și a ținutului Herța (iunie 1940) între neputință și iresponsabilitate. O perspectivă românească*. Bucharest, [2010].
- Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918–1945. Series D. Volume X*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918–1945. Series D. Volume XI*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Dumoulin, Michel, Mark Van den Wijngaert, and Vincent Dujardin (eds.). *Léopold III*. Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 2001.

- Easterman, A.L. 'King Carol Tells His Plans. Only Jews "Who Came By Fraud" to Suffer'. *Daily Herald*, 10 January 1938, 6.
- Fărcășanu, Mihail, 'Monarhia socială și echipele regale studențești'. *Viitorul*, 17 September 1938, 1–2.
- , *Monarhia socială*. Bucharest: Fundația pentru literatură și artă 'Regele Carol II', 1940.
- , *Über die geistesgeschichtliche Entwicklung des Begriffes der Monarchie. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der juristischen Doktorwürde an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1938.
- Filipovici, Anca. "Faith and Work for King and Country!" Nationalization and Covert Romanization through the Youth Organization Straja Țării (1934–1940). *National Identities* 23, 4 (2021): 349–67.
- , 'Healthy Young Bodies of an (Un)healthy Nation: Physical Education and Discipline in Straja Țării (1934–1940)'. *Plural* 9, 1 (2021).
- Fischer-Galati, Stephen. *Twentieth Century Rumania*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Florian, Alexandru and Ana Bărbulescu. *Elita culturală și discursul antisemit interbelic*. Iași: Polirom, 2022.
- Grecu, Florin. 'Critical Analysis of National-Populist Rhetoric of Mihail Ralea, Labour Minister, about Guilds and Corporatism'. *South-East European Journal of Political Sciences* 2, 1 (2014): 249–72.
- , *Construcția unui partid unic: Frontul Renașterii Naționale*. Bucharest: Editura enciclopedică, 2012.
- Hanebrink, Paul. *A Specter Haunting Europe. The Myth of Judeo-Bolshevism*. Cambridge/London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.
- Harward, Grant T. *Romania's Holy War. Soldiers, Motivation, and the Holocaust*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 2021.
- Haynes, Rebecca Ann. 'Reluctant Allies? Iuliu Maniu and Corneliu Zelea Codreanu against King Carol II of Romania'. *The Slavonic and East European Review* 85, 1 (January 2007): 105–34.
- , *Romanian Policy towards Germany, 1936–40*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- Heinen, Armin. *Die Legion 'Erzengel Michael' in Rumänien. Soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1986.
- Inglis, Cody James. 'The Languages of Monarchism in Interwar Yugoslavia, 1918–1941: Variations on a Theme'. *History of European Ideas* (2023).
- Iordachi, Constantin. 'A Continuum of Dictatorships: Hybrid Totalitarian Experiments in Romania, 1937–44'. In António Costa Pinto and Aristotle Kallis (eds.). *Rethinking Fascism and Dictatorship in Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, 233–71.
- , 'Mihail Manoilescu and the Debate and Practice of Corporatism in Romania'. In António Costa Pinto and Federico Finchelstein (eds.). *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Europe and Latin America*. Abingdon-on-Thames and New York: Routledge, 2019: chapter 5.
- , *The Fascist Faith of the Legion 'Archangel Michael' in Romania, 1927–1941. Martyrdom and National Purification*. London and New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Iorga, N. *Byzance après Byzance. Considérations générales pour le congrès d'études byzantines de Sofia*. Bucharest: 1934.
- Kostadinova, Tatiana. *Bulgaria 1879–1946. The Challenge of Choice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Lin, Juan J. 'An Authoritarian Regime: Spain'. In Erik Allardt and Stein Rokkan (eds.). *Mass Politics: Studies in Political Sociology*. New York: The Free Press, 1970, 251–83.
- Lixandru, Doru Adrian. 'Le monarchisme carliste dans la Roumanie des années 1930: autoritarisme, nationalisme et modernisation'. PhD diss., University of Paris Sciences et Lettres, 2018.
- Lungu, Dov B. 'The French and British Attitudes towards the Goga-Cuza Government in Romania, December 1937 – February 1938'. *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 30, 3 (September 1988): 323–41.
- Maner, Hans-Christian. 'König Carol II. Der Anfang vom Ende der rumänischen Monarchie'. In Edda Binder-Iijima, Heinz-Dietrich Löwe, and Gerald Volkmer (eds.). *Die Hohenzollern in Rumänien 1866–1947. Eine monarchische Herrschaftsordnung im europäischen Kontext*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2010, 151–64.
- , *Parlamentarismul în România*. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2004.
- Marin, Vasile. *Crez de generație*. Bucharest: Tipografia 'Bucovina' I.E. Torouțiu, 1937.
- Mehring, Reinhard. *Carl Schmitt. Aufstieg und Fall. Eine Biographie*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2009.
- Munteanu, Teodor Al. 'Eminescu și Evreii'. *Convorbiri literare* 72, 6–9 (June – September 1939): 891–903.
- Négulesco (Negulescu), Paul. *Les institutions romaines en Dacie. Thèse pour le doctorat présentée et soutenue le 21 décembre 1898, à 9 heures*. Paris: Jouve et Boyer, 1898.
- , 'Constituția României'. In *Enciclopedia României. Volumul I*. Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938.
- , *Curs de drept constituțional român ținut la universitatea din București*. Bucharest: Alex. Th. Doicescu, [1927].
- , *Principiile fundamentale ale Constituțiunei din 27 Februarie 1938*. Bucharest: Zanet Corlăteanu, 1939.
- , *Tratat de drept administrativ român*. Bucharest: Tipografia 'Gutenberg', Joseph Göbl, 1906.
- , *Tratat de drept administrativ român. Vol. II: Organizarea administrativă a României*. Bucharest: Fundația culturală 'Voevodul Mihai', 1930.
- Nielsen, Christian Axboe. 'Policing Yugoslavism. Surveillance, Denunciations, and Ideology during King Aleksandar's Dictatorship, 1929–1934'. *East European Politics and Societies* 23, 1 (February 2009): 34–62.

- Oișteanu, Andrei. *Inventing the Jew: Antisemitic Stereotypes in Romanian and Other Central-East European Cultures*. Jerusalem: Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, 2009.
- Orléans, Jacques de. *Les ténébreuses affaires du comte de Paris*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1999.
- Oulmont, Charles. 'Avec le roi Carol, « père du peuple, père de son peuple »'. *Paris-Midi*, 18 May 1937, 6.
- , 'Domnia Regelui Carol al II-lea'. In *Enciclopedia României. Volumul I*. Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională, 1938.
- , 'Politica noastră voevodală'. *România*, 12–16 October 1939, 1.
- , *Cei trei regi*. Bucharest: Fundația culturală regală 'Principele Carol', 1935.
- Rădulescu-Motru, C. *Cultura Română și politicianismul*. Bucharest: Librăria Socecă & Co., 1904.
- Roberts, David D. 'The Monarchy and the Fascist Regime in Italy'. *History of European Ideas* (2023).
- Romier, Lucien. *Explication de notre temps*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1925.
- Rostás, Zoltán. 'Contextul cristalizării școlii sociologice de la București în anul 1936'. *Revista română de sociologie* 27, 5–6 (2016): 387–401.
- Roșu, Răzvan. 'Kulturelle Enklaven in Siebenbürgen als Bewahrerinnen des Mythos vom "guten Kaiser". Eine Fallstudie im Motzenland'. *Spiegelungen* 14, 1 (2019): 47–57.
- Sandu, Traian. 'Droite française, fascisme italien: influences croisées sur la Garde de fer'. *Analele Universității din București. Seria Științe Politice*, 6 (2004): 61–77.
- , *Un fascisme roumain. Histoire de la Garde de fer*. Paris: Perrin, 2008.
- Sândulescu, Valentin. 'Revolutionizing Romania from the Right: The Regenerative Project of the Romanian Legionary Movement and Its Failure (1927–1937)'. PhD diss., Central European University, 2010.
- Savu, Al. Gh. *Dictatura regală (1938–1940)*. Bucharest: Editura politică, 1970.
- Schmitt, Carl. 'Was bedeutet der Streit um den "Rechtsstaat"?'. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 95, 2 (1935): 189–201.
- , 'Die Stellung Lorenz von Steins in der Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts'. *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reich* 64, 2 (1940): 641–46.
- Schmitt, Oliver Jens. *Căpitan Codreanu. Aufstieg und Fall des rumänischen Faschistenführers*. Vienna: Zsolnay, 2016.
- Sdrobiș, Dragoș. *Limitele meritocrației într-o societate agrară. Șomaj intelectual și radicalizare politică a tineretului în România interbelică*. Iași: Polirom, 2015.
- Shapiro, Paul A. 'Prelude to Dictatorship in Romania: The National Christian Party in Power, December 1937 – February 1938'. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 8, 1 (Spring 1974): 45–88.
- Sidorovici, Teofil Gh. *Carol II. Din culmea unui deceniu de glorioasă domnie*. Bucharest: Ateliere Luceafărul, [1940].
- Simion, A. *Dictatul de la Viena*. Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1996.
- Smeltzer, Joshua. 'To Represent a People: Carl Schmitt and the Monarchical Principle'. *History of European Ideas* (2023).
- Stein, Lorenz von. *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage. Band I-III*. Munich: Drei Masken, 1921.
- , *Staat und Gesellschaft*. Zürich: Rascher & Cie, 1934.
- Stutje, Jan Willem. 'Toward an Authoritarian and Populist Monarchy in Belgium: Leopold III and Hendrik de Man during the 1930s Crisis'. *History of European Ideas* (2021).
- Țurcanu, Florin. 'Aux origines de la "Garde de Fer". Deux lettres de Ion Moța à Charles Maurras'. *Romanian Political Science Review* 2, 2 (2002): 539–44.
- Unger, Gérard. *Histoire du Second Empire*. Paris: Perrin, 2018.
- Vlădescu, Theodor. *Frontul Renașterii Naționale. Origina și doctrina*. Bucharest: Adevărul, 1939.
- , *Mareșalul, Națiunea, Statul, Monarhia*. Bucharest: Dacia Traiană, 1944.
- Volovici, Leon. *Nationalist Ideology and Antisemitism: The Case of Romanian Intellectuals in the 1930s*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1991.
- Waldeck, R.G. *Athene Palace*. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1942.
- Watts, Larry L. *Romanian Cassandra. Ion Antonescu and the Struggle for Reform, 1916–1941*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1993.
- Wieser, Friedrich. *Das Gesetz der Macht*. Vienna: Julius Spengler, 1926.