

***THE GUSTIAN SOCIOLOGICAL SCHOOL AFTER
THE AUGUST 23RD, 1944.
CONDEMNATION, MARGINALIZATION AND S
URVIVAL DURING THE COMMUNIST REGIME***

*Organizers: Gusti Cooperative and the Institute for the Investigation
of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile, Bucharest*

*Bucharest, October, 27–28, 2017
9 Schitu Măgureanu Street, "Dimitrie Gusti" Hall
(Faculty of Sociology and Social Work) Friday, 27 oct.-17*



cooperativa
GUSTI

FRIDAY, 27 OCT.-17

9.30 – 9.45

Official Opening of the Conference

By

Alin Mureşan (IICCMER) şi
Andrei Florin Sora (University of Bucharest)

9.45 – 11.30

PANEL I. SOCIOLOGIES IN TRANSITIONAL COMMUNISM

Moderator: Theodora-Eliza Văcărescu (University of Bucharest)

Zoltán Rostás (University of Bucharest), *Dimitrie Gusti after 1944 and the Plans of the School Immediately after the War*

This paper presents the activity of Prof. Dimitrie Gusti and his school of sociology after the August 23rd, 1944 coup d'état which brought Romania on the side of the Allies. As president of the Romanian Academy, Dimitrie Gusti tried from the very beginning to establish constructive relations with the new civil and military authorities, so as to gain acceptance for his school during this transitional situation. Gusti and the members of his School attempted to resume field research, to renew their international scientific contacts and to start out the academic project of a National Council of Scientific Research under the tutelage of the Romanian Academy. However, the progressive marginalization of the school, which was already underway by 1944, became fully effective by 1948; afterwards some of its members were imprisoned, while the ones spared were left to follow their vocation under the guise of new professional specialties.

Marek Skovajsa (The Caroline University of Prague), 'Not in the least useful to Socialism': The Suppression of Czech Sociology, 1945-1950

This paper describes the losing battle of Czech sociology against the ascending Communist power in the period 1945-1950. The liberation of 1945 opened the door to a rapid renewal of sociology which, in terms of its personnel, emerged from World War II relatively well preserved. The pre-war sociological institutions were soon re-established and sociology seemed to be entering another period of expansion. University programs were reopened in Prague and Brno and even new tertiary institutions were created to satisfy extraordinary demand for social science education. International contacts were quickly renewed. This feverish organizational and teaching activity was, however, doomed to be short-lived. While the Czechoslovak Communist Party was expanding and tightening its grip over the country, the Communist influence was also increasingly dominant in the academic sphere. Confronted with this growing pressure, Czech sociologists, among whom Marxists were the rarest exceptions, attempted, first, to demonstrate in polemical writings sociology's superiority over Marxism-Leninism, and, later, to show the compatibility between the two. This life-saving strategy remained fruitless. Sociology was among the first academic disciplines to be dismantled after the Communist takeover of February 1948. The most senior figures of the discipline (Inocenc Arnošt Bláha, Josef Král, Emanuel Chalupný) were sent into forced retirement, many other sociologists found themselves on, or beyond, the margins of the academic sphere. Especially exposed

were those sociologists who had taken an active part in the political life of the country on the non-Communist side. Some faced political repression; others avoided this fate by going into exile. Still other members of the discipline reoriented themselves away from sociology towards politically more acceptable academic disciplines. Sociology in general and empirical social research in particular were targets of a negative campaign orchestrated by the Communist Party apparatus and carried out mostly by students and young academics. Even had sociology retained a modicum of support among some representatives of the new power, the standing of the discipline, according to the official ideology, was so low that this support could not materialize in any official actions meant to preserve it. The proponents of the discipline of Marxism-Leninism, imported from the USSR, which replaced sociologists and philosophers in the academic institutions, were not ready to strike any compromise with sociology, this ultimate bourgeois pseudoscience, at least not until 1956, when the tide began to change again.

Veronika Szabari (Eötvös Lorany University, Budapest), *Opportunities of Hungarian Sociology between 1945 and 1948*

In my presentation I offer a brief account of the history of Hungarian sociology right before the socialist era. Firstly, I will focus on how the earlier Hungarian sociological traditions survived or died between 1945 and 1948. I will mention only two traditional movements in Hungarian sociology. 1. The bourgeois radicals who created the journal *Twentieth Century* (*Huszadik Század*), and the Association of Social Sciences (*Társadalomtudományi Társaság*) at the beginning of the century. In spite of their initial scientific success, the journal and the associations ceased to exist due to political reasons. 2. The folk writers in the 1920-30's, who believed that the agrarian question was the most important social problem in Hungary. Some of these 'populist writers' (Gyula Illyés, Péter Veres, Imre Kovács, Zoltán Szabó and Ferenc Erdei) became interested in social research and published descriptive works (so-called sociographies) on the situation of the agrarian population. These were mostly impressionistic and highly critical accounts, but some of them had scientific aims too. Undoubtedly, it was Ferenc Erdei who was most interested in using social scientific methodology and theories. In spite of the productive sociographical works, the first sociological academic establishment was created in 1942 by István Dékány. The question arises why the bourgeois radicals (Oszkár Jászi) or 'populist writers' could not institutionalize sociology in Hungary. Just like before 1945, even right before the socialist era one of the most important features of Hungarian sociology was its extreme closeness to political spheres. I would like to present how this close relationship between sociology and politics influenced sociology even after 1945. Similarly to the bourgeois radicals (Oszkár Jászi, Karl Mannheim) after WW I, Dékány too had to leave his chair after WW II. In 1946 Sándor Szalai was appointed as the chair of the new Department of Sociology. Before Szalai took this office, István Hajnal, the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities invited Karl Mannheim (who left the country in 1919) and Erdei to be chairs of the Departments of Social Theory and Sociographics which were to be founded, but by that time Mannheim was already a professor at the London School of Economics (from 1933) and declined the invitation. Erdei chose a political career after the Second World War. Thus, in 1946 this important leap towards the establishment of sociology, was not the result of a systematic, immanent development closely tied to the structure of the university and the construction of the discipline. This event was rather inextricably linked to the person of Sándor Szalai, who had been deported to a labor camp in 1944 and who, after his return, was politically active and became the head of the intellectual department of the Social Democratic Party in Hungary. Thus, after 1948, during the political cleansings, Szalai was charged and condemned of scientific espionage, and, in 1950 he was sentenced to life imprisonment. After the imprisonment of Szalai the sole institutional basis of the discipline was gone, and in consequence of the political changes the indispensable medium of sociological thinking, the public sphere, was also destroyed. Although in accordance with the ideology of the 1950's,

drastic changes occurred in the structure of society, there was no discussion about society, and for the unilateral party communication the only unquestionable theoretical ground was provided by the official ideology.

11.30-11.45

Coffee break

11.45 – 13.30

PANEL II. ELIMINATED, MARGINALIZED, SURVIVORS. MONOGRAPHISTS BETWEEN TWO REGIMES

Moderator: Ion Matei Costinescu (University of Bucharest)

Alina Juravle (University of Bucharest), H. H Stahl and Șerban Voinea: On the Role of Sociologists and Sociology in a Changing World

*This paper proposes to show the manner in which Henri H. Stahl and Șerban Voinea, in their work entitled *An Introduction to Sociology*, published by the Social Democratic Party's printing house in 1947, defined the role of sociology and sociologists in a world undergoing a radical transformation. I argue that these writers' discourse, regarded in the complex context of their time, and from the viewpoint of the new political power structure, may be interpreted as a way in which the two try to assert and consolidate the status of sociology and sociologists as allies of the state in a process of modernization that should have neutral scientific base. Moreover, one can also identify in their work an attempt to place Dimitrie Gusti's sociological system in a more favorable position in rapport to the new order of power, by highlighting its compatibility with Marxist sociological thinking. We may thus argue that their volume is yet another means by which Stahl and Voinea attempt to secure the continuity of the Gustian school of sociology and its values, the survival of sociology and, most likely and literally, the survival of sociologists.*

Ionuț Butoi (University of Bucharest), *Life Stories in Times of Trouble. Vulcanescu's World after the War*

Mircea Vulcănescu's biography is apparently abruptly ended almost immediately after the World War, due to the trial that led to his imprisonment and death. Nevertheless, Vulcănescu had several scientific and editorial projects underway until the time of his arrest. Based on these projects, a plan of "adaptation" / survival to the realities of post-war Romania can be partially reconstructed. This plan has a clear monographical dimension. The radical changes in Vulcănescu's life impacted, however, on his social relations, some of his ties with members of the "young generation" becoming inactive for various reasons. Nonetheless, the hard times caused by his trial for his family are also an opportunity to identify that part of his social ties, from the monographic cultural field, but not limited to it, which remained functional. In this research I intend to understand how a small-scale world, i.e., Vulcanescu's social world, experienced changes in status and life expectancies, the way they are interpreted, and the specific reactions to the new realities after August 23rd, 1944. Using the microhistorical method, I will use sources from private and/or public archives.

Dragoș Sdrobiș (New Europe College, Bucharest), *The Shadows of the Past in the Postwar Trajectory of the Sociologist Traian Herseni*

The works that address Traian Herseni's biography (and not solely his biography) highlight only certain chronotopical segments of his life, sometimes removed from the historical context. Consequently, Herseni was unilaterally labeled "Marxist", "legionary", "anti-semitic", or "eugenicist". These characterizations, some of them incompatible, represent the reason why Herseni's biography must be reconsidered, starting from his aspirations of social mobility and affirmation in the sociological field. Traian Herseni's file from the CNSAS Archive allows the reconstruction of the sociologist's biography and of a social trajectory that is not at all alien to the idea of university promotion in interwar Romania and, later, to public rehabilitation during the establishment of the communist regime in Romania. For this latter period, an interesting aspect to reconsider is Herseni's relationship with Mihail Ralea, known as a Marxist sociologist as early as the interwar period.

13.30-15.00

Lunch break

15.00-17.15

***PANEL II. ELIMINATED, MARGINALIZED, SURVIVORS.
MONOGRAPHISTS BETWEEN TWO REGIMES***

Rucsandra Pop (University of Bucharest), *Mihai Pop's Contribution to the Establishment of the Institute of Folklore*

This paper aims to look at Mihai Pop's rather "irregular" career choices in the years following the Second World War and at the way the rise of communism in Romania might have influenced those choices and his subsequent career path. Between 1941 and 1945, Mihai Pop was appointed as Cultural Attaché to the Romanian Embassy in Bratislava. In 1946, when he returned to Romania, he was part of the Romanian team that worked for the Paris Peace Conference. The following year, he resigned from the Foreign Ministry and accepted a position as Administrative Director at the Cement Plant at Fieni, a little town situated 100 kilometers north-west of Bucharest. He left Fieni in October 1948, when he was called to Bucharest to be part of the team who set up the Institute of Folklore, where he was among the first employees. Pop and Harry Brauner - the first director of the Institute - had previously worked together in the research campaigns lead by the sociologist Dimitrie Gusti, between the two world wars. In April 1949, the Institute of Folklore was set up in Bucharest as an ethnological research institution by the Decree no. 136. The institute was built on a collection of sonorous and visual documents that united 2 different archives - the Folklore Archives of the Romanian Composers Society, founded by Constantin Brăiloiu, and the archive of the Ministry of Cults and Arts, established at C. Breazu's suggestion. In January 1950, due to their friendship with Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu, the communist leader fallen from grace, Harry Brauner and his partner Lena Constante were arrested. Another friend of Mihai Pop and member of Gusti's research team, Anton Golopenția, was also charged in the Pătrășcanu trial. After these events, Pop, who was the coordinator of the scientific activities of the Institute, served as an Interim Director until 1954 when Sabin Drăgoi was appointed Director of the Institute.

Corina Doboş (New Europe College, Bucharest), *Gheorghe Retegan: Contributions to Demography, 1960-1970*

*The post-war career of the sociologist Gh. Retegan (1916-1998) was marked by disciplinary fluidity and by Retegan's capacity to reinvent himself, both epistemologically and personally. In spite of the fact that he served 5 years in prison because of the connection with Patrascanu's case, Retegan had the power to get over and pursue a valuable career in demography in the 1960s and 1970s. At the beginning of the 1940s, many of the researchers previously involved with the Romanian Social Institute were able to find a job at the Central Institute for Statistics, run at the time by Sabin Manuila. Retegan personally was hired at the CIS by the sociologist and demographer Anton Golopenția at the beginning of 1940. At CIS, Retegan specialized in vital statistics and was involved in the research campaigns run by CIS during the WW2 (1942-1943) in territories east of the Southern Bug River. The research campaign was undertaken at the express request of the head of the Romanian government, Marshall Ion Antonescu. It was an interdisciplinary research across several domains - such as ethnography, sociology, social medicine and demography - and was meant to gather information on the history, and the social, economic and sanitary situation of the communities of Romanians located in the Soviet territories, and which were discovered during the Romanian army's Eastern military campaign. After the research campaign was concluded, in 1943, Retegan continued to work at the CIS. The change of political regime in 1944 found him involved with demographic research at CIS. The socialist transformation of the economy was on its way and the need for accurate economic statistics was greater than ever. The proceedings of the Conference for the Reorganization of Statistics (18th of October 1947) revealed the need for a new, centralized system of statistical data meant to prop up the economic planning and the socialist reconstruction of the country. Labour and industrial statistics slowly developed in the 1950s, as information was badly needed for the regime's economic plans, and a division of labour statistics was created at CIS at the end of the 1940s, being put under Retegan's supervision. At the end of 1948, Golopenția was sacked from the CIS. He and other researchers previously involved in demographic research were imprisoned and placed under criminal investigation, for their participation in the research campaign run by CIS in the Soviet territories in 1942-1943. Golopenția died in prison in 1951 during the investigation. Other population researchers from CIS were arrested in the same criminal case, but survived their prison terms. Retegan was imprisoned in 1950 and liberated in 1954, when he was found not guilty. Afterwards, he was hired at the Institute of Economic Research of the Romanian Academy where he conducted several monographic studies on several industrial centers in Romania he published the first results of these studies in journals such as *Revista de statistică* and *Probleme economice*. In an article published in the journal *Lupta de clasa* in 1958, the monographic method as a research tool and Retegan's particular research activities were rejected as ideologically unacceptable. During the 1960s, with the reemergence of demographical research in close relationship with economic planning, and especially with the effects that population dynamics could have for the age structure of the workforce, Retegan became more and more involved with demographic research. He published many articles on demographic issues, especially on fertility dynamics, in journals such as *Revista de Statistică*, *Viața economică* or *Consfățuriri Statistice*. After the re-institutionalization of demography, marked by the foundation of the National Commission of Demography in 1971, Retegan worked in this structure. He was very active within the Romanian Committee for the organization of the World Population Conference in Bucharest, where he was in charge with the elaboration of the working documents the Romanian delegation presented during the WPC proceedings. Retegan actually participated to these proceedings, as member of the Romanian delegation. My presentation examines Retegan's contributions to the development of demographical science in the 1960s and 1970s, and especially his efforts to define the epistemological status of a discipline caught between theoretical endeavors and the need to deliver for policy making as a governmental science. This examination will be pursued by taking into*

consideration the specific dynamics of the reemergence and re-institutionalization of demographical research in communist Romania. As a point of comparison, I will use the epistemological and institutional developments characteristic of the French school demography, whose model of reflection and action proved very influential for the demographic discipline in postwar Romania.

Ștefan Bosomitu (The Institute for the Investigation of Communist Crimes and the Memory of the Romanian Exile, Bucharest) *The „Survivors”: The Monographists of the Gustian Sociological School in the Service of the Popular Democracy Regime*

In the aftermath of World War II, Romanian sociology experienced a slow, but inevitable, marginalization. The causes of this evolution were multiple. On the one hand, it was due to the institutional and intellectual mimicry of the new regime, which “imported” the scientific and academic Soviet model – which disavowed sociology, considered to be a “pseudo-bourgeois and reactionary science”. But an equally important factor was the new regime's belief that sociology (and especially Gusti sociological school) had to “pay a price” for its political involvement during the interwar years and for the sideslips of some of its exponents – who either supported the Iron Guard (Fascist) movement or had been actively involved in the administration of the authoritarian regimes in Romania during the Second World War. But not all the cadres that forged the Gustian sociological school's infrastructure were to experience the consequences of their school's disavowal. For some of them – who were supporters or just sympathizers of the Leftist groups in the interwar, the new political order was to foster important career options, both political and academic. If Miron Constantinescu is a well-known case, less apprehended ones are those of Gheorghe Vlădescu-Răcoasa, Stanciu Stoian, Roman Moldovan, Mircea Biji, etc. My paper will follow the political and academic careers of the Gustian sociological school's cadres, namely those approved and supported the new order imposed by the Communist Party in postwar Romania.

Carmen Albert (Museum of the Highland Banat, Reșița), *Cornel Groșorean in Front of the Purges Committee (1945)*

The political struggle in Romania during the Second World War intensified with the change of August 23rd, 1944, when the old allies became enemies, and the Communist Party encouraged by the Soviet presence had begun its intimidation and “purging” action to annihilate any opposition. Cornel Groșorean from Timișoara, the founder of the Banat-Crișana Social Institute, as well as other personalities, did not escape the attention of the new authorities, and he was forced to defend himself as so many others also did by writing memoirs meant to justify, in fact to respond to, accusations that, according to the time, once formulated had their effect without anyone trying to prove them. The most common was fascism. He did not escape the label assigned hurriedly and without discernment to too many personalities. It was launched from the extreme left, mainly from the communists, whose organizations in Banat managed to impose their acolytes, some of them people in good faith, who soon realized the danger represented by the purging actions that they had allowed themselves to be drawn into. A set of documents from the archives of the Timis County Bar, complete with Cornel Groșorean's justification, illustrates this stage in the life of the man who directed the destiny of the Banat institute from its foundation to the end; it also shows the way he tried to escape accusations, to get the much-desired “decision for purging exemption”.

17.15-17.30

Coffee break

18.00-19.30

ROUND TABLE

Mechanisms of Adaptation in Transitional Communism

SATURDAY, 28 OCT.-17

9.30-11.45

PANEL III. DIFFICULT CHOICES

Moderator: Martin Ladislau Salamon (University of Bucharest)

Andrei Florin Sora (University of Bucharest), Victor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu: The Choices of a Committed Intellectual after August 23rd, 1944

Victor (Picki) Rădulescu-Pogoneanu (1910-1962) is known today for his participation in the overthrow of Ion Antonescu, on August 23rd, 1944, and, most of all, for his incarceration and his death in one of the Romanian communist prisons. This martyrdom is intensified by the fact that, despite the infirmity that he was suffering from, he had an uncompromising behaviour during the trial and in prison. Even though the main biographical data of the intellectual and diplomat Victor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu are accessible, his role in the anti-communist movement is not entirely known. We propose a biographical study meant to enhance the understanding of Victor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu's intellectual profile and choices assumed by him after the overthrow of the Antonescu regime, a political change conducted also with his assistance. My analysis is focused on four complementary research directions. Firstly, it is necessary to offer a short presentation Victor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu's intellectual path: his family, studies, the relationship with Dimitrie Gusti and with other members of the Gustian school, his duties at the Ministry of Education in the beginning of the 1930s, his admission and career at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs before August 1944. The second research direction I propose, seeks to retrace his activity for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs after Ion Antonescu's overthrow. The accusations against V. Rădulescu-Pogoneanu, in what is known as the Maniu trial (1947), will be analysed separately. Did Rădulescu-Pogoneanu believe that the establishment of a totalitarian regime could have been prevented in Romania? Last, but not least, I hope to find more information about his life in communist prisons. Victor Rădulescu-Pogoneanu was one of the Romanian intellectuals who refused any form of extremism and totalitarianism and fought against them, who understood very well that Romania had fallen under Soviet influence.

Irina Nastasă-Matei (University of Bucharest), Ernest Bernea and the Legionary Movement: The Ideological Options of a Sociologist and Their Post-War Consequences

The paper discusses Ernest Bernea's legionary past, focusing on its consequences, as well as on the post-war destiny of the sociologist. We will analyse his journalistic activity, especially at the journal Rânduiala journal, but not only. An additional concern is his work as Simion Mehedinți's assistant, as well as the

time spent by him at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. All this will be analyzed in light of the subsequent attitude of the communist authorities, highlighting his post-war fate as a member of the Gustian school profoundly marked by his legionary drift. The main sources used in this paper are the documents from the CNSAS Archive and from the Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Balázs Telegdy (Sapientia University, Miercurea-Ciuc), *The History of Hungarian Sociology in Romania Illustrated through the Events of József Venczel's Life*

My current study aims to present the consequences of political events on sociology and on sociologists, as seen through the events of József Venczel's life. This perspective offers a quasi-subjective presentation of the events in Northern Transylvania starting with August 23rd, 1944. It also offers an overview of the purging mechanisms employed by the upcoming communist regime. On that date, Romania and Hungary became enemies after being former allies, and the front moved about 40 km distance from Cluj. Despite these events, Bolyai University in Cluj began its academic year as planned. After the end of the war began a relatively calm and free period began, when Venczel accepted to contribute to a future agrarian reform. After the inauguration and consolidation of a newly-established university in Cluj, Venczel became an undesirable person in the eyes of the new regime. Consequently, in 1947 began his freefall as a sociologist and as an intellectual began. That year he was arrested and imprisoned for almost a year in Ploiesti, without any charges. Even though he wasn't even charged, let alone convicted, as a former political detainee he was not accepted back to his university chair. Hence, an acceptable alternative was to become, with help from his friends, a librarian at the Transylvanian Museum Society, a position he held until 1950, when he was arrested for a second time. This time there was a charge, namely high treason, and the persons accused in this trial were carefully selected from each social stratum undesirable for the communist power. In the study, I present several key moments of the trial which, I think, aptly illustrate the legal practices employed during the communist period. The result of the trial meant the total elimination of Venczel from social and scientific life. He was sentenced to 12 years of imprisonment and hard labor. This was tantamount to a death sentence, which Venczel somehow managed to survive.

Dumitru Lăcătușu (Historical Consulting Centre), *The Communist Destiny of Mihai Levente and his Relationship with Anton Golopenția*

Although in the first post-war years the communist biography of Mihai Levente was one of numerous personal trials, including his arrest by the Securitate and interrogation about the period he had spent in Transnistria during the Second World War and his relations with Anton Golopenția, he managed to escape the tragic fate of intellectuals with "stains" on their files. Later on, during the communist regime, he managed to fill some of the most important positions, such as minister and member of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party. Also, for a short period of time, he was an officer of the Secret Police (the Securitate). That is why his biography constitutes an exemplary case study for analyzing the ways through which some of the representatives of interwar society integrated themselves and adapted to the new regime. From this point of view, examining Mihail Levente's biography can uncover some of the stratagems through which those who were in the same situation represented and justified their own "stains" from the past and reinterpreted their biographies in accordance with communist ideology. Also, researching such cases could show what was particular about those who integrated themselves in the new regime. This communication has three parts. The first one analyzes the connections between Mihail Levente and the ones close to the Gustian school from the period when he worked at the National Institute of Statistics. The second one follows his relation with Anton Golopenția and his part in the census taken by the Romanian authorities in Transnistria. The last part will examine his professional evolution after

August 23rd, 1944 and the way in which he adjusted and reinterpreted his biography according to the communist ideology canons. In this paper, I will try to identify the main factors that could explain Mihail Levente's communist biography and to analyze whether or not his entering a client-patron relation with the communists and his connections with them before August 23rd, 1944 could explain his survival and, afterwards, his ascension in the communist period. If not, how can this ascension be explained and what are its main factors? The presentation has as main sources the documents created by the Securitate, regarding his biography, and the ones produced during the time when he was investigated by the Party Control Commission.

11.45-12.00

Coffee break

12.00-14.15

PANEL IV. INSTITUTIONAL "REMAINS"

Moderator: Adela Hincu (CEU, Budapest)

Andrei Gagli (Paris-Descartes University), *The Reception of Gusti's Monographical School in France after WWII. An Analysis of the Institutional and Printed Archives (1944-1958)*

*In this presentation, I would like to analyze the reception of Dimitrie Gusti's sociological works in Western Europe and, more particularly, in France in the years following the end of the Second World War. I will likewise examine the various trajectories of the collaborators and of the disciples of the Bucharest Monographical School who fled to Western Europe or collaborated with institutions and researchers in Western Europe. Parallel to the changes taking place in Romania, the landscape of French sociology in the aftermath of the WWII is profoundly changed. The discipline has only four university chairs and its members are weakly represented in the ruling body of the newly founded National Centre of Social Research (CNRS - Centre national de la recherche scientifique). The Center of Sociological Studies (CSS), founded by G. Gurvitch in 1946, had a modest budget, but it significantly contributed to the rebirth of sociology in post-WWII France. I will explore the ways in which the activity of Gusti's Sociological school – their research campaigns, their pre-WWII publications and their post-war projects, among others – was reflected in the research activities of the CSS, where D. Gusti delivered a lecture in 1946. I will extend my analysis of the reception of the Gustian school in France by exploring the third series of *Année sociologique*, as well as the newly established journals *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* and *Populations*, and the archives of the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, which made Dimitrie Gusti a corresponding member in 1938. I will also present the published references made in reference to the absence of Romanian researchers at the Congresses of the International Institute of Sociology and of the International Association of Sociology (AIS/ISA) in 1949, 1950, 1953 and 1956. Furthermore, I will try to highlight the ways in which the activities of Constantin Brăiloiu, the founder of the International Archives of Popular Music in 1944, and researcher of the CNRS from 1948, could shed light on the Monographical School's contributions to the domains of folklore studies, ethnology and ethno-musicology.*

Cătălina Dobrescu (University of Bucharest), *The Royal Cultural Foundations after August 23, 1944 in the Mirror of the "Căminul Cultural" (The Cultural House) Publication*

This study details the work of the Royal Foundations after August 23, 1944, as evidenced by the "Căminul Cultural" Magazine. The story of the monographic teams, which became student teams of the Social Service and reoriented after the abolition of the Social Service Law, continued after August '44, carrying forward the broadest and most complex doctrine and movement. The post-war reconstruction plan of the country was carried out through the King Michael Foundation, which is active through its own organizations: Cultural House (village, town, workers and soldiers), Peasant Schools, Youth Teams and Work Camps at villages. The Cultural House was the organization that worked for the good of the entire community in collaboration with the school, the church, the state authorities and the community, contributing to the improvement the health, the way of work in the villages, and the education of the children. The effective establishment of the communist regime led to the reorientation of the Foundation's activity, implying a degree of collaboration with the authorities. Towards the end of 1946, we can talk about a decentralization of the activity, much of the work done by the Department of Cultural Houses in the center, which has to go into the competence of the County or Regional Cultural Houses. The Royal Foundation constituted, until 1947, a refuge for the activity of the Gustians, a way to carry on a work of satisfaction and success. Thus, in the journals of the "Căminul Cultural" journal, we discover a whole world of research: the researches carried out before 1944, the research carried out after the '44, but without the original magnitude, working plans for the over 4000 Cultural Centers, their results and evaluations the lifting of villages, publications, books, reviews.

Levente Székedi (Partium Christian University, Oradea) *The Survival of the Monographic Idea in the Postwar Hungarian Sociological Thought within Romania*

The influence of the Gustian school of Bucharest upon the Transylvanian sociology in the interwar era – practised by ethnic Hungarian social scientists – has been described by recent studies in the social history of the Romanian sociology. The thorough presence of the monographists' theoretical ideas and their methodological pillars in the social research endeavours of the Hungarian social scientists of Transylvania has become historiographical evidence, yet the postwar life of the Gustian idea is rarely analysed. The author of the present study attempts to highlight certain events and processes which indicate the continuity of the Gustian approach and way of thinking in the post-World War II ethnic Hungarian sociology within Romania. The close aftermath of the war the transition years (1944–1947) brought a "clemency era" for ethnic Hungarian sociology: a large high school survey was carried on (about the career option of the students), at the Hungarian-language Bolyai University of Cluj a number sociological disciplines were taught (including monographic sociology), politicians and intellectuals debated the establishment of a Romanian-Hungarian research center (envisioning the monographic study of ethnically mixed villages), social scientists planned the continuation of the monographic village research realized in Unguraş (1941–1943). For the ethnic Hungarian sociologists of transition-era Cluj, the Gustian school was much more than a viable tradition: it was the present. Following the consolidation of the political system and the prohibition of the "bourgeois science" of sociology (manifested in the political targeting and arrest of sociologists, the restructuring of the university curricula etc.), "ideologically sound" social research had to be oriented towards the field of socialist industry. This paradigmatic turn led to the birth of "economic monographs", which respected the provisions of historical materialism, but latently preserved elements of the Gustian orientation. After Stalin's death and the relative opening of the communist regime, the discourse gradually shifted away from the absolute rejection of sociology towards the harsh critique of "bourgeois sociology". In this context, the editor-in-chief of the Cluj-based Hungarian language Korunk

journal, Ernő Gáll, published a major text on the importance of social research (1957), acknowledging certain positive aspects of the Gustian methodology. The study of Gáll signals a start in the discursive restoration of the Gustian school in the Hungarian-language publications, a process that reached its peak after the official rehabilitation of the sociology in 1960s.

Bogdan Popa (“Nicolae Iorga” Institute of History, Bucharest), *Sociology of Sport and the School of Dimitrie Gusti: A Forced Relationship*

During the 1970s, Romanian sociology started to look into the sports phenomenon. Articles and monographs dedicated to the organisation of leisure within the Romanian socialist society were published, alongside with several important translations (mainly from French and Russian). It was a new field of study and, in order to discover potential Romanian roots, the sociologists turned to the authority of H.H. Stahl. About the same time, the editors of the complete works of Dimitrie Gusti tried to publish a few contributions the latter apparently wrote on the sociology of physical education. Their attempt was censored and the above mentioned texts were published only in the volumes printed in the early 1990s. Despite such an optimistic approach, the analysis of the topics preferred by the sociologists surrounding Dimitrie Gusti reveals that their interest for sports and body culture was reduced. Dimitrie Gusti himself did not seem to have written the texts attributed and published under his name in the 1990s. During the 1950s, the science and theory of sports were based on translations from Soviet publications. Two decades later, the Gustian school was re-discovered in order to justify the new fields of sociological research. Given this context, the aim of this contribution is to analyse the real impact of the Gustian school in the field of the Romanian physical education and sports sociology. By looking at physical education and sport as research topics, this contribution will shed a light on both the recovery attempts and exaggerations of the 1970s, and, at the same time, to contribute to the present analyses of the Gustian school.

14.15-15.30

Lunch Break

15.30-17.00

Workshop