

Notes and Remarks on the (Re) Institutionalization of Sociology in Communist Romania in the 1960s

Ștefan Bosomitu
IICCMER – Bucharest

Abstract: This paper aims to evaluate the place of Romanian sociology during the communist regime by trying to reconstruct the regional and internal political context which led to the (re) institutionalization of that discipline. After experiencing a fertile period between the wars, Romanian sociology was “banned” at the end of WWII and the establishment of the communist regime. After two decades of “misery”, sociology was once again institutionalized in the mid 1960s in the context of an intellectual and political “liberalization”. The paper tries to explain the institutional development of Romanian sociology within Michael Voříšek’s methodological framework, discussing a series of indicators of a discipline’s institutionalization: research, teaching, professional organization, discourse, and label. The paper also analyzes the role of diverse factors (prewar tradition, political regime) in the development of sociology after WWII. It concludes by explaining that the tortuous process of institutionalization was due to the necessity to find the right timing when sociology was to be accepted as a legitimate and useful discipline, but also to the fact that sociology was only then able to individualize itself within the theoretical and ideological complex of Marxism-Leninism.

Keywords: Romanian sociology, communist regime, institutionalization

Introduction

Towards the end of 1965, speaking to Grand National Assembly deputies, Nicolae Ceaușescu, Secretary General of the Romanian Communist Party, gave a signal on reconsidering the role of sociology in Romania. He said that

“the significance of sociology as a social science was not understood, by being denied a role in socialist society”¹.

The event seemed to be an important milestone in the history of the discipline. The consent given by Ceaușescu apparently guaranteed the re-institutionalization of sociology after nearly two decades of marginalization. But we would be wrong to be satisfied with this mono-causal explanation in relation to the topic of the present paper. Beyond the approval of the Secretary General of the party, which, as we shall see, did indeed lead to the restoration of sociology as an academic discipline, there are other causes which can be considered to have influenced the revival of Romanian sociology.

The history of sociology in Romania in the twentieth century was closely connected to the political history of the country. Experiencing a fertile period during the two interwar decades² as a result of a modernization process that followed the creation of the national state in 1918, the discipline would be “banned” thirty years later, upon with the creation of the “people’s democracy”. A new education reform (1948)³, which aimed at a deep “restructuring” of the Romanian education system, virtually abolished sociology – considered to be a “bourgeois” and “reactionary” science – by removing it from university curricula. The revival of the discipline was possible in the context of the intellectual “liberalization” in the mid 1960s. Sociology regained its place among the academic disciplines, and departments of sociology were re-established within the universities of Bucharest, Iași and Cluj-Napoca.

The subsequent history of sociology however, was a difficult one, punctuated by moments that will lead to a new “dismantling” of it. A first important

¹ Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, *Expunere cu privire la îmbunătățirea organizării și îndrumării activității de cercetare științifică*, in Nicolae CEAUȘESCU, *Știința, învățământul, cultura în procesul formării societății socialiste multilateral dezvoltate*, București: Editura Politică, 1976, p. 31.

² On Dimitrie Gusti’s sociological school, see: Ovidiu BĂDINA, *Dimitrie Gusti: contribuții la cunoașterea operei și activității sale*, București: Editura Științifică, 1965; Ovidiu BĂDINA, Octavian NEAMȚU, *Dimitrie Gusti. Viață și personalitate*, București: Editura Tineretului, 1967; Constantin MARINESCU, *Dimitrie Gusti și școala sa. Însemnări, evocări*, București: Editura Felix Film, 1995; Zoltan ROSTAS, *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuuri cu H. H. Stahl (1985-1987)*, București: Editura Paideia, 1999; Zoltan ROSTAS, *Sala luminoasă. Primii monografiști ai Școlii gustiene*, București: Editura Paideia, 2003; Zoltan ROSTAS, *Atelierul gustian. O abordare organizațională*, București: Editura Tritonic, 2005; Mircea VULCĂNESCU, *Școala sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti*, București: Editura Eminescu, 1998; Marin DIACONU, *Școala sociologică a lui Dimitrie Gusti*, București: Editura Eminescu, 2000.

³ The new education law – Decree no. 175/August 3, 1948, aimed at making a radical change in the Romanian educational system. The main aims of the law were: the training of young people in the communist spirit, strict control over elementary and secondary schools and over higher education, by suppressing university autonomy, providing workforce for Romania’s industrialization plan, and the development of middle and higher technical education, Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, Cristian VASILE, Dorin DOBRINCU (eds.), *Raport final. Comisia Prezidențială pentru Analiza Dictaturii Comuniste din România*, București: Humanitas, 2007, p. 354.

turning point was the creation of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences (1970), since that meant a political subordination of social sciences⁴. The death of Miron Constantinescu (1974), a personality who had a significant role in the revival of sociology, can also be considered an important moment in the history of the discipline⁵. Starting in 1965, Miron Constantinescu was the ideological “patron” of the discipline. The rehabilitation of some of the preeminent figures of D. Gusti’s former school of sociology (H. H. Stahl, Traian Herseni) may well have been possible thanks to his efforts⁶. Finally, a breaking point occurred in 1977. The Central Committee Plenum in June imposed a set of measures that led to a further marginalization of the discipline. In brief, at that time, the study of sociology was restricted to post-graduate studies, while the possibility of graduating with this specialization was abolished⁷.

Our study tries to answer some questions on the history of Romanian sociology in the communist era. What interests us in particular refers to the institutional and biographical history of the discipline. We will focus on issues regarding the (re)institutionalization of sociology, and we will only make incidental references to the epistemological development of the discipline. The focus of this paper will be the events of 1965-1966, which coincided with years of reaffirmation of sociology and its restoration within the university curriculum. The article will try to analyze these developments by reconstructing a sum of regional contexts which influenced the history of Romanian sociology. We are interested primarily on the influence of the emerging model of Soviet sociology on Romanian sociology. Equally, the paper will discuss similar processes in some countries of the so-called “Soviet bloc”, trying to estimate the profile of what could be considered a regional process of reaffirmation of the discipline.

Michael Voříšek defines a scientific discipline as “a unit for teaching, research, and professional organization, typically embedded in other social systems of

⁴ On the premises of the creation of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences (A.S.P.S.), see: Arhivele Naționale Istorice Centrale (ANIC), Fund *CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație*, File no. 29/1969, „The Transcript of the Conference with Social Science Researchers and Professors (November 13, 1969)”. On the creation of the A.S.P.S., see: „Decret 121/1970 privind înființarea Academiei de Științe Sociale și Politice a RSR / Decree 121/1970 for the Creation of the Socialist Republic of Romania’s Academy of Social and Political Sciences”, in *Buletinul Oficial al Republicii Socialiste România*, no. 22, March 18, 1970, Part I. On the organization and on the activity of the A.S.P.S., see: Mihai Dinu GHEORGHIU, *Intellectualii în câmpul puterii. Morfologii și traiectorii sociale*, Iași: Polirom, 2007, and ANIC, Fund *Secția Propagandă și Agitație*, File no. 31/1971, ff.1-13.

⁵ Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, *Criza sociologiei contemporane românești*, in Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, *Scopul și mijloacele. Eseuri despre ideologie, tiranie și mit*, București: Editura Curtea Veche, 2004, pp. 159-160.

⁶ Cătălin ZAMFIR, *O istorie subiectivă în sociologia românească din 1944 până în prezent*, Iași: Polirom, 2009, pp. 76-77.

⁷ Ștefan COSTEA (ed.), Irina CRISTEA, Dumitru DUMITRESCU, Maria LARIONESCU, Lucian STANCIU, Florian TĂNĂSESCU, *Istoria sociologiei românești*, Second edition, București: Editura Fundației României de Măine, 2005, p. 366.

modern society, and gathered around a shared disciplinary discourse”⁸. He also suggests a series of indicators that could define the institutionalization of a scientific discipline, as follows⁹:

- i. Research. One of the most important indicators of an institutionalized discipline is the existence of continuously and systematically funded research activity. Such activity is only possible with the existence of a specialized research institute.
- ii. Teaching. Another important indicator that defines the establishment of a discipline is the emergence of specialized courses within the universities. This detail, however, must take into account an important aspect: some initiatives which could be considered as exceptional, marginal, and often ephemeral should not be taken into account. Tomas Masaryk’s course in sociology, at the University of Prague in 1882, could fall into this category. Thus, the detail which clearly defines the institutionalization of a scientific discipline is the emergence of a system of university courses that consistently and systematically produces professionals in that discipline.
- iii. Professional organization. This criterion is one of the most obvious details that define the institutionalization of a discipline, as an organized scientific discipline is possible only when a professional association has been founded. In the case of the East-Europeans sociology, however, this indicator should be taken into account with extreme caution, because many of the associations founded in the 1950s and 1960s had as its primary purpose to facilitate an ideological offensive in a scientific international framework. Thus, a professional association is supposed to be actively involved in the coordination of the discipline and of its teaching programs, to publish books and specialized reviews, and to develop a disciplinary discourse.
- iv. Discourse. The sociological discourse can be detected at different levels. Whether in various philosophical, economic or social sciences reviews, or in books, newspapers or weekly or monthly publications. However, one indicator of the utmost importance for the institutionalization of a discipline is the existence of a specialized sociological journal. The emergence of such a publication indicates the existence of a sufficient number of sociologists, allowing a regular publication of the journal, but also a sufficient number of readers interested in such a topic.
- v. Label. Last but not least, another criterion of institutionalization is the very use of the term. Often, when the history of sociology in a particular country is reconstituted, there are some appeals to certain traditions which precede the institutionalization of a discipline. But there was no sociology until it acquired and asserted an identity of its own, until it adopted the very name.

⁸ Michael VOŘÍŠEK, “«Antagonist, Type, or Deviation?». A Comparative View on Sociology in Post-War Soviet Europe”, in *Revue d’Histoire des Sciences Humaines*, vol.1, no. 18, 2008, pp. 85-113.

⁹ *Ibidem*.

Thus, my paper will seek to explain the institutional development of Romanian sociology during the communist period within this methodological framework.

Regional and political context

For a correct understanding of the history of sociology in the communist era in Romania, it is important to undertake a comparative analysis of the phenomenon in a regional context. There are few issues on which we should reflect upon. What happened to Hungarian or Polish sociology after 1948? Can the marginalization of the discipline in the context of the establishment of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe be considered a regional phenomenon, or can we speak about a Romanian exception? Can we talk about a “reinvention” of sociology in the countries of the ‘Soviet bloc’ in the 1960s, or, once again, are we talking about a Romanian unique situation? Finally, it is crucial to analyze the influence of the Soviet Union in the process of reconsidering the importance of sociology among social sciences.

Of course, this comparative approach must acknowledge that the stage of development of sociology in the different countries of the “Soviet bloc” after 1947 was far from being uniform or unitary. If for Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania we could talk about meaningful pre-war traditions, in Bulgaria, Hungary and even in the Soviet Union the discipline was not institutionalized during the interwar period.

The Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union, sociology was not an institutionalized discipline until the late 1950s. Before Stalin’s death, in 1953, the social sciences continued to be normative and speculative. The very term “sociology” was carefully avoided, as being synonymous with the bourgeois science¹⁰ or even the bourgeois pseudo-science¹¹ of societal studies. “Historical materialism” replaced sociology as a part of the Marxist theory that dealt with social history and social progress. Western sociology was considered a capitalist discipline that was rejecting the notion of progress¹². Also, “scientific communism” (or “scientific socialism”), which could be considered as an empirical branch of Marxism,

¹⁰ Dmitri N. SHALIN, “The Development of Soviet Sociology, 1956-1976”, in *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 4, 1978, pp. 171-191

¹¹ Elena Z. MYRSKAYA, “Soviet Sociology: Fateful History and Present-Day Paradoxes of Fate”, in *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, vol. 16, no. 1 (Winter, 1991), pp. 75-78.

¹² Alexander VUCINICH, “Marx and Parsons in Soviet Sociology”, in *Russian Review*, vol. 33, no. 1 (January, 1974), pp. 1-19.

was not much different from historical materialism. Both disciplines focused their attention on establishing a link between the realities of socialist society and Marxist theory and on the identification of different signs that were announcing the emergence of the communist society.

A point of maximum importance in the history of the discipline was the de-Stalinization campaign promoted by Nikita Khrushchev with the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1956). The main consequence was a tacit, but increasingly more palpable acceptance/ approval of a relative autonomy of the scientific enterprise. Also, another consequence of the de-Stalinization process was the lifting of the 30-years ban on the exchange of ideas between Western and Soviet scholars.

As a result of this ideological breakthrough, on June 19 1958 a group of philosophers, economists and historians met at the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and established the *Soviet Sociological Association* (S.S.A.). The first president of the S.S.A. was George Pavlovich Frantsev (Frantsov), editor of the newspaper *Pravda*, President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and a well-known figure in Soviet diplomatic, political and intellectual circles¹³. There followed a period of emergence of the discipline, which was characterized as a period of “*legitimacy and fight for survival*”¹⁴. It was, of course, a time when in the Soviet Union there was no sociology or professional sociologists. The Soviet philosophers who chose this path had to make an important scientific step, by overcoming the paradigm of a specific type of research and accept a *shift* towards the empirical research¹⁵.

The first sociological research centers in the Soviet Union were established in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The first laboratory of this kind was founded in Novosibirsk, within the *Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Enterprise*, and was led by Vladimir N. Shubkin, head of the Laboratory of Mathematical Economics of the University of Novosibirsk¹⁶. The Novosibirsk researchers had a solid background in economics and mathematics, which was reflected in the highly quantitative character of their studies¹⁷. In the early 1960s, a *Sociological Laboratory* was established within the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Leningrad under the leadership of Vladimir A. Yadov and Andrew G. Zdravomyslov¹⁸. In subsequent years, similar laboratories appeared at the Faculties of Economics, Psychology and Law. All these research centers were unified in 1965 when *The Institute of Complex Social Research* was founded¹⁹. In Moscow,

¹³ Edward BELIAEV, Pavel BURTORIN, “The Institutionalization of Soviet Sociology: Its Social and Political Context”, in *Social Forces*, vol. 61, no. 2 (December, 1982), pp. 418-435.

¹⁴ Dmitri N. SHALIN, *op. cit.*

¹⁵ Edward BELIAEV, Pavel BURTORIN, *op. cit.*

¹⁶ George FISCHER, “Current Soviet Work in Sociology: A Note in the Sociology of Knowledge”, in *The American Sociologist*, vol. 1, no. 3 (May, 1966), pp. 127-132.

¹⁷ Dmitri N. SHALIN, *op. cit.*

¹⁸ George FISCHER, *op. cit.*

¹⁹ Dmitri N. SHALIN, *op. cit.*

sociological research was institutionalized through the establishment, in 1961, of the *Sector of Labor and Daily Life*, within the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Later, in 1968, *The Institute of Concrete Social Research* was established²⁰. By the mid-1960s, sociological research centers had also been founded in Kiev and Sverdlovsk, which were coordinated by the Soviet Sociological Association as its regional branches²¹.

In February 1965, in Leningrad, the first “national” meeting of the Soviet sociologists took place. The assembly was an important one because it was to produce a major change at the top of the S.S.A., with “veteran” G. P. Frantsev being removed from the presidential chair and the younger and more active Gennadi V. Osipov²² being appointed as the new president of the S.S.A.

Despite the institutionalization of the discipline and the fact that the Soviet Sociological Association had several hundred members, in the Soviet Union there wasn't a distinct sociological journal until the 1970s²³. The first specialized periodical publication appeared in 1974 – *Sociological Research (Sociologicheskie issledovania)*²⁴.

Poland

Of all the “Soviet bloc” countries, Poland had the most important professional and institutional tradition of sociology as a discipline at the time of the outbreak of the Second World War. Interwar Polish sociology was closely linked with the names of two experts: Florian Znaniecki and Ludwik Krzywicki. Florian Znaniecki founded the first department of sociology at the University of Poznan (1919) and headed the *Polish Institute of Sociology* of the same city. Ludwik Krzywicki was the director of the Institute of Social Economics in Warsaw²⁵. In 1931 the first meeting of Polish sociologists took place in Poznan, when the *Polish Sociological Society* was founded²⁶. The third and fourth decades of last century were the years of professionalization for the discipline. Besides the institutes in Poznan and Warsaw, sociology departments were established in almost all Polish universities and specialized periodicals appeared²⁷.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

²¹ *Ibidem*.

²² George FISCHER, *op. cit.*

²³ Jiri KOLAJA, “Remarks on Soviet Sociology”, in *The American Sociologist*, vol. 6, no. 1 (February, 1971), p. 47.

²⁴ Laurie MANDEVILLE, “La sociologie en URSS: Réalisme sociologique ou terrain privilégié de la politique d'ouverture?”, in *Revue française de sociologie*, vol. 30, no. 1 (January – March, 1989), pp. 137-154.

²⁵ Eileen MARKLEY ZNANIECKA, “Sociology in Poland”, in *American Sociological Review*, vol. 1, no. 2 (April, 1936), pp. 296-298.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Edmund MOKRZYCKI, “From Social Knowledge to Social Research: the Case of Polish Sociology”, in *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 17, no. 1 (1974), pp. 48-54.

During World War II, Polish sociology experienced a significant decline, but after 1945 there was a revival of the discipline. Sociology regained its prewar form and substance, but a new decline in the discipline, caused by the onset of Stalinist regimes in Eastern Europe, would again afflict Polish sociology. However, a group of sociologists from the University of Lodz was able to continue its existence under the guidance of Professor Chałasiński, undertaking research and studies on the history of social ideas²⁸.

A new revival of the discipline occurred after 1956, most likely following the Soviet example. In 1957 the *Polish Association of Sociology* (*Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne*) was founded. The institution was carefully controlled by the communist authorities²⁹. However, the Polish sociologists tried to maintain regular contacts with international intellectual circles. After 1956, cooperation and institutional relations with various institutions in the United States was facilitated. Moreover, Polish sociologists regularly attended the I.S.A. (*International Sociological Association*) Congresses, and some of them even occupied important functions in the I.S.A.'s management³⁰.

Hungary

Hungarian sociology didn't have a significant tradition before 1945. Sociological studies and sociographic investigations were conducted in the interwar period, but sociology was never institutionalized. The tendency to analyze social facts appeared in provincial universities, when groups of young students began to undertake sociographic investigations on disadvantaged social groups³¹.

Such studies were resumed after 1945, mostly because the government had performed an agrarian reform and wanted to receive positive feedback as a result of it. The reality was far from being the one expected, the studies demonstrating that the standard of living of the peasantry deteriorated. Also in 1945 an attempt to institutionalize the discipline was made. Sándor Szalai, a Marxist intellectual, managed to establish a chair of sociology at the University of Budapest. The experiment failed, his department being abolished in 1948³².

Discussions on the (re)institutionalization of sociology appeared once again in 1961, when the same S. Szalai raised the issue in an article entitled

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ Janusz MUCHA, Paweł ZALECKI, *Sociology – Poland*, text available on-line at the following address: <http://www.gesis.org/knowledgebase/archive/sociology/poland/report1.html>. (10 August 2011)

³⁰ Jennifer PLATT, *History of ISA: 1948-1997*, Quebec: the International Sociological Association, 1998, pp. 65-66.

³¹ Gabor KISS, "History of the Development of Sociology in Hungary from 1945", in *The American Sociologist*, vol. 2, no. 3 (August, 1967), pp. 141-144.

³² Dénes NAMEDI, Péter ROBERT, *Sociology – Hungary*, text available on-line at the following address: <http://www.gesis.org/knowledgebase/archive/sociology/hungary/report1.html#jump13>. (8 August 2011)

“The State of Sociology in Hungary”³³. In response to such trends, that same year, Andras Hegedus³⁴ signed an article which postulated the basis for a special sociological discipline within the framework of Marxist social sciences³⁵.

³³ Gabor KISS, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-144.

³⁴ HEGEDÜS András (31 October 1922, Szilsárkány–23 October 1999, Budapest), Hungarian Communist activist. Born into the family of a medium-size estate owner, Hegedüs lost his father in early childhood. During the German occupation he was the secretary of the Union of Communist Youth, and in January 1945 he became regional secretary of the Hungarian Union of Democratic Youth, which was created at the initiative of the communists. Later, he was appointed national organizational secretary of the union. In 1946 he took a three-month training course at a higher party school. From the end of 1947, Hegedüs was agricultural adviser to Erno Gero and deputy director, later becoming director, of the Department of Agriculture and Collective Farms of the Central Committee (CC) of the Hungarian Communist Party. From 1950 he was a member of the CC of the Hungarian Workers' Party (HWP) and its Secretariat. At the Second Congress of the HWP, held in February 1951, Hegedüs was elected to the organizational committee of the Politburo and to the CC. From November 1951 he was deputy minister of agriculture, and from January 1952 he was minister of the state-owned agricultural and forest farms. In the first government of Imre Nagy in 1953, Hegedüs served as first deputy prime minister and minister of agriculture. On 18 April 1955 he was appointed president of the Council of Ministers, and in this capacity he signed, on behalf of Hungary, the treaty establishing the Warsaw Pact. During the revolution, on 24 October 1956, Hegedüs was dismissed as premier and was appointed deputy prime minister. On 28 October he signed the government's formal request for assistance from Soviet troops which were stationed in Hungary. He antedated the document by five days. The Politburo had already made this decision on the night of 23–24 October. On 29 October, along with other discredited executive activists, Hegedüs was taken to the USSR. In Moscow, he worked at the Institute of Philosophy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. After his return to Hungary in September 1958, he worked at the Institute of Economic Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS), and from 1962 he was vice-president of the Central Statistical Office. From 1963 he headed the Sociology Research Group, which was created at the HAS, and from 1966 he lectured at the Karl Marx University of Economics. In the mid-1960s, Hegedüs's views underwent a gradual metamorphosis. In 1968 he condemned the intervention of Warsaw Pact troops in Czechoslovakia. As a result, he was dismissed from his post and went to work at the Industrial Research Group of the HAS. In 1973, the Politburo of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party passed a resolution on the “anti-Marxist views of certain sociologists,” among them Hegedüs; in May the same year he was accused of revisionism in the so-called trial of philosophers, expelled from the party and fired. In 1975–90, because of the great interest he attracted (owing, for example, towards his complicated career path), Hegedüs toured the world, giving lectures; in these lectures he subjected socialism to scholarly and political criticism, trying to draw the world's attention to Eastern Europe. In 1979 he signed a declaration of solidarity with the imprisoned members of the Czechoslovak Charter 77 movement. In December 1986 he took part in an illegal conference devoted to the events of 1956. In December 1988 he delivered a lecture at the first legal and public conference on the revolution of 1956. In 1988 he was elected tenured professor of the Karl Marx University of Economics. Among other works, Hegedüs published his memoirs, *A történelem és a hatalom igézetében* (Life Under the Spell of History and Power), and *Élet egy eszme árnyékában* (Life in the Shadow of One Idea), Wojciech ROSZKOWSKI, Jan KOFMAN (eds), *Biographical Dictionary of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century*, New York, London: M. E. Sharp, 2008, pp. 337-338.

³⁵ András HEGEDUS, “A Marxista Szociológia Tárgyáról” (About the Object of Marxist-Sociology), in *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle*, no. 2, 1961, pp. 166-183 *apud* Gabor KISS, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-144.

The further development of the discipline followed a specific pattern: in 1960 a *Committee of Sociology* was established within the Department of Social Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; in 1962, at the initiative of this Committee, a research group was established, which became operational on January 1, 1963, under the coordination of Andras Hegedus. Later, a specialized publication appeared regularly: in 1972 *Szociológia* (Sociology), which later became *Szociológia Szemle* (Sociological Review)³⁶.

We believe that the examples provided by the Soviet Union, Poland and Hungary are sufficient to highlight the existence of a pattern of institutional development of sociology in the Soviet Bloc in the early postwar decades. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union example is illuminating because in many fields, including the scientific and the educational ones, the model promoted by the Soviet Union was duly followed by the satellite states. The Polish model suggests a pattern of re-institutionalization of an important tradition, while Hungary's example highlights the efforts of institutionalizing sociology in a country without such a precedent.

Even a superficial analysis of the global process of institutionalization of sociology in Eastern Europe reveals us a number of certain facts. Thus, the decisive moment in this history was the paradigm shift that followed Stalin's death and the de-Stalinization process promoted by Nikita Khrushchev. The new climate favored the reconsideration of the need for a reassessment of the role of social sciences in communist societies.

1948-1965 – Romanian sociology in the “age of misery”

The *Decree no. 175 of August 3, 1948* (the new Law of Education) officialized the removal of sociology from among academic disciplines. In a gesture of mimicry and following the desire to align itself to the “enlightened” model of the Soviet land, where sociology was considered a bourgeois pseudo-science, Romania was abolishing an important prewar intellectual tradition. The short, medium and long term consequences of this decision were all unfavorable to professional sociologists. The sociology department in universities were disbanded, as well as the specialized institutes. Under these circumstances, the former professionals of the discipline had to seek ways and means of retraining or professional reconversion.

³⁶ Dénes NEMEDI, Péter ROBERT, *Sociology – Hungary*, text available on-line at the following address: <http://www.gesis.org/knowledgebase/archive/sociology/hungary/report1.html#jump13> (12 August 2011)

Postwar Destinies

The retraining possibilities of the former sociologists were not many. Moreover, many of them had fallen out of favor with the regime, the reasons for this situation varying from case to case. The most important figure of the interwar sociology, academician Dimitrie Gusti, would feel the full shock of the discipline's disintegration, falling out of favor with the regime. Sociology's terrible image in those years seemed to coincide with that of the disgraced former academician, driven away from his home and his books: an old man who sat weeping on a tiny suitcase in a room of an unfinished house in a slum of Bucharest³⁷.

Gusti's drama would have continued and been amplified if some of his old disciples would not have done their utmost to help him. For five years, Dimitrie Gusti lived in totally inappropriate conditions in the house of one of his former students and team mate of monograph writers. Only in 1955 he was to be rehabilitated, being granted a special pension and a comfortable home in downtown Bucharest³⁸. The burdens of old age and the bitterness of the five years of disgrace influenced D. Gusti's life, who could not take advantage of this late rehabilitation. He died just two months after moving in his new home³⁹.

There were also some less dramatic cases of those who chose exile in the early post-war years. Constantin Brăiloiu went abroad at the beginning of World War Two, continuing his work in France and Switzerland⁴⁰. Sabin and Veturia Manuilă also chose exile, settling in the United States after 1947⁴¹. Another similar case was that of Dumitru Amzăr, Press Secretary and Cultural Attache of the Romanian Legation in Berlin since 1940. After the war he did not continue his career as a sociologist, dedicating himself to a career in education, as a teacher in Berlin and then in Wiesbaden⁴².

The most dramatic destinies were those of the monographists who were involved in politics in interwar or during World War Two. With the establishment of the communist regime, their political commitments became one of their most odious "crimes". Many suffered, while some even died in the Romanian Gulag. Mircea Vulcănescu was one of the brightest intellectual figures

³⁷ "In early August 1950, called by Octavian Neamțu, I was given incredible news: Gusti was banished from his house, his library and taken away from his books. We visited him both. I found him in a room with a dirt floor, in an unfinished house, with newspapers that were fixed with some pins instead of windows, in the former slum Cațelu, weeping on a suitcase", Constantin MARINESCU, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 38 and 47.

³⁹ O. BĂDINA, *Dimitrie Gusti: contribuții la cunoașterea operei și activității sale*, O. BĂDINA, O. NEAMȚU, *Dimitrie Gusti. Viață și personalitate*.

⁴⁰ Zoltan ROSTAS, *Sala luminoasă. Primii monografiști ai Școlii gustiene*, p. 62.

⁴¹ Dan DUNGACIU, *Elita interbelică. Sociologia românească în context european*, București, Editura Mica Valahie, 2002, p. 232.

⁴² Sorin LAVRIC, "Cărturarul din exil", in *România literară*, no. 9, 2009.

of the Bucharest Sociological School. During the Antonescu regime, Mircea Vulcănescu served as State Secretary with the Ministry of Finance. After the war, he was prosecuted and condemned as a “war criminal”. Imprisoned in Jilava and Aiud, he died in prison in 1952⁴³.

Traian Herseni was another important member of the interwar sociological school who would experience the horrors of the Romanian Gulag. The indictment in his case was his political orientation and activity in the prewar years, especially the office of Secretary of State for Education, which he held during the “Iron Guard’s” government. Traian Herseni was arrested and detained between 1952 and 1956 in the Jilava and Aiud prisons⁴⁴. After his release, Traian Herseni continued to be intellectually marginalized, having for a few years the interdiction to publish⁴⁵.

Anton Golopenția was another victim of the regime established on 30 December 1947. One of Dimitrie Gusti’s university assistants, Golopenția had an exemplary intellectual background, materialized in a brilliant PhD awarded in Germany (1936)⁴⁶. After August 23, 1944, Anton Golopenția refused to get involved in the political struggles, remaining loyal to his intellectual preoccupations⁴⁷. He was a member of the Romanian delegation as an expert statistician on the Paris Peace Conference (1946). He later was the director and then general delegate of the Central Institute of Statistics, but he was fired from that position in 1948, mainly because of his refusal to make any political commitment⁴⁸. Later, he worked as a collaborator in various projects at the State Planning Committee, helped by the then S.P.C. president, Miron Constantinescu, one of his former students. In January 1950 he was arrested and indicted in Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu’s political process⁴⁹. Golopenția wasn’t able to take the harsh conditions of detention and the exhausting investigation, and died September 9, 1951 in Văcărești Hospital.

The purges of various sociologists after 1948 were not entirely due to the abolition of sociology that same year. The discussion should be more nuanced, and we should take into account some aspects which are little or not at all

⁴³ Ioana CÂRSTOCEA, “Splendeurs et misères d’un projet intellectuel: l’école monographique de Bucarest”, in *Revue d’Histoire des Sciences Humaines*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2007, pp. 33-56.

⁴⁴ Cicerone IONIȚIU, *Victimele terorii comuniste. Arestați, torturați, întemnițați, uciși. Dicționar H, I, J, K, L*, București: Editura Mașina de scris, 2003, p. 49.

⁴⁵ For this reason, he had to sign with a pen name his book on the sociology of success: M. RALEA, T. HARITON, *Sociologia succesului*, București: Editura Științifică, 1962.

⁴⁶ Zigu ORNEA, “Cazul Anton Golopenția”, in *România literară*, no. 43, 2001.

⁴⁷ Sanda GOLOPENȚIA, *Viața noastră cea de toate zilele*, București: Editura Curtea Veche, 2009, pp. 14-15.

⁴⁸ Lavinia BETEA, “Un sociolog, decedat în ancheta Securității”, in *Jurnalul național*, September 11, 2007.

⁴⁹ Anton GOLOPENȚIA, *Ultima carte. Text integral al declarațiilor în anchetă ale lui Anton Golopenția aflate în Arhivele S.R.I.*, Text, Introduction and Annex by Prof. Sanda GOLOPENȚIA, București: Editura Enciclopedică, 2001, p. 60.

into attention. In postwar Romania, Traian Herseni, Sabin Manuilă, Mircea Vulcănescu, and even Anton Golopenția were considered collaborators of the former right-wing regime of Marshal Ion Antonescu. They were all accused of being involved in scientific enterprises that justified the policies of the Antonescu regime⁵⁰. This detail is carefully avoided and almost nonexistent in the literature, but it is necessary to highlight the inclination of some important sociologists towards right-wing extremism.

The former professionals who had sympathies for the left between the wars fall into a totally different category. Henri H. Stahl and George Vlădescu-Răcoasa are the most significant examples. Miron Constantinescu, a disciple sociologist during the monographic campaigns of the late 1930s is another interesting case, because he would come to have a major political career during the communist regime⁵¹.

Henri H. Stahl had never been a member of the clandestine interwar communist movement, but he had an affinity for the Left between the wars, being known as a sympathizer of the Romanian Social Democrats. After 1948, Stahl didn't experience difficulties like Anton Golopenția or Traian Herseni. However, he was not allowed to continue a career in sociology⁵². After 1948, he was a lecturer at the Superior Institute of Social Welfare, until its dissolution in 1952. Later, he worked at the Institute for City Design and Territorial Systematization until his retirement in 1961⁵³. After two years of "creative leave", Miron Constantinescu recruited him for the team that issued the book collection "Biblioteca Historica Romaniae"⁵⁴.

Gheorghe Vlădescu-Răcoasa was first scientific assistant for Dimitrie Gusti. Known as a leftist sympathizer, Vlădescu-Răcoasa did not suffer because of post-war political changes. However, in postwar Romania he didn't continue his teaching career, feeling satisfied with a job as assistant director of the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, the job he held when he retired in 1974⁵⁵.

To undertake an analysis of the epistemological development of sociology in the specific time framework of those more than 15 years of "misery" is quite difficult. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that with the dissolution

⁵⁰ Good examples of such policies were the Romanian-Russian population exchange programs initiated by the Government in Bucharest. For further details, see: Viorel ACHIM, "Proiectul Guvernului de la București vizând schimbul de populație româno-ruso-ucrainean (1943)", in *Revista istorică*, vol. XI, no. 5-6, 2000, pp. 395-421.

⁵¹ Ștefan BOSOMITU, "Miron Constantinescu – profilul intelectualului angajat", in *Intellectualii și regimul comunist: istoriile unei relații*, Anuarul IICCR, Iași: Polirom, 2009, pp. 167-194.

⁵² Arhiva Universității București (AUB), Fund *Resurse Umane - Dosare de cadre*, File H 135 (Henry Stahl), (I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague, Mihai Burcea, who was kind enough to provide us with this file).

⁵³ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁵ Zoltan ROSTAS, *Sala luminoasă. Primii monografiști ai Școlii gustiene*, pp. 361-379.

of sociology, the discipline succumbed instantly. It is also a mistake to believe that any concern or interest in the field would have disappeared after 1948. However, the year 1965 remains a milestone in terms of institutional transformation, because only then a *Centre for Sociological Research* was established within the P.R.R. Academy of Sciences⁵⁶. A significant thaw occurred, however, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, when several contributions in the field of sociology were published⁵⁷. Another sign of the revival of sociology were the “rehabilitation” of Dimitrie Gusti and Petre Andrei, and the republication of some of their works by Ovidiu Bădina, Octavian Neamțu and M. Măciu⁵⁸.

During the 15 years of marginalization, sociology was undoubtedly a notion and a term carefully avoided. But there were some scientific approaches in the sociological field and several sociological research initiatives. Those initiatives were carried on by institutions such as: The Central Department of Statistics⁵⁹, The Institute of Economic Research of the P.R.R. (People’s Republic of Romania) Academy⁶⁰, The Institute of Geology and Geography of the P.R.R. Academy, The

⁵⁶ Jiri KOLAJA, “Sociology in Romania”, in *The American Sociologist*, vol. 3, no. 3 (August, 1968), pp. 241-243.

⁵⁷ M. BIJI, Vladimir TREBICI, *Uzinele „I. C. Frimu” – Sinaia*, București: Editura Politică, 1958; S. CERNEA, *Sociologia contemporană burgheză și problema claselor*, București: Editura Științifică, 1962; M. RALEA, T. HARITON (T. HERSENI), *Sociologia succesului*, București: Editura Științifică, 1962; H. H. STAHL, Ioan I. Matei, *Manual de prevederi și asistență socială*, București: Editura Medicală, 1962; H. Cazacu, M. Cernea, Gh. CHEPES, C. VLAD, *Profilul spiritual al clasei muncitoare în socialism: pe baza unor cercetări sociologice în uzine*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1964.

⁵⁸ See: O. BĂDINA, *Dimitrie Gusti: contribuții la cunoașterea operei și activității sale*, Ovidiu BĂDINA, Octavian NEAMȚU, *Dimitrie Gusti: viața și personalitatea*. It is also worth mentioning the efforts of O. BĂDINA și Octavian NEAMȚU, who republished the complete works of Dimitrie Gusti, in an impressive effort, from 1968 until 1993: Dimitrie GUSTI, *Opere*, vol. I, *Sistemul de sociologie, etică și politică*, Part. A. *Sociologia*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1968; vol. II, *Sistemul de sociologie, etică și politică*, Part. B. *Etica*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1969; vol. III-IV, *Sistemul de sociologie, etică și politică*, Part. C. *Politica*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1970; vol. V, *Fragmente autobiografice: autosociologia unei vieți, 1880-1955*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1971; vol. VI, *Documente*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1977; vol. VII, *Autoanalize, comentarii de epocă, documente și mărturii*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1993; The rehabilitation of Petre Andrei’s work started by the publishing of one of his famous books - Petre ANDREI, *Sociologie generală (General Sociology)*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1970. Subsequently, other important works by Petre Andrei were published in a four volume series: Petre ANDREI, *Opere sociologice*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 4 vol., 1973-1983.

⁵⁹ Roman MOLDOVAN, “La sociologie, science du présent et de l’avenir”, in *Revue Roumaine des Sciences Sociales, serie Sociologie*, t. 10-11, 1966-1967, pp. 49-54; Miron CONSTANTINESCU, *Direcții actuale ale cercetării sociologice în țara noastră*, in Miron CONSTANTINESCU, *Cercetări sociologice, 1938-1971*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1971, pp. 211-222; Miron CONSTANTINESCU, “A General Survey of Romanian Sociology”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 7-13.

⁶⁰ Costin MURGESCU, “Field Research Work as Conducted by the Economic Research Institute of the Academy of the Rumanian’s People Republic”, in *The Romanian Journal of*

Department of Social Welfare of the Institute of Hygiene and Labor Protection and The Institute of Philosophy of the P.R.R. Academy⁶¹.

We also should take into account another event which could be important to our topic, and we must say that almost all subsequent contributions to analyzing the institutional development of sociology in Romania chose to ignore it⁶². On 29 May 1959, several representatives of various sectors dealing with research in social sciences set up the *National Sociological Committee*, which was affiliated, the same year, to the I.S.A. (*International Sociological Association*)⁶³. The first meeting of the Committee established a number of priorities, adopted a statute and voted a ruling committee which included: Athanase Joja (chairman), Mihail Ralea, Vasile Malinschi, Petre Constantinescu-Iași (vice-presidents), Manea Mănescu (general secretary), Andrei Oțetea, Constantin Ionescu-Gulian and Tudor Bugnariu (members)⁶⁴. The priorities of the Committee have been organized as follows:

to contribute to developing international co-operation in the field of sociology, by its affiliation to the International Association of Sociology; to strengthen, either directly or through the agency of the I.S.A., the scientific relations between Romanian and foreign sociologists; to inform foreign sociologists of the

Sociology, vol. I, 1962, pp. 239-247; V. TREBICI, L. TOVISSI, "Aspects of Sociological Research. At the Statistical Chair for Various Branches of the National Economy at the 'V. I. Lenin' Institute of Economic Science, Bucharest, and at the Statistical Chair of the Bucharest Polytechnic Institute", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. I, 1962, pp. 231-238; M. STĂNESCU, AL. PUIU, "Aspects of the Activity of Sociological Research of the Economic Research Institute Between 1963-1964", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. II-III, 1964, pp. 201-206; P. GRIGORESCU, "Concrete Sociological Investigation Performed at the Institute of Economic Research", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. IV-V, 1966, pp. 319-321.

⁶¹ *** "From the Activity of Sociological Research of the Academy Institute of Philosophy", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. II-III, 1964, pp. 207-210; H. ENE, "Concrete Sociological Investigation at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. IV-V, 1966, pp. 321-322; H. CULEA, "The Session of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania Concerning Sociological Problems", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. IV-V, 1966, p. 327.

⁶² The works on the different aspects of the history of Romanian sociology never bring into discussion the establishment of the National Sociological Committee in 1959: Ștefan COSTEA (ed.), Irina CRISTEA, Dumitru DUMITRESCU, Maria LARIONESCU, Lucian STANCIU, Florian TĂNĂSESCU, *Istoria sociologiei românești*, Second edition, București: Editura Fundației România de Măine, 2005; Cătălin ZAMFIR, *O istorie subiectivă în sociologia românească din 1944 până în prezent*, Cătălin ZAMFIR "9 ipoteze pentru o analiză sociologic-epistemologică a sociologiei românești în perioada comunistă: 1944-1989", in *Sociologie românească*, vol. III, no. 1, 2005, pp. 53-71.

⁶³ "Activities of the National Sociological Committee", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. I, 1962, pp. 225-229.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*.

preoccupations and achievements of Rumanian sociologists, by participating in international congresses and conferences, and by editing a publication in a widely-used foreign language; and to be itself abreast of developments in the world sociological movement⁶⁵

The establishment of this committee and the affiliation to the International Sociological Association were followed by the participation, for the first time by a Romanian delegation, in the *IV International Congress of Sociology* which took place from 8 to 15 September 1959 in Stressa, a small town near Milan. Athanase Joja, Mihail Ralea, Vasile Malinschi, Constantin Gulian, Manea Mănescu and Traian Ionașcu formed the Romanian delegation that participated in the international congress⁶⁶.

Regarding this initiative, the affiliation with I.S.A. and the first participation of a Romanian delegation to an International Congress of Sociology, it is necessary to point out a fact that is undoubtedly curious. None of those who were part of the management committee established in 1959 and none of those who attended the Congress of Italy were professional sociologists. What good was such such initiatives? Firstly, it could have been just an imitation of the Soviet model. We know that only a few months earlier, a similar initiative took place in Moscow. No doubt that the decision making bodies urged Romanian social scientists to follow the Soviet example. Henri H. Stahl spoke about another reason that influenced the establishment of N.S.C. He thought that the need and desire for international recognition was the reason for such an initiative. He remembered how the Romanian delegation that attended the Congress of Stressa – Milan was questioned about the situation of the former professionals of the discipline, Dimitrie Gusti's followers. Taken undoubtedly by surprise, Manea Mănescu and the other members of the delegation lied,

⁶⁵ *Ibidem.*

⁶⁶ At the Forth International Congress, held in Stressa-Milano, the Romanian delegation's activity was as follows: Mihail Ralea presented a report on "Sociology and Psychology" within the "Committee on the Methodology of the Relations between Psychology and Sociology", and had other interventions in the debates of the Committee for Underdeveloped Countries; V. Malinschi delivered the paper "Some Methodological Problems of Sociological Research" in the 'Investigation Methods Committee', and also spoke at the "Agricultural Committee"; Athanase Joja presented a paper on "The Sociology of Logic" in the "Committee on the Sociology of Knowledge"; Constantin Gulian submitted the paper "Critique of the Psycho-Analytical Interpretation on Sociology", and had other interventions in the "Education Committee" and the "Committee on the Sociology of Religion; Manea Mănescu spoke in the "Committee for Industrial Sociology", presenting a paper entitled "Concerning the Method of Sociological Investigation in Industrial Enterprises", and in the "Statistics Committee", with the paper "Investigation Into the Living Conditions of the Population by Means of a Family Budgets"; Traian Ionașcu presented a paper concerning "Sex Equality in the Rumanian People's Republic", in the "Committee on Family Sociology". An ample survey of the papers presented at the Forth International Congress was published in the October 30, 1959, issue of the review *Contemporanul*, and *Cercetări filozofice* vol.6, 1959, *Ibidem.*

apparently, saying that they all were part of the newly established Committee. H. Stahl also remembered that after the delegation's return from Italy he was orally informed on his so-called "membership" in this new Committee⁶⁷.

We may presume that the activity of the National Sociological Committee continued in the same manner in the years that followed. There is no evidence or information regarding a specialization of sociological research at the N.C.S. Practically, on the eve of the *5th International Congress of Sociology*, which was to take place in the United States at Washington, from 2 to 8 September 1982, N.C.S. was to send a delegation which was not much different from the one that went to Italy: Athanase Joja, Constantin I. Gulian, Manea Mănescu and Tudor Bugnariu⁶⁸. It is clear then that the creation of this committee falls into that category of those professional organizations whose main purpose was to facilitate the recognition of various scholars internationally.

The re-institutionalization of sociology: 1965-1966

The moment considered as the most important in the history of the discipline took place in 1965-1966. An initial first important step towards the institutionalization of sociology is implemented by the creation of a *Centre for Sociological Research* at the S.R.R. (Socialist Republic of Romania) Academy of Science, and by the re-creation of departments of sociology, first at the University of Bucharest, and later at the universities of Iași and Cluj-Napoca⁶⁹.

On the "ins and outs" of these undertakings and on the efforts made by those who could claim the paternity of these departments, Henri H. Stahl remembers some interesting details. As reported by Stahl, Tudor Bugnariu was the one who had a practical and coherent initiative for the recovery of sociology as an academic discipline⁷⁰. As Stahl remembers, Bugnariu "had a much

⁶⁷ Zoltan ROSTAS, *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuri cu Henri H. Stahl*, p. 170.

⁶⁸ "Activities of the National Sociological Committee", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. I, 1962, pp. 225-229.

⁶⁹ After the establishment of the first Department of Sociology at the School of Philosophy within the University of Bucharest (1966), similar Departments were founded at the University of Cluj-Napoca and the University of Iași – a Philosophy-Sociology Department at the University of Cluj-Napoca and Psychology-Sociology Department at the University of Iași. In the period between 1968-1970, sociology courses were introduced in all branches of higher education (technical, economic, agricultural, medical, architectural, pedagogical), Ștefan COSTEA *et alii*, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

⁷⁰ Tudor Bugnariu (b. June 30, 1909, Budapest – d. June 25, 1988, Bucharest). He was the son of Andrei Bugnariu and of Lucreția (Moisil). At the time of his birth his father was a mail clerk in Budapest. After the 1918 union between Transylvania and Romania, the Bugnariu family moved to Cluj, where his father became the manager of the "Avram Iancu" student dormitory. Tudor Bugnariu attended primary school in Budapest, and secondary school at 'George Barițiu' High School in Cluj. He became a student of the School of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Cluj and, after graduating, he was offered a job as an assistant professor at the

clearer and more appropriate view than Miron Constantinescu on what sociology can represent in a socialist regime⁷¹. Constantinescu was the one who would later succeed in a similar initiative⁷¹. Trying to materialize his intention in as professional a manner as possible T. Bugnariu sought feedback on this issue through lengthy discussions with Traian Herseni and Gh. Vlădescu-Răcoasa. Later, they brought the topic back into the discussion through a series of articles on the relationships between sociology and socialism/communism which were published in the “Contemporanul” magazine⁷². Among the beneficiaries of the new climate around the discipline was Constantin Nicuță, a former diplomat and a philosophy PhD, who reinterpreted the theses launched by Bugnariu, radicalizing them in a Stalinist manner⁷³. Thus, it seems that he was the one to reestablish a Department of Sociology at the University of Bucharest School of Philosophy. However, C-tin Nicuță was soon to be introduced in his project by Miron Constantinescu, a former student of Dimitrie Gusti and a former important member of the communist nomenclature. Removed from the Politburo and the Central Committee after a putsch attempt in 1957, Constantinescu was to regain his high position in the management structures of the communist system within less than a decade. The new balance of power determined a compromise. Thus, two departments were created: one of sociology, led by Miron Constantinescu, and another one in the sphere of sociological doctrine and methodology, which was assigned to C-tin Nicuță⁷⁴. Subsequent to the agreement between the two, C-tin Nicuță experi-

Romanian Language Department. He was soon fired because of his political options, becoming a secondary school teacher. In 1934, he was one of the initiators and organizers of the “Friends of the USSR” association. In 1935 he was tried by the VI Army War Tribunal in Cluj, and sentenced to 10 months in prison, 10 years loss of civic rights, a 10,000 lei fine, and a ban on teaching. Later, he worked as a clerk for various private companies, and became a contributor to several leftist publications, signing with a pen name. During WWII he was detained in the camps of Caracal and Someșeni, being sent afterwards to the front line on disciplinary grounds. After August 23, 1944 Tudor Bugnariu became mayor of Cluj, and after the 1948 Education Law was passed he was reinstated as a professor at the University of Cluj and then at the University of Bucharest, Corneliu CRĂCIUN, *Dicționarul comunizanților din noaptea de 23 spre 24 august 1944*, Oradea: Editura Primus, 2009, p. 121. In March 1950 Bugnariu was appointed Deputy to the Ministry of Education and Culture, a position which he held until November 1956. Later, he was a professor at the “A. A. Zhdanov” Superior School in Social Sciences. In October 1958 he was transferred to the University of Bucharest, where he became a professor of dialectical and historical materialism and the Dean of the School of Philosophy, AUB, *Fund Resurse Umane - Dosare de cadre*, File B 516 (Tudor Bugnariu), (I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague, Mihai Burcea, who was kind enough to provide us with this file).

⁷¹ Zoltan ROSTAS, *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuuri cu Henri H. Stahl, op.cit.*, p. 233.

⁷² *Ibidem*.

⁷³ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁴ Constantin (Costache) Nicuță (September 8, 1906, Pașcani – 1991, Bucharest). He attended secondary school studies in Suceava (1919-1927), and then he became a student of the University of Iași – the School of Letters and Philosophy and the School of Law (1928-1932).

enced a period of professional decline, which allowed Miron Constantinescu to take charge and become the only “patron” of the discipline.

It is necessary to underline at this point that the presence of these three characters at the top of discussions on the restoration of sociology in Romania was not coincidental. Curiously, the destinies of the three show similarities which are worth being brought to attention. All three were students in the 30s and had sympathies for the Left. All three graduated from the School of Letters and Philosophy, but each one in another important Romanian academic center: Miron Constantinescu in Bucharest, Tudor Bugnariu in Cluj and Constantin Nicuță in Iași. All of them had a degree in sociology, each working with a different important sociologist of interwar Romanian: Miron Constantinescu with Dimitrie Gusti, Tudor Bugnariu with Virgil I. Bărbat and Constantin Nicuță alongside Petre Andrei. After 1945, all of them were professors of dialectical and historical materialism in Iasi (Constantin Nicuță), Cluj (Tudor Bugnariu) and Bucharest (Miron Constantinescu).

Moreover, after 1945 the careers of the three experienced similar ascending trends. During the postwar years, they held similar positions and offices. Miron Constantinescu was Secretary of State in the Ministry of Education in 1947. Tudor Bugnariu occupied a similar position from 1950 until 1956. Meanwhile Constantin Nicuță was a professor, head of department and vice-chancellor at the “A. A. Zhdanov” Superior School of Social Sciences between 1951 and 1956. Afterwards he was replaced in all these functions by Tudor Bugnariu, while Constantin Nicuță took his place as Deputy Minister of Education. During this period, Miron Constantinescu had an impressive political career, occupying high positions in party and state structures. After Constantinescu’s “fall” in 1957, the careers of the other two took a turn for the best.

Later, he was a teacher at the Military High School of Cernăuți, then in Iași (1933-6). He was later offered a job as an assistant professor at the Department of Sociology and Ethics of the University of Iași, thus working with Petre Andrei (1936-37). Between 1937-39 he got a scholarship to France, where he studied sociology and philosophy. Afterwards, he was eliminated from the university due to his leftist politics. He got a PhD at the University of Iași with a thesis on the theory of social knowledge in the work of Max Weber (1945). Soon after, he became a professor of dialectical and historical materialism at the University of Iași. After 1948, he settled in Bucharest, where he worked as a secretary general of the Institute of Romanian-Soviet Studies. From 1951 he was a professor, then head of a Department and later vice-chancellor of the “A. A. Zhdanov” Superior School of Social Sciences. Between 1956 and 1958, he was Deputy of the Minister of Education. In 1948 he was Romanian Ambassador to Vienna; in 1959 he was a member of the Romanian U.N. delegation, and between 1960-63 he held the position of Romanian Ambassador to Paris. Starting in 1965, he was the Dean of the School of Philosophy (1965-68), head of the Department of Sociological and Political Doctrines (1966-1972), and head of the Department of Sociology (1972-74). In 1970, he became a member of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences, and the vice-president of the Section of Sociology (1970-1990), Ștefan COSTEA (ed.), *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie*, București: Editura Expert, 2005, pp. 342-343.

Bugnariu was appointed professor of dialectical and historical materialism and head of department at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Bucharest, occupying an academic office which belonged to Miron Constantinescu prior to his political decline. Constantin Nicuță made built a career in diplomacy, becoming ambassador of Romania in Vienna and Paris.

In 1965 the balance of power between the three seemed to favor Bugnariu, who had the most important academic background. Nicuță was the one who left the academic field for nearly a decade, opting for a career in diplomacy, while Constantinescu was politically and academically marginalized also for nearly a decade. But Nicuță was probably the one who took advantage of his political capital acquired during his diplomatic experiences and easily surpassed Bugnariu, taking top position in the re-institutionalization of Romanian sociology. Also, Miron Constantinescu's gradual rehabilitation after 1965 changed again the balance of power, since Constantinescu had the most impressive political background, now acting as a "new old star". Thus, it is probably clear that political influence seemed to have preponderance in this "intellectual" dispute.

By assuming the success in terms of "ruling" the new academic discipline, Miron Constantinescu saw a huge potential in this opportunity. He brought by his side the retired Henri H. Stahl, one of the most valuable exponents of the Bucharest Sociological School, seeking to obtain primacy in the discipline, which would have satisfied Constantinescu's pride and thirst for power after a decade of political and social marginalization. His pride and perhaps a dose of significant resentment made him take some bizarre decisions as well. Thus, Constantinescu did everything in his power to "marginalize" Traian Herseni or just keep him away from sociology. Constantinescu probably believed that the latter could weaken, through his intellectual background and his prestige, his privileged position in Romanian sociology.

Constantinescu's influence on sociology was also due to the fact that the process of rehabilitation of the discipline coincided with the political rehabilitation of Constantinescu. Thus, in a few years, Miron Constantinescu would become a unique example in world sociology. Jiri Kolaja, professor of sociology and anthropology at the University of West Virginia, noted in an article in 1974 that no other teacher/sociologist in the world had such an important political office as that held by Miron Constantinescu in Romania⁷⁵.

After 1965, Romanian sociological research units has expanded and diversified. In addition to departments of sociology established within Romanian universities, other departments have emerged within institutions subordinated to the S.R.R. Academy of Science. Distinct sociological research units were also established. Moreover, a 1970 "general survey" of the sociological

⁷⁵ Jiri KOLAJA, "Notes on Romanian sociology", in *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 17, no. 1 (1974), pp. 78-82.

research projects carried out in Romania revealed that there were many other academic research institutes working in the field of sociology⁷⁶.

Within the University of Bucharest there were two separate units of sociological investigation. First, the *Department of Sociology* of the School of Philosophy, whose main objective was teaching. The other unit was the *Sociological Laboratory*, which had administrative status, even if it was working under the authority of the *Department of Sociology*. The *Department* was established in 1966 through the efforts of Miron Constantinescu and Ion Drăgan⁷⁷. The *Sociological Laboratory* was established by Order no. 739/5.12.1968 of the Minister of Education. It was functioning as a branch of the Department of Sociology of the University and had different tasks: to undertake field investigations, to grant methodological assistance and to co-ordinate as far as methodology was concerned the investigations made by other educational units. The laboratory's personnel consisted of eight persons: five sociologists, two librarians and a secretary⁷⁸.

At 'Babes-Bolyai' University in Cluj-Napoca, a *Department of Philosophy-Sociology* and a *Sociological Laboratory* were established. The department was founded in 1967, while the *Laboratory* a year later⁷⁹. All the professors who were teaching sociology within the *Department* (11) and four other researchers who did not have chairs worked at the laboratory. Of the researchers working in Cluj, noteworthy are Nicolae Kallos, Andrew Roth, Ernő Gáll, Achim Mișu, Ion Aluaș, George Tomuța, George Nagy and Traian Rotaru.

A *Department of Psychology-Sociology* was founded in 1967 at the 'Al. I. Cuza' University of Iași⁸⁰. Sociological research was also undertaken by the *Department of Economics, Agriculture and Statistics* of the School of Economics⁸¹.

The *Department of Sociology* of the 'Ștefan Gheorghiu' Academy of Social and Political Education was established in 1966. Operating within the School of Philosophy and Political Science, it also served the School of Economics and the School of History of the Academy. The Department consisted of nine teachers, including 4 Ph.Ds.⁸².

⁷⁶ For further details, see: *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970.

⁷⁷ Virgil CONSTANTINESCU, Pompiliu GRIGORESCU, "The Bucharest University's Sociological Activity in the Realm of Education and Scientific Research", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 25-31.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁹ Nicolae KALLOS, Andrei ROTH, "Achievements and Prospects in the Activity of the Sociological Laboratory of «Babeș-Bolyai» University, Cluj", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 123-125.

⁸⁰ Ștefan COSTEA *et alii*, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

⁸¹ Al. BĂRBAT, "Sociological Activity Carried Out by the Department of Economy of Agriculture and Statistics with the «Al. I. Cuza» University, Iași", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 127-129.

⁸² Ion IORDĂCHEL, "The Activity of the Department of Sociology of the «Ștefan Gheorghiu» Academy of Social and Political Education under the C. C. of the Romanian Communist Party", in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 33-36.

It is also worth mentioning the fact that the Popular University of Bucharest approved a series of lectures called “*Introduction to sociology*” starting in 1967. The course was organized in nineteen separate lectures, assigned to several teachers and researchers: Tudor Bugnariu, Henri H. Stahl, Ovidiu Bădina, I. Iordăchel, Octavian Neamțu, C-tin Nicușă or Miron Constantinescu⁸³.

Beside these centers, whose mission was primarily didactic, sociology departments were also established within the institutes subordinated to the Academy of Sciences, or even distinct specialized institutes. An example of this kind is the *Department of Sociology* of the Institute of Philosophy of the S.R.R. Academy of Science. Founded in 1953, the Institute didn't have a separate department of sociology until the second half of the 1960s⁸⁴. Another example is the *Research Center for Youth Affairs*, established in 1968 under the coordination of the Ministry for Youth Affairs. The *Center* was coordinated by Ovidiu Bădina, and had a structure similar to a research institute of the Academy of Science. The fundamental difference consisted in how the projects were approached: the *Center* was not structured in separate departments, but in interdisciplinary teams (sociology, pedagogy, ethics, psychology, philosophy, statistics, and legal sciences) which were working on different topics or different projects⁸⁵.

Investigations with sociological character were also undertaken by other institutions, despite the fact that they did not have distinct departments of sociology within their structure there : the Institute of Psychology of the S.R.R. Academy (later the Academy of Social and Political Sciences)⁸⁶, the Center for Anthropological Research⁸⁷, the Institute of Economic Research⁸⁸, the Institute of Hygiene and Public Health⁸⁹, the Institute of South-East European

⁸³ ANIC, Fund *Miron Constantinescu*, File no. 26, ff. 1-5.

⁸⁴ Mihail CERNEA, “Sociological Investigation Carried Out by the Institute of Philosophy”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 45-62.

⁸⁵ Ovidiu BĂDINA, “Research Center for Youth Problems – Bucharest”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 63-71; Ovidiu BĂDINA, “Le cadre institutionnel de l'étude scientifique de la jeunesse en Roumanie. Centre de recherches sur les problèmes de la Jeunesse, attributions, structure, actions”, in *Revue Roumaine des Sciences Sociales, serie Sociologie*, tom 14, 1970, pp. 97-108.

⁸⁶ C. BOTEZ, “Activities of Sociological Interest Carried Out by the Psychology Institute of the Academy of Social and Political Studies”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 73-76.

⁸⁷ Vasile V. CARAMELEA, “Sociological Research in Social Anthropology Carried Out by the Centre of Anthropological Research”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 77-84.

⁸⁸ C. GRIGORESCU, “Research of Sociological Character in the Institute of Economics Research of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 85-88.

⁸⁹ Gh. PĂTRU, “Sociological Research at the Hygiene and Public Health Institute”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 109-114.

Studies⁹⁰, the Institute of Pedagogical Sciences of the Ministry of Education⁹¹ and the Research Institute for Agrarian Economy and the Organizing of Socialist Agricultural Enterprises⁹².

Towards a (new) political subordination – the founding of the academy of social and political sciences (1970)

In the early months of 1969, the Propaganda Section of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee and the Ministry of Education organized a series of conferences and discussions with professors from the departments of social sciences of the most important universities in the country: Bucharest, Iași, Cluj-Napoca, Timișoara, Tg. Mureș and Craiova⁹³. The main purposes of these conferences lay in the intention of party officials to try to “improve”: the teaching of Marxist-Leninist disciplines; the activity of professors from the departments of social sciences, which had the mission to “develop the students’ concept of dialectic and historical materialism”; to focus scientific research towards some specific purposes such as the elaboration of extended studies and works or fundamental monographs, etc.⁹⁴. In reality, the real purpose of these measures was to produce a political subordination of the social sciences.

In 1969, there were 22 social sciences and humanities research institutes within the S.R.R. Academy of Sciences. In these institutes worked 1,250 employees, 837 of them being researchers, while the annual budget of all these institutes amounted to over 29.5 million lei. 700 other specialists worked in the social sciences departments of different universities⁹⁵. During the discussions from early 1969, party officials specified that the period after 1965 was punctuated by “some successes”, the need of change was also highlighted, as “scientific research in social sciences was not carried out according to the current requirements and the opportunities created”⁹⁶. The deficiencies that were brought to attention were a consequence of a poor or insufficient coordination of all these institutions:

⁹⁰ L. MARCU, “Sociological Research at the Institute of South-East European Studies”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 105-108.

⁹¹ Leon ȚOPA, “Sociological Research at the Pedagogic Sciences Institute of the Ministry of Education”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 119-122.

⁹² D. DUMITRU, “Sociological Activity at the Research Institute for Agrarian Economy and the Organizing of Socialist Agricultural Enterprises”, in *The Romanian Journal of Sociology*, vol. VI, 1970, pp. 89-92.

⁹³ ANIC, Fund CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, File no. 14/1969, ff. 16-17.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, f. 17.

⁹⁵ “Propuneri cu privire la îmbunătățirea îndrumării activității în domeniul științelor sociale și crearea Academiei de Științe Sociale / Proposals to improve management in social sciences and the establishment of the Academy of Social Sciences”, ANIC, Fund CC al PCR - Secția Propagandă și Agitație, File no. 14/1969, f. 23.

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*.

There was never a scientific forum to determine, based on extensive discussions, the main directions and the order of priorities in social science research; to organize research collaboration of various forces in order to solve the major problems in this area. Given the great diversity of branches of science within its area of interests, the Socialist Republic of Romania's Academy of Science was unable to coordinate the proper ideological, theoretical and thematic orientation of research in social sciences. The National Council of Scientific Research also failed in solving this problem. Such shortcomings continuing in social sciences research was also due to the division of responsibilities between several sections of the Party's Central Committee⁹⁷

Consequently, the solution of the Central Committee Propaganda Department was:

the establishment of the Academy of Social Sciences, who had the task to organize, direct and coordinate research in all the fields of social science; to guide them more actively in accordance with the requirements of socialist construction, with the knowledge of social realities, and with contemporary scientific progress⁹⁸

On November 13, 1969 a work meeting that brought together scientists, researchers and professors of social sciences was held. During this meeting it was decided to form a team which included Paul Niculescu-Mizil, D. Popescu, Miron Constantinescu Miron Niculescu (then president of the S.R.R. Academy) and Constantin Daicoviciu. They were to be responsible for hiring other members in order to establish a commission which was to draw up the drafts of what would become the Academy of Social and Political Sciences⁹⁹.

On February 19, 1970, the first General Assembly of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences was held. The institution was going to be submitted to the authority of the Romanian Communist Party's Central Committee. At this meeting, the Statute of A.S.P.S. was adopted, and the full members, correspondents and managing offices of the Academy were elected.

The decisions adopted by the General Assembly of February 19, 1970 were enacted through the S.R.R. State Council Decree no. 121/ March 18, 1970¹⁰⁰. The Decree scrupulously established the duties of the institution that was to control social sciences in Romania:

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 25-26.

⁹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 27.

⁹⁹ "Stenograma consfătuirii de lucru cu oamenii de știință, cercetătorii și cadrele didactice din domeniul științelor sociale (13 noiembrie 1969)" / "The Transcript of the Conference with Social Science Researchers and Professors (November 13, 1969)", ANIC, Fund *CC al PCR - Secția Propagandă și Agitație*, File no. 29/1969, f. 49.

¹⁰⁰ Vezi: "Decret 121/1970 privind înființarea Academiei de Științe Sociale și Politice a RSR / Decree 121/1970 for the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Romania's Academy

The Academy of Social and Political Sciences is a scientific forum that organizes, guides and coordinates, as a whole, all social and political science research, regardless of the units in which it is undertaken; it provides guidance in accordance with the requirements of building socialism and contemporary scientific progress; it elaborates studies and it makes proposals to help substantiate the solutions to problems of economic and socio-cultural development of the Socialist Republic of Romania; it studies and highlights the historical past of the Romanian people, their living side by side with the other nationalities and their fight for social progress, the cultural and artistic heritage of the country, our people's contribution to universal history, culture, science and art; it contributes to the formation of socialist consciousness in the working people, to the development of social and political thought in our country, and its affirmation in the international exchange of ideas and ideological confrontation; it organizes, directs and controls the activity of its own research units.¹⁰¹

Also, the third article of the Decree stipulated that:

The Academy of Social and Political Sciences promotes dialectical and historical materialism as methods of research, and provides the theoretical and ideological orientation of scientific research on Marxism-Leninism grounds¹⁰²

The supreme ruling body of the A.S.P.S. was the General Assembly, which consisted of full members and associate members of the A.S.P.S., delegates elected from among the researchers of the subordinated research units, and of the professors of the departments of social science in higher education units. The A.S.P.S. leadership, between the sessions of the General Assembly, was represented by the A.S.P.S. Presidium, and consisted of the President of A.S.P.S., the Vice-Presidents, the Secretary General, the Presidents of the different sections, and a number of members elected by the General Assembly.

The Academy was organized in specialized departments, which were subordinated to the General Assembly and the Presidium. A.S.P.S. had eight sections: Economics (headed by Alexander Bârlădeanu), Philosophy and Logic (Dumitru Ghișe), History and Archeology (Ștefan Ștefănescu), Law (Janos Demeter), Political Science (Valter Roman), Psychology and Pedagogy (Alexandru Roșca), Sociology (Henri H. Stahl), and The Theory and History of Literature and Art (Ion Frunzetti)¹⁰³.

At its founding in 1970, the Academy had 125 full members and 95 associate members. The A.S.P.S. Presidium consisted of Miron Constantinescu

of Social and Political Sciences", in *Buletinul Oficial al Republicii Socialiste România*, no. 22, March 18, 1970, Part I.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem.*

¹⁰² *Ibidem.*

¹⁰³ Mihai Dinu GHEORGHIU, *Intellectualii în câmpul puterii. Morfologii și traiectorii sociale*, p. 95.

(president), Zoe Dumitrescu-Bușulenga, Constantin Daicoviciu, Roman Moldovan, Constantin Vlad, Ștefan Voicu (vice-presidents), Constantin Ionescu (secretary general) and Tudor Bugnariu, Alex. Dima, Emilian Dobrescu, Erno Gall, Carol Gollner, Constantin Ionescu-Gulian, Athanase Joja, Mircea Malița, Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița and Ion Popescu.Puțuri (members)¹⁰⁴.

The impact of the creation of the A.S.P.S on Romanian sociology was mainly negative. Although the appointment of Henri H. Stahl as head of the Section of sociology could have been considered as a guarantee that work and of research methods would improve, Miron Constantinescu remained the “master” of discipline. Moreover, Miron Constantinescu’s influence on all social sciences increased with his appointment as president of the A.S.P.S. Constantinescu, who was still one of the most zealous “Stalinists” as far as his attitude went towards his subordinates, had powers allowing him to control all scientific activity in the social sciences. He was the one who approved research internships abroad or any travel to international convention or conferences. And, during those times, such privileges were the ultimate benefit that a researcher could have. On the other hand, it is quite likely that Miron Constantinescu’s political position could have had a positive influence over the discipline, mainly in terms of the advantages that he was able to provide to research units. Thus, his death in 1974 produced a small “earthquake” in Romanian sociology, as the discipline lost important support and influence among party officials and decision-making bodies.

Conclusions

The postwar history of Romanian sociology could be divided into several, distinct periods, each and every one influenced by some dramatic changes due to social, economic, and political causes, but also to the international context. If the 1944-48 chronological framework was a period of revival marked by a “re-launch” of the discipline, this short *intermezzo* was nothing but a late echo of prewar and wartime scientific accumulation. Although in this period the contributions to the field were valuable and numerous, these works were written by well-known prewar sociologists, and were based on their previous activity and research. The establishment of the communist regime in Romania was the first major breaking point in the history of the discipline. The new political regime developed a hostile attitude towards sociology, considering it as a “bourgeois pseudo-science of society”. The university departments and the specialized institutes were disbanded, and the sociologists had to find possibilities for professional retraining. However, sociological research continued during these years of “misery”, but at an “underground” level, conducted by

¹⁰⁴ ANIC, Fund CC al PCR – Secția Propagandă și Agitație, File no 31/1971, ff. 1-13.

some of the prewar sociologists who worked at different research institutes: V. Caramelia (The Institute of Anthropology) or T. Herseni (The Institute of Psychology), or as sociological research projects initiated by institutions such as The Institute for Economic Research or The State Planning Committee.

A significant political, ideological and intellectual breakthrough could be seen during the first half of the 1960s, doubled by a paradigm shift in the communist regime's attitude towards sociology. This change was detectable even as in discourse, as the "bourgeois pseudo-science of society" became "bourgeois sociology". The re-institutionalization of the discipline in the 1960s led to an explosion of empirical studies, which was followed by a significant increase in sociological literature. But a new decline of the discipline occurred in the second half of the 1970s. Although the number of sociological contributions did not decrease dramatically, most of these were not valuable, but rather profound ideological contributions.

To conclude, we must say that the establishment of the Soviet-type communist regime in Romania led to the abolition of sociology and then delayed its re-institutionalization for almost two decades. The natural and normal development of the discipline was thus delayed by the political repression and the ideological inflexibility of the communist regime. Thus, with the rehabilitation of the discipline in the 1960s, the efforts to recover the advances made by the Western sociology doubled. However, the need to fill the scientific gap had at least a positive aspect, as the attitude of the (re)emerging Romanian sociology towards Western sociology was both receptive and critical.

If we would analyze the re-institutionalization of Romanian sociology according to the methodological framework proposed by Michael Voříšek, we can easily notice that the Romanian particularity lies in the long period of time that sociology needed to regain its place among academic disciplines. The re-institutionalization process started in the late 1950s, when the very term "sociology" was to cease being a part of taboo vocabulary and became a current and accepted notion. Another milestone in this process was the establishment of the *National Sociological Committee* in 1959. It is true that this scientific organization could probably be considered one of those exceptions Michael Voříšek speaks about, because the members of this forum were "diplomatic scientists", rather than professionals of the discipline. The N.S.C. remains an important landmark in the history of Romanian sociology, as its establishment led to a new *de jure* recognition of the discipline in the international context. The other moments that preceded, and also contributed to the complete re-institutionalization of Romanian sociology were the issue of the first specialized periodicals: *The Rumanian Journal of Sociology* (1962) and *Revue Roumaine de Sciences Sociales: Serie Sociologie* (1965); and the founding of a *Centre for Sociological Research* within the S.R.R. Academy of Sciences (1965). Thus, we could argue that the complete re-institutionalization of sociology occurred in 1966-67, when sociology departments were established in the major Romanian universities.

This tortuous process during which Romanian sociology sought to regain its position among the other social sciences could be explained by several hypotheses. Firstly, sociology was again institutionalized only when the regime was capable of accepting it as a legitimate and useful discipline¹⁰⁵. Moreover, a re-launch of sociology was only possible when the discipline was able to individualize itself within the theoretical and ideological complex which consisted of Marxism-Leninism, dialectical and historical materialism, and scientific socialism¹⁰⁶.

In addition, it is quite hard to establish Miron Constantinescu's real influence over the discipline. All we know is that after his sudden death in 1974, the history of Romanian sociology took an unexpected turn. Subsequently, the Sociological Laboratory of the University of Bucharest was to be dismantled. A few years later, in 1977, Romanian sociology would receive another blow. The Central Committee Plenum in June was to impose a set of measures that led to a further marginalization of the discipline: the study of sociology was restricted to post-graduate studies, with no ability to graduate with this degree.

Ștefan Bosomitu
stefan.bosomitu@gmail.com

¹⁰⁵ Cătălin ZAMFIR, "9 ipoteze pentru o analiză sociologic-epistemologică a sociologiei românești în perioada comunistă: 1944-1989".

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*.