Anthropogeography, geopolitics, the dialogue and the polemics opposing sociology and geography are central elements in the process of imagining the national space in the interwar period. A dense network of competitions, alliances and counter-alliances is coming together in this area of scientific legitimacy and representativity.

The birth of this new disciplinary subdomain offers us the chance to track down the external influences, to see how the central scientific canon(s) are replicated and transformed at the periphery and how the Romanian culture finds itself synchronized with the dilemmas, themes and tensions of the European culture. This sincronicity is taking place – it is one of the thesis of this paper – under the sign of „reactionary modernism”. This perspective has the ability of questioning the uniqueness of the modernity process. Is modernity a package deal or are there other ways of spelling modernity?

This appropriation of the „reactionary modernism” discourse for the analysis of Romanian anthropogeography and sociology is, in itself, an example of translating/transforming scientific discourses on a central-periphery axis.

Political and cultural contexts. The role of polemics

In pre-war Romania, but especially in the interwar period, there is a large and important coming together of various intellectual disciplines under the sign of romanticism and reactionary modernism, a massive scientific, intellectual and cultural redefinition and reworking of different disciplinary canons.

A number of sub-domains are being constantly formed, criticized, expanded and contracted in the quite prolific intellectual atmosphere of the period. One of these sub-domains is forming in the region between geography, sociology, ethnography, historiography etc. sometimes called, in a German manner, anthropogeography or geopolitics, or, under a French influence, human geography.

This rather new sub-disciplinary field is quite a significant element of this study, for a number of interrelated reasons. The first one consists of the fact that it explicitly integrates the discourse on national space in the construction of the national self imaging in the social, geographical, historiographic and ethnographic sciences in interwar Romania. The second reason would be represented by the fact that, analyzing the emergence of this new scientific (sub) domain, we would have a privileged access to the historic articulation of a political language (Pocock 1989, Pocock 1987). The last one is connected to the
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