

NAE IONESCU. INTRODUCTORY DEBRIEF

*Radu Baltasiu*¹²¹

ABSTRACT

There are three levels of discussion regarding Nae Ionescu:

- 1. His contributions to the Romanian Culture.*
- 2. His contributions to the Romanian society at large.*
- 3. His relation to the king and the secret service of the time (Siguranța) and the manipulation of the public perception by the different political and agencies, Romanian and foreign.*

Keywords: Nae Ionescu, Charles the 2nd, nationalism, and philosophy.

TWO WORDS ON NAE IONESCU (1890–1940)

There are three levels of discussion regarding Nae Ionescu:

1. His contributions to the Romanian Culture.
2. His contributions to the Romanian society at large.
3. His relation to the king and the secret service of the time (*Siguranța*) and the manipulation of the public perception by the different political and agencies, Romanian and foreign.

Nae Ionescu was a student of Nicolae Iorga – another generational formator – the one of the Great War. Professor of logic until the king Charles II evicted him from the chair, in 1938, of psychology, a deep learner in theology – the founder of Romanian Neopatristics, director of “Cuvântul” (1926–1934; 1938) until the newspaper was forcibly shut by the king in 1934 and again in 1938 for good, Nae Ionescu was an essentialist realist like Pavel Florenski¹²².

In turn, he had several eminent students, among whom we list some of those with whom the professor Nae Ionescu dialogued without detours: Mircea Vulcănescu, Mihail Sebastian, Alexandru Dragomir, Paul Sterian (...).

Nae Ionescu was the most important mystical logician in Romanian culture, an educator of the golden generation of the interwar period. He was thinking almost freely of Europe in its classical languages and, on top of that, he had two advantages, so far unmatched only by Mihai Eminescu: the clarity of his mind came from the

¹²¹ PhD in Sociology, Professor at the University of Bucharest, Romania, E-mail contact: radu.baltasiu@sas.unibuc.ro

¹²² Dora Mezdrea in Nae Ionescu, *Teologia. Integrala publicisticii religioase [Theology. The full text of religious publicity]*, edition, introduction and notes by Dora Mezdrea, Sibiu, Deisis Publishing House, 2003, p. 6.

depth of the orthodox faith that he lived mystically and from the courage to autochthonize the perspective on the world. Yes, the world could and should have the right to be seen from Bucharest as well - logically, mystically-orthodox and from a Romanian perspective. Arrested twice by king Charles II for his political sympathies and unforgivable by Patriarch Miron Cristea for the scathing criticism of the Church's weaknesses, Nae Ionescu was the main supporter of the idea that the Romanian Orthodox Church has the power and duty to be a factor in geopolitical stability in this part of the world.

“Orthodoxy and Latinity are the two identity predicates of the Romanian being and, simultaneously, the fundamentals on which a major culture can be built, which can be equivalent, and even compete, with those of the West. Latinity, never questioned with serious arguments, as an identity predicate, could be capitalized, over time, in terms of creation and spirituality. Orthodoxy, however, our main identity predicate, has been challenged and forced, especially in the age of imitation positivism, the nineteenth century, to retreat only to places of worship. What none of Romania's modern thinkers dared to do was daring Nae Ionescu: the restoration of Orthodoxy in its cultural and cultural rights. Orthodoxy, he specifies, is not only the true faith, the only one that can bring us salvation; it is also a *Weltanschauung* proper to the Romanian being: ‘Orthodoxy is an integral part of our very soul structure; not as a conscious, active element, but as an organic and mechanized component. We are Orthodox in the same way we are Romanians, in the same degree *we are*. It is our tradition, it is our way of behaving, of understanding and capitalizing on existence’, he wrote in 1926. Therefore, being so deeply impregnated in our being, it can also offer a model of construction of the social structure and because there are correspondences between the religious structure of a nation and the forms of political organization that it and can give to itself, as he explicitly states in a conference of October 28, 1929, entitled *Religious Renaissance*. The spiritual and cultural fulfillment of the national being is, according to Nae Ionescu, the main objective that the new Romanian state can establish. The reason for its existence, not the reason for the state”¹²³.

¹²³ „Ortodoxia și latinitatea sunt cele două predicte identitare ale ființei românești și, totodată, fundamentale pe care se poate construi o cultură majoră, care să poată echivala, și chiar concura, cu cele din Apus. Latinitatea, niciodată pusă în discuție cu argumente serioase, ca predicat identitar, a putut fi valorificată, în decursul timpului, pe planul creației și al spiritualității. Ortodoxia însă, principalul nostru predicat identitar, a fost contestată și silită, mai ales în veacul pozitivismului de imitație, al XIX-lea, să se retragă doar în lăcașurile de cult. Ceea ce nu a îndrăznit să facă nici unul dintre gânditorii moderni ai României a cutedat Nae Ionescu: restaurarea ortodoxiei în drepturile ei culturale și în cele culturale. Ortodoxia, arată el, nu este numai *adevărata credință*, singura care ne poate aduce mântuirea; ea este și un *Weltanschauung* propriu ființei românești: «Ortodoxia face parte integrantă din însăși structura noastră sufletească; nu însă ca un element conștient, activ, ci ca o componentă organică și mecanizată. Suntem ortodocși în același fel înc are suntem români, în același grad în care *suntem*. E tradiția noastră, e felul nostru de a ne comporta, de a înțelege și a valorifica existența», scria el în 1926. Prin urmare, fiind atât de adânc impregnată în ființa noastră, ea poate oferi și un model de construcție a structurii sociale și politice, deoarece există corespondențe între structura religioasă a unui neam și formele de organizare politică pe care acesta și [l]e poate da, după cum afirmă explicit într-o conferință din 28 octombrie 1929, intitulată *Renașterea religioasă*. Împlinirea spirituală și culturală a ființei naționale este, după Nae Ionescu, principalul obiectiv pe care și-l poate stabili noul stat românesc. Rațiunea existenței sale, nu rațiunea de stat.” in Dora Mezdrea (ed.), *Nae Ionescu și discipolii săi în Arhiva Securității [Nae Ionescu and his disciples in the Security Archive, Vol. I: Nae Ionescu]*, Bucharest, Mica Valahie Publishing House, 2008, pp. 20–21.

Regarding the relationship between the state and Nae Ionescu, there are few considerations to be made:

1. Nae Ionescu firmly believed that the state is strong only as long as it is based on the cultural fulfillment of the national being (see above).
2. Since Nae Ionescu did not agree with the Charles' personal rule and later, with the royal dictatorship, this thesis did not agree with the Royal Camarilla and Nae Ionescu was put under surveillance¹²⁴. Meanwhile, Romania was becoming a police-state.
3. Almost all the surveillance reports were out of reality as their pledges were void of any data but full of allegations and rumors. In fact, the *Siguranța*, and *Securitate* later on, were constructing their own field of research made of their own allegations.

Nae Ionescu became the owner of "Cuvântul", a first-rank newspaper in 1928 and an ardent militant for the return to power of king Charles II.

In the beginning he was an adviser of king Charles II in his first years (1930–1933). A good businessman, he successfully represents in Germany the interests of Nicolae Malaxa – one of the strongest industrialists in Romania¹²⁵. The main "result" of this collaboration is his splendid villa in Băneasa, confiscated by Antonescu in 1941¹²⁶. As well, Nae Ionescu was a representative of I.G. Farben in Romania¹²⁷.

Nae Ionescu was arrested in 1934 and liberated after the intervention of Nicolae Iorga¹²⁸, and forcibly interred by the regime of Charles II twice, in 1938 – when he became a political detainee¹²⁹ and 1939. His newspaper was suspended twice by the king in 1934 and 1938. He was continuously monitored by the intelligence services from 1927 until long after his death (!) – from 1942 are the last reports. The surveillance is resumed by the communist regime in 1953¹³⁰, when the old dossier is reactivated and filed as a threat to the new order, file number 1178¹³¹. Both stages of surveillance are related to the "criminal potential of the thinker"¹³². For both regimes, the Carlist and the communist were criminalizing thinking. Notably, the Prime Minister, Armand Călinescu, recognized that "We arrest Nae Ionescu again (the thing with Brâncoveanu) [he had told some friends that the king

¹²⁴ His most fierce enemies were Elena Lupescu, the king's mistress and Nicolae Titulescu, the foreign minister, see Dan Ciachir, *Gânduri despre Nae Ionescu*, [Thoughts on Nae Ionescu], 4th edition, afterword by Răzvan Codrescu, Bucharest, World of Faith Publishing House, 2018, pp. 96–97.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

¹²⁶ Dora Mezdrea, *op. cit.*, 2008, p. 233.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, Document 195, p. 227.

¹²⁸ Dan Ciachir, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

¹²⁹ Alexandru Surdu in Nae Ionescu, *Opere, I, Cursuri de Metafizică* [Works, I, Courses in Metaphysics], 2nd edition, revised and added. Introductory study by Acad. Alexandru Surdu, edited by Dora Mezdrea and Marin Diaconu, Bucharest, Romanian Literature Museum Publishing House, 2019, p. 16.

¹³⁰ Dora Mezdrea, *op. cit.*, 2008, p. 7.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² „Potențialitate[a] penală a gânditorului” – as Dora Mezdrea put it, after scrutinizing all surveillance documents available of both Siguranța (1927–1942) and Securitate (after 1953).

will have the fate of the ruler]”¹³³. In fact, data offered by the CNSAS regarding the informative surveillance of Nae Ionescu showed that “Nae Ionescu’s mere discipleship is enough to incriminate someone....”¹³⁴.

Besides the surveillance was affected by serious ineptitude of different sorts. Overall, the informative reports are a series of repetitions of the oldest by the most recent. Most of the reports were full of phantasmagoric stories, the personal opinion of the analyst taking precedence over data. For instance, Nae Ionescu’s ties with his former colleagues during his studies in Germany were interpreted as relations with first-rate Nazi politicians; his revenues and properties were astonishingly overrated or straightforwardly invented – as it was the case with the so-called property – a blockhouse in Balcic, or the 4 million worth Mercedes etc.¹³⁵; the *femme fatale* Elena Baston – his would-be mistress, important sponsor and “German spy” was an allegation, which disappears in the last reports on Nae Ionescu etc.¹³⁶. Two clear types of information emerge, though, from these reports: firstly, **Nae Ionescu was not a member of the legionary movement, a far-right politician:**

“To the disappointment of those looking for evidence of Nae Ionescu’s ‘legionarism’, we will see that they do not exist in the files kept by CNSAS¹³⁷ today: no doctrinal texts, written or published during his lifetime, no statements of affiliation, no other incriminating documents. His sympathy for the legionary movement, which is not the same as his affiliation, and much less to be confused with the philosopher’s solidarity with the nefarious actions of some of its representatives, seems to be to some extent responsible for the ambiguity of his position, of which, at least in part, the authorities of the time were aware”¹³⁸.

¹³³ „Armand Călinescu confirmă, în *Însemnările sale politice* în dreptul datei de 12 ianuarie 1939, că adevăratul motiv al reținerii lui Nae Ionescu este ceea ce se numește un *delict de opinie*: «Arestăm din nou pe Nae Ionescu (chestia cu Brâncoveanu)», in Dora Mezdrea, *Nae Ionescu. Biografia, [Nae Ionescu. Biography]*, Vol. II, second edition, revised and added, Bucharest, Museum of Romanian Literature, 2015, p. 535.

¹³⁴ „Simpla calitate de discipol al lui Nae Ionescu e suficientă pentru ca cineva să fie incriminat; dar lucrurile care li se vor pune în seamă sunt nespuse mai grave decât acesta.” in Dora Mezdrea, *op. cit.*, 2008, p. 9.

¹³⁵ See:

¹ “Document 35”, CNSAS File 73552, vol. I, f.50, July 8th 1937 and the editor’s note, in *Ibid.*, pp. 66–67, and

² “Document 36”, CNSAS File 73552, vol. I, f.52, September 3rd 1937, and the editor’s notes, in *Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹³⁶ See Dora Mezdrea’s conclusions of the surveillance reports.

¹³⁷ CNSAS – *Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității* – National Council for Studying the Securitate Archives.

¹³⁸ „Spre decepția celor care caută dovezi ale «legionarismului» lui Nae Ionescu, vom observa că nici în dosarele păstrate azi de CNSAS ele nu există: nici texte doctrinare, scrise ori apărute pe durata vieții lui, nici declarații de apartenență, nici alte documente incriminatoare. Simpatia lui față de mișcarea legionară, care nu este tot una cu apartenența, și cu atât mai puțin se poate confunda cu solidarizarea filosofului cu acțiunile nefaste ale unora dintre reprezentanții ei, pare a fi, până la un punct, responsabilă față de ambiguitatea poziției sale, de care, cel puțin în parte, erau conștiente și autoritățile vremii.” in Dora Mezdrea, *op. cit.*, 2008, p. 12.

Secondly, **Nae Ionescu refused any political or high-level dignities.**

Interesting enough regarding his relations with the political regime of the king Charles II were the political propositions offered to him: the chief of the secret service *Siguranța* – soon after Carol reenters Romania in 1930¹³⁹, and the Presidency of the Government – the Ministers Council, in January 1938, few months before his internment in the Miercurea Ciuc camp¹⁴⁰.

What “use” has Nae Ionescu today? – briefly:

- Learning how the reality has a *meta*-a pervasive “from above” reality, called *metaphysics* and how to use it by the mystical logic.
- Learning how to serve with astute logic and cultural arguments your country. That is, nationalism is not to be a political attitude, but a deep-rooted cultural one.
- What nationalism does it mean?

NATIONALISM. FORGIVENESS AND MYSTICISM

Two of the significant Ionescu’s themes are the pardon/forgiveness and mysticism. These are integrated into the Orthodox theology, in which Ionescu is highly interested. At the same time, Orthodoxy is intimately related to nationhood. Here is the starting point of this discussion.

Nationalism is the normal attitude of every individual, his awareness of time, space, and relationship with other kin-people alive or not:

“Nationalism is the attitude that draws all the allowed consequences from the finding of the natural and necessary fact that every human being belongs – without the possibility of evasion – to a nation. If, therefore, belonging to a nation is a natural fact, nationalism must also be a natural attitude, and absolutely not a heavy fall into sin. (That the nation, as a historical reality, is a consequence of original sin, from which history began, through which we fell into history, that is another matter!)

However, the nation is not only the logical category, but also the real community that defines each of us, the place, the framework and principle of our entire action and existence in eternity; and nationalism is not only a political doctrine (...), but a polyvalent attitude (...). Nationalism is not to be confused with chauvinism, ‘the worst sin of a race’”¹⁴¹.

When organically developed and not oppressed, nationhood forms the community of destiny (*comunitatea de destin*) It is organically related to religion, since nationalism is more than a doctrine, but an attitude¹⁴².

¹³⁹ Dan Ciachir, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

¹⁴⁰ Dora Mezdrea, *op. cit.*, 2008, p. 71.

¹⁴¹ „Nu-mi voi permite niciodată să dau lecții unui neam, mai ales când e străin. Le scriu însă pentru frații mei, Români. Ca să înțeleagă ei ridiculul sinistru la care poate duce șovinismul; și ca să se ferească de acest cel mai greu păcat al unei rase”, in Nae Ionescu, *Roza Vânturilor [The Rosary of the Winds]*, Bucharest, The Rosary of the Winds Publishing House, 1990, reproduction after *The Rosary of the Winds*. 1926–1933, collection edited by Mircea Eliade [and George Racoveanu], Bucharest, National Culture Publishing House, [1937], p. 86.

¹⁴² Nae Ionescu, *op. cit.*, 2003, pp. 404–406.

Forgiveness is at the heart of the new Anthropos brought to bear by Christianity and mysticism is a spiritual technique to transcend the world of the senses and quality of the foresight (the inner sight).

We all have pride. It's hard for us to forgive, even though we know we should. But the power of the Christian religion, power in the sense that it improves man, not because he "looks" down on non-Christians, is precisely the fact that I stop judging my neighbor. Because the neighbour can be Himself, He is Him, always and permanently. Furthermore, ceasing to judge one's neighbour means forgiveness. It is more, much more than being indifferent/tolerant. And here is the huge revolution that Jesus committed on a human scale, says Nae Ionescu. This is the path from which all the hostile ideologies and messages slip. Is the Christian weak? Not at all! How so? The Saviour forgives (or not!). Here is the text:

"Christianity is the religion of love, mercy, and forgiveness. So, the religion of the weak? Of slaves? Oh, no! Rather of heroes. Of humble and anonymous heroes; of those who have defeated them, of those who are no longer theirs, but God's.

Whoever does not ask for anything for himself – is a Christian.

Whoever no longer exists through him – is a Christian.

Whoever has killed himself in his body, in his ambitions and lusts, but lives in his spirit and in his law, which is God's, – is a Christian.

But does this mean that a Christian does not exist, does not ask for anything, does not want anything, does not fight for anything? Not at all. He is, he fights and demands the fulfilment of God's law.

If your neighbour errs not seven times, but seventy times seven, forgive him. Of course. If it does, it will be wrong for YOU! If he is wrong, you have no right to condemn him; for who hath made thee a judge over thine own judgments? And whence then hast thou power to condemn and to execute judgment?

How can you gather so much strength in your soul that you take upon yourself the great sin of enthroning yourself as a master over people? So, forgive him. But we know something else:

We know that Christ, mocked, spit on, slapped, and hanged on the cross, Christ moaned, 'Forgive them, Lord, for they do not know what they are doing'. But Christ, the merciful of all, is the one who took the whip and drove away the money lenders and merchants who defiled the house of the Lord (...)

For this is exactly what is sublime in our religion: the uprooting of subjectivism and sentimentalism accustomed to center all events on ourselves, – and our absolute putting in the service of a new transcendent reality. Forgiveness in the relative field of personnel is in its place: because we do not exist as 'we', the insult that is done to us has no object, it simply does not exist. The forgiveness of the mistakes of our wrongdoers is tantamount to indifference to the harm done to us because we do not feel this evil, we do not have to feel it. Thus, forgiveness is not a moral principle, but a therapeutic method for our personal processing.

But then there is no forgiveness of sins against the law for us; it is not in our hands, but in God's hands; only God can forgive. We do not! It would be too daring, and this pride would lose us.

Stop, therefore, the lambs of God, with the waste of generosity; NO DE RE TUA AGITUR! [IT'S NOT YOUR JOB!]"¹⁴³.

Forgiveness is not achievable both mentally and factually if it is unplaced in the above-world – what we call *meta*. To be able to go to the *meta reality*, you should be a *true* believer, that is, with mystic capabilities. Peasants and children can see beyond what is seen – the worlds of innocence. The eye of the soul is the specialized organ of the mystical sight, and less the “science of books”. The inner eye, for that is what it is about, transpires in the great literature through the great foreshadowing and pre-announcements (such as Dostoevsky’s novel, for example).

Obviously, this capacity suffers a lot today, being the victim of Pharisaic, which took the form of “pragmatism” and “accounting efficiency” – the relation to reality being reduced to financial calculation, the postmodern man forgetting that the return on capital must include a contribution to the “growth of civilization”, a “sharing” of welfare, more difficult to quantify. The act of sharing, along with praying, is one of the visible manifestations of the mystical perspective.

Mystical ability belongs to the totalitarian man, or the integral man, who knows that the world here always has a correspondent in heaven, and that everything has a purpose and a calling, a natural one, each with its own face – to put it in its terms Mircea Vulcănescu, of Petre Țuțea and Ernest Bernea.

¹⁴³ „Creștinismul este religia iubirii, a milei și a iertării. Religia celor slabi deci? A sclavilor? A, nu! Ci mai degrabă a eroilor. A eroilor umili și anonimi; a celor care s-au înfrânt pe ei, a celor care nu mai sunt ai lor, ci ai lui Dumnezeu.

Cine nu mai cere nimic pentru el, – e creștin.

Cine nu mai există prin el, – e creștin.

Cine s-a omorât în trupul lui, în ambițiile și poftele lui, dar trăește în spiritul și în legea lui, care e a lui Dumnezeu, – e creștin ...

Înseamnă însă aceasta că un creștin nu există, nu cere nimic, nu vrea nimic, nu luptă pentru nimic? Deloc. El este, luptă și cere împlinirea legii lui Dumnezeu.

De-ți va greși aproapele tău de nu de șapte ori, dar de șaptezeci de ori câte șapte, iartă-l pre el. Desigur. De-ți va greși ȚIE! De-ți va greși ție, nu ai niciun drept să-l osândești; căci cine te-a pus pe tine judecător în propria ta cauză: și de unde vei lua puterea să osândești, și hotărârea să execuți?

Cum de poți aduna atâta tărie în sufletul tău, încât să iei asupra ta păcatul grozav de a te înscăuna ca stăpân peste oameni? Deci iartă-l. Dar noi mai știm ceva:

Știm că batjocorit, scuipat, palmuit și spânzurat pe cruce, Christos a gemut îndurător: Iartă-lor, Doamne, că nu știu ce fac. Dar tot Christos îndurătorul a toate e cel care a luat biciul și a gonit pe zarafii și negustorii cari spurcau casa Domnului. ...

Căci tocmai asta e sublim în religia noastră: desrădăcinarea subiectivismului și a sentimentalismului obicinuit să centreze toate întâmplările asupra noastră înșine, - și punerea noastră absolută în slujba unei realități transcendente nouă. Iertarea în domeniul relativ al personalului e la locul ei: pentru că noi neexistând ca «noi», insulta ce ni se face nu are obiect, nu există pur și simplu. Iertarea greșalelor greșiților noștri echivalează cu indiferența față de răul care ni se face pentru că acest rău noi nu-l simțim, nu trebuie să-l simțim. Așa fiind iertarea nu e un principiu de morală, ci o metodă terapeutică pentru prelucrarea noastră personală.

Dar atunci iertare pentru păcate împotriva legii nu există pentru noi; ea nu stă în mâna noastră, ci în mâna lui Dumnezeu; singur Dumnezeu poate să ierte. Noi nu! Ar fi prea mare îndrăsneală, și orgoliul acesta ne-ar pierde.

Încetați deci, mielușei ai lui Dumnezeu, cu risipa de generozitate; NON DE RE TUA AGITUR! [NU E TREABA TA!]", „Duminica”, in „Cuvântul”, November 29, 1926, in Nae Ionescu, *op. cit.*, 1990, pp. 41–42.

The mystical relation to reality is primarily an extraordinary ability to see the wholeness beyond the immediate reality, through a strong experience (not emotion, which is psychism). It is living knowledge through love.

In “Theology” – the fundamental collection of texts on the subject established by Dora Mezdrea¹⁴⁴, Nae Ionescu mentions a whole series of features of mystical perspective/capacity. We present them, punctually, in the ones below. Being mystical means:

– Credo, *quia absurdum* (I believe because it’s absurd), “that’s what Tertullian said”. *Credo ut intelligam* (I believe in order to understand).

– [The Lived Sacrifice]

“Our journeys go through Gethsemane, through the garden of the accepted sacrifice; *credo, quia absurdum* is only the painful sacrifice of the intellect, which every Christian must do: serene and with conviction; for it is the sacrifice of the flesh”¹⁴⁵.

– “Cosmic perspective in understanding and capitalizing on man . . .”¹⁴⁶.

– “Strength to meditate and to defeat ourselves...”¹⁴⁷.

– “Religious meditation” – through which we overcome the “limiting” contours of speech¹⁴⁸.

– What is beyond existence.

“[1] There are people, cultures and civilizations who believe that this sensitive reality, in which we live and, which, constitutes our immediate experience, does not exhaust our immediate existence, does not exhaust our existence;

[2] That, moreover, there are some two worlds, of which one is tangible, visible – from here – and another is intangible, invisible – from beyond –, a somewhat principle and reason for being for the tangible world.

[3] The ability of the man *here* to penetrate beyond, in this very life, is the mystical experience of each of us. The penetration of the afterlife into the life here, its presence in every moment of history, is the mystical understanding of existence.

[4] Mysticism can therefore be challenged, but with one condition: namely, those who make it realize that it challenges the very existence of religion; or, if you will, of any religion.

¹⁴⁴ Nae Ionescu, *op. cit.*, 2003.

¹⁴⁵ „Drumurile noastre merg pe la Ghetsemani, prin grădina jertfei acceptate; credo, quia absurdum este doar durerosul sacrificiu al intelectului; pe care orice creștin trebuie să-l facă: senin și cu convingere; căci e sacrificiul trupului.” in *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁴⁶ „punctul de vedere cosmic în înțelegerea și valorificarea omului ...” *Ibid.*, p. 80.

¹⁴⁷ „tăria să ne reculegem și să ne înfrângem...” *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

- [5] I want to add, for the enlightened people, who imagine that they are Romanians, that our peasant, who, leaving on the road, makes the sign of the cross, bears the most categorical testimony for... mysticism¹⁴⁹.
- The ability to penetrate the invisible world:
“The ability of the man here to penetrate beyond, in this very life, is the mystical experience of each of us. It is the essence of any religion”¹⁵⁰.
 - Identifying with what is around you, the pre-eminence of knowledge and experience over the action. We know what is already in us: “To see what is, you must first become what is”¹⁵¹ – the essence of love (you become what is to be known)¹⁵².
 - The ability to be in the “*community of destiny*”¹⁵³ – the community of love of the Church is covered structurally and spatially with the community of destiny of the nation. This is Orthodoxy¹⁵⁴.
 - Changing man through love. “This transcendence of the individual, this exit from myself and this transformation [through love] into the objects given to me for knowledge is fulfilled by the gnoseological function [of love, which has another function, that of creation], the act of knowledge, that is, identification with the outside object”. – “*transformatio amoris*”¹⁵⁵.

CONCLUSIONS

If there is to be a rebuilding of our society on clever and clear-cut concepts, Nae Ionescu is to be brought to light. Culture, not any culture, the mystical attitude to properly understand reality, as a foundation for national attitude – not as a vulgar and extremist approach, but as neighbourly love. There is a chance to properly rebuild the statehood in an organic manner from these concepts: culture, mystical attitude, and nationalism, as opposed to an ideological and confused “political correctness”.

¹⁴⁹ „[1] Sunt oameni, culturi și civilizații cari cred că realitatea aceasta sensibilă, în care trăim noi și care, constituie experiența noastră imediată, nu epuizează existența noastră imediată, nu epuizează existența; [a.n.]

[2] că, mai mult, există oarecum două lumi, dintre care una tangibilă, vizibilă – de aci – și alta intangibilă, invizibilă – de dincolo -, principiu oarecum și rațiune de a fi a celei de aci.

[3] Putința omului de aci de a pătrunde dincolo, în chiar această viață, constituie experiența mistică a fiecăruia din noi. Pătrunderea vieții de dincolo în viața de aci, prezența ei în fiecare moment al istoriei, constituie înțelegerea mistică a existenței.

[4] Misticismul poate fi, deci, contestat, dar cu o condiție: ca anume, cei care o fac să-și dea seama că contestă însăși existența religiei; sau, dacă vreți, a oricărei religii.

[5] Vreau să adaug, pentru oamenii luminați, cari își închipuie că sunt rumâni, că țăranul nostru, care, plecând la drum, face semnul crucii, depune cea mai categorică mărturie pentru ... misticism.”, in *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹⁵⁰ „Putința omului de aci de a pătrunde dincolo, în chiar această viață, constituie experiența mistică a fiecăruia dintre noi.”, in *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ „Pentru ca să vezi ceea ce este, trebuie să devii tu, întâi, ceea ce este.”, in *Ibid.*

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁵³ Comunitatea de destin, in *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 45–46.

REFERENCES

- Ciachir Dan, *Gânduri despre Nae Ionescu*, [Thoughts on Nae Ionescu], 4th edition, afterword by Răzvan Codrescu, Bucharest, World of Faith Publishing House, 2018.
- Ionescu Nae, *Roza Vânturilor* [The Rosary of the Winds], Bucharest, The Rosary of the Winds Publishing House, 1990, reproduction after *The Rosary of the Winds*. 1926-1933, collection edited by Mircea Eliade [and George Racoveanu], Bucharest, National Culture Publishing House, [1937].
- Ionescu Nae, *Teologia. Integrala publicisticii religioase* [Theology. The full text of religious publicity], edition, introduction and notes by Dora Mezdrea, Sibiu, Deisis Publishing House, 2003.
- Ionescu Nae, *Opere, I. Cursuri de Metafizică* [Works, I, Courses in Metaphysics], 2nd edition, revised and added. Introductory study by Acad. Alexandru Surdu, edited by Dora Mezdrea and Marin Diaconu, Bucharest, Romanian Literature Museum Publishing House, 2019.
- Mezdrea Dora (ed.), *Nae Ionescu și discipolii săi în Arhiva Securității* [Nae Ionescu and his disciples in the Security Archive, Vol. I: Nae Ionescu], Bucharest, Mica Valahie Publishing House, 2008.
- Mezdrea Dora, *Nae Ionescu. Biografia*, [Nae Ionescu. Biography], Vol. II, second edition, revised and added, Bucharest, Museum of Romanian Literature, 2015.