

Social Science Journals in Interwar Romania and the U.S. Model of Sociology

Valentina Pricopie

Institute of Sociology, Romanian Academy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Other Film and Media Studies Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Television Commons](#), and the [Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Recommended Citation

Pricopie, Valentina. "Social Science Journals in Interwar Romania and the U.S. Model of Sociology." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.4 (2013): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2027>>

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

The above text, published by Purdue University Press ©Purdue University, has been downloaded 470 times as of 11/07/19.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 15 Issue 4 (December 2013) Article 12
Valentina Pricopie,
"Social Science Journals in Interwar Romania and the U.S. Model of Sociology"
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss4/12>>

Contents of **CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 15.4 (2013)**
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss4/>>

Abstract: In her article "Social Science Journals in Interwar Romania and the U.S. Model of Sociology" Valentina Pricopie analyzes the US-American presence in two journals of the Bucharest School of Sociology between the two world wars, as well as the information provided by US articles with regard to the US-American sociological model and its developments. Pricopie's analysis suggests strong academic connections, cooperation, and consistent exchange of academic knowledge between the two schools of thought. The analysis is based a quantitative study of the archives including the frequency of occurrence of items in thirty-one issues of *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* (Archive for Science and Social Reform) and twenty-six issues of *Sociologie Românească* (Romanian Sociology). Pricopie's conclusion is that the development of the Romanian school of sociology was in line not only with what was happening in schools of sociology in Europe, but also with the theoretical developments of U.S. sociology.

Valentina PRICOPIE

Social Science Journals in Interwar Romania and the U.S. Model of Sociology

Founded in 1893 in Paris, the International Institute of Sociology was to hold its fourteenth congress in Bucharest in 1939: it would have been the first time the congress to take place in Central Europe, but the event was postponed when World War II broke out. Papers written for the conference were subsequently published including 305 papers by scholars from the United States in the learned journals *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* (1919-1947) (Archive for Science and Social Reform) and *Sociologie Românească* (1936-1947) (Romanian Sociology). *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* was a quarterly journal first issued in 1919 by the Asociația pentru Studiul și Reforma Socială (Association for Social Study and Reform) at the initiative and under the supervision of Dimitrie Gusti. Gusti had already sent the first letter of invitation to potential journal contributors in March 1913 and the letter detailed the guidelines of the future journal (Gusti, *Opere* 3, 59). The original concept of the journal was preserved in the final title as the journal's main purpose would be collecting studies and comprehensive research revolving around the most interesting themes of the time. The same letter provided details about the topics to be tackled in the articles of the new journal and these topics were classified into four categories: "articles on the causes of social realities," "articles on the scientific policies of social realities," "systematic and comprehensive critical reviews of foreign and Romanian works," and "reviews of the most significant social events in Romania and abroad" (Gusti, *Opere* 3, 59-60; unless indicated otherwise, all translations are mine). The purpose of the publication of research conducted was, in Gusti's opinion, "the comprehensive and documented study and assessment of social realities in Romania" (59) with a declared aim: "*Arhiva* will act both in the interest of science and in the interest of the country" (60). The quantity and quality of articles published by *Arhiva* show that the main purpose of the journal was achieved: "*Arhiva* will continue to feature studies that are more complex than newspaper articles, but are not sufficient for a standalone volume, as well as contributing articles on international sociological issues" (Gusti, *Opere* 1, 465). In 1913, Gusti claimed that the articles received from foreign contributors would be sourced "mainly in neighboring countries" (Gusti, *Opere* 3, 60). This initial claim would be disproved later on as most foreign studies came from France, Germany, and the United States. The purpose of such foreign contributions was to "establish a partnership between the Romanian and international scientific communities" (Gusti, *Opere* 3, 60). In 1934, *Arhiva pentru Știința și reforma Socială* became the Organ of the International Federation of Societies and Institutes of Sociology and the Institutul Social Român (Institute of Romanian Sociology) (see Pricopie, *Recunoașterea* 76).

Sociologie Românească was first published in 1936 in response to the need to emphasize Romania's contribution to the field of sociology. The journal mainly focused on "reporting and discussing the data gathered in Romanian villages by the sociology team of the Romanian Sociological Institute" (Gusti, *Opere* 3, 60). Unlike *Arhiva*, *Sociologie Românească* was due to appear as a monthly publication and with focus on topics of interest to a domestic readership while *Arhiva* was also concerned with theories, methodologies, and research applications developed and practiced abroad. *Sociologie Românească* would feature articles written by foreign contributors on Romanian topics, while *Arhiva* would take a close-up view of sociological research in other countries. In his study of the said publications, Henri H. Stahl wrote that established researchers were not paid for their published articles as young researchers were considered a priority and that "what contemporary readers cannot grasp is the atmosphere of enthusiasm which the journal created among young scholars and the manner in which each issue of the journal was edited — with sometimes heated debates where all participants did their best for the quality of the journal" (357). The editorial board, as a panel, evaluated and approved or rejected articles submitted (Stahl 358) and thus "a genuine school of sociology for young scientists was thus established" (Trestieni 241-42). The first issue in 1921 of *Arhiva* marked the publication of the first article dedicated to the U.S. sociological model. It was written by Nicolae Petrescu and was entitled "Concepțiunile sociologilor americani" ("The Principles of U.S. Sociologists") and the second similar article was written by the same author and was entitled "Învățământul superior în Statele-Unite" ("Higher Education in the United States"). This latter article provided a detailed account of the structure of the U.S. higher education system established after the British model. It indicated salary scales, the number of teaching hours, student attendance, and the structure and requirements of exams: "US-American students are outgoing by education. They are almost always part of a society which has its own place. ... Life on U.S. campuses is far more interesting than one can imagine. The number of students in a dormitory is usually not higher than fifty, which means everyone gets to know one another. ... It is worth mentioning that there is perfect harmony among all dormitories, which usually work together and cooperate on various matters. The customs observed by US-American student fraternities are generally less barbaric than in Germany. Duels are out of the question, bad morals are restrained, and alcohol

consumption was not encouraged before prohibition (January 1920). There is one single less civil tradition, that of initiation" ("Învățământul" 473-74).

Starting with "Bibliographical Notes" and "Notes, Opinions, and Information on Foreign Sociologists" columns, the fourth volume of *Arhiva* published in 1922 (fourth year) contained articles on sociology in the U.S., France, and Germany. The four issues of 1922 featured thirty-nine articles on sociology in France, twenty-nine in the U.S. and Germany, and sixteen in Great Britain. The column "Foreign Book Recommendations" featured eight recommendations of French books, five of German, and four of US-American. In volume 3-4 (1927) there was an article written by U.S. sociologist, J.T. Shotwell (Columbia University) entitled "L'Organisation de la paix" and it was the first in a series dedicated to the U.S. sociological model and in later issues the series would comprise one article each year dedicated to the U.S. model, one dedicated to Austria and two articles dedicated to Germany. Further, there were seven reviews dedicated to Germany, five to Great Britain, two to the U.S., and one to Italy. In 1932 the journal published a single edition comprising a record number of bibliographical notes on U.S. books: 136 compared with 192 bibliographical notes on German books and 214 on French books. Another single edition was published in 1933 and comprised 336 bibliographical notes on German books compared with 203 bibliographical notes on French and U.S., as well as reviews of six French, five German, and three U.S. books. Issues 1-2 (1937) included details on the international participation in the fourteenth World Congress of Sociology which was due to be held in Bucharest in the fall of 1939. The USA would have had a record number of presentations, 305. All presentations were collected by Christina Galitzi, the person whom Gusti "entrusted with the duty of coordinating the Secretariat General" (Golopenția, "Începuturile" 147) of the congress to be held in Bucharest.

Starting with 1920 (second year), *Arhiva* featured ten articles on the U.S. sociological model, reviews of fourteen U.S. books, and 314 notes on U.S. sociology, as well as 385 bibliographical references to U.S. scholars. In the last edition of 1943, the structure and titles of columns were changed and featured the detailed program of the World Congress of Sociology and including the 305 U.S. participants. In *Sociologie Românească* fewer reviews of foreign books appeared and focus was on Romanian books: in the entire archive of the journal 1936-1943 only two reviews of U.S. books and nine reviews of French books appeared. Mention should be made of the publication of six articles dedicated to the U.S. sociological model, all featured in the first three years of publication, as well as of the publication of 50 recommendations of U.S. books, all featured in the volume of 1942.

With regard to accounts of academic relations established between Romanian and U.S. schools of sociology, Galitzi mentions in her article "Studii americane despre sociologia Școlii dela București" ("U.S. Studies on the Sociological Model of the Bucharest School") Philip E. Mosely's article published in *Rural Sociology* entitled "A New Romanian Journal of Rural Sociology" and comprised Mosley's opinions as founder of rural sociology at Cornell University: "The journal *Sociologie Românească* is the ultimate link between theory and practice, ideal and reality and deals not only with the more interesting issues of traditional form and content — such as 'taboos' regarding marriage, spiritual parenting, healing by charms and spells — but also with modern issues, such as: farmers' eating habits, rural and public health, social protection, cooperatives, peasant genealogy. Professor Mosely concludes with a praise to Romania, a country which in the author's opinion is bound to advance, given that the principle of "self-awareness" is not only applied by the Romanian school of sociology, but it is also considered scientific method and a large-scale popular movement" (*Studii americane* 96). The journal also features a review of Joseph Stabey Rouček's article entitled "Sociology in Romania" published in the *American Sociological Review* in 1938. Rouček's Ph.D. dissertation was dedicated to the topic of Romanian sociology and was entitled *Contemporary Romania and Her Problems*. The review follows the structure of Rouček's article and gives account of the contribution of student groups to the development of Romanian villages, as well as of the impact of the Bucharest School of Sociology on Romanian society during the period and also describing the strained and competitive relations between sociologists in the two countries:

Mr. Rouček's article has a very distinctive, personal note. He chooses not to mention many names of Romanian sociologists, including the late Virgil Bărbat, the founder of sociological studies at the University of Cluj, whose pioneering work has been brought to an end by his untimely death. It is somehow regrettable that this personal note goes a little bit too far: the scientific aim of the article was to present the realities of Romanian society, but the author also makes critical comments on the difficulties encountered in Romania as regards the gathering of any material data either by mail or on site ("a genuine Romanian fact," as claimed by the distinguished author). Nevertheless, Mr. Rouček's article is based on extensive data on Romanian sociology in general and the individual contributions of our leading sociologists in particular. (Galitzi, "Studii americane" 97)

The on-going comparison between Romanian sociology and U.S. sociology is attributed by representatives of the Bucharest School of Sociology to some prominent social realities: "in a country where social structure is

coherent and social awareness is present among all citizens, the need to contemplate social issues becomes a daily task. The United States of America is a country with such social structure and awareness. There is no country in the world with greater interest in social issues. We find the same concern with the role of individuals in society both in the common factory worker and in the leader of a public institution" (Petrescu, "Conceptiunile" 324). Petrescu gives detailed accounts of the concepts advanced by William James, Franklin Henry Giddings, Albion Woodbury Small, Lester Frank Ward, and Simon Nelson Patten for the foundation of social psychology, seen by Charles Abram Ellwood as a branch of sociology and by William Isaac Thomas as a branch of individual psychology. Petrescu describes new concepts such as the "organization of happiness" (Ward 1897), the "consciousness of kind"/"social mind" (Giddings), the "pain economy"/"the pleasure economy" and "theory of social forces" (Patten 1896). With regards to the concept of "consciousness of kind" Petrescu sees the similarity with the notion of sympathy as conceptualized by Adam Smith (1759), but also the difference between the two notions: Smith considers sympathy and mutual aid to be alternative causes of social relations," while Giddings makes a clear cut distinction between the two concepts: consciousness of kind is understood as "the cause of social phenomena," while mutual aid is seen as an "effect" (334).

US-American sociologist Albion Woodbury Small's work has been the subject of several reviews published in *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* and *Sociologie Românească*. Upon Small's death in 1926, Petrescu refers to Small as "one of the most famous promoters of sociological studies in the United States, entrusted with the management of the first Department of Sociology in the USA, when the University of Chicago was established in 1892" (Petrescu, "A.W. Small" 514). Petrescu analyzes Small's contributions to the development of sociology and his career, from the establishment of the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1895 until he became president of the American Sociological Society in 1912-1913) and of the International Institute of Sociology in Paris in 1922. Upon Giddings' passing in 1931, Petru Comarnescu published a bio-bibliographical article in which he wrote the following: "His endeavors have established a comprehensive and substantiated theory for the scientific concerns of other sociologists for whom Giddings remains a pioneer of secure methods and a constructor of relevant systems" ("Franklin Henry Giddings" 93-94). Further, in "O încercare americană de constituire a unei monografii sociale asupra tendințelor și problemelor recente" ("A U.S. Attempt to Prepare a Monograph of Recent Social Trends and Issues") Comarnescu deals with the interest shown by U.S. presidents in the findings of sociological studies conducted at national level as significant "sources of information for their decisions" (475), in particular as regards the 1933 *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends* (President's), a two-volume work prepared by sociologists at the request of President Hoover in 1929 and whose findings were used by the Roosevelt administration "as the source of many of the reforms and transformations achieved" (Comarnescu, "O încercare" 478).

The U.S. sociological model is described in Galitzi's article "Sociologia americană și rolul ei în organizarea Statelor-Unite" ("U.S. Sociology and Its Role in the Organization of the United States") who returned from the United States where she had been working together with scholars including Samuel McCune Lindsay, R.E. Chaddock, A.A. Tenney, Robert MacIver, Giddings, and H.P. Fairchild. Galitzi was enrolled in a Ph.D. program in political science at Columbia University. Upon her return to Romania, she "would become a member of the Romanian Sociological Institute ... while also working for the Higher School of Social Work" (Golopenția, "Începuturile" 147). Galitzi's article presents the forty-year history of U.S. sociology, including the development and impact of the U.S. sociological model all over the world:

The most prominent features of U.S. sociology ... are, on the one hand, the effort made by U.S. sociologists to develop scholarship based on concrete foundations which would sustain the multitude of findings of present and future research, and on the other hand a philosophy saturated with William James's pragmatism and maybe imbued with Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism, a philosophy which supports the majority of U.S. sociological studies and uses its findings to the benefit of society ... the systematic interpretation of social phenomena which leads to the elaboration of sociological theories has as its main purpose not only to discover laws which govern social realities and thus, the promotion of pure science only, but also the application of the findings to improve the standard of living of individuals in their natural environment — family and profession — and Good Government. The analysis of the manner in which the U.S. sociologists were able to free sociology from ... a priori theories whose stereotypes were not able to mirror the ever changing nature of social realities. The description of the topics considered and of the various methods used and the presentation of their contribution to the progress of the United States by promoting social progress are three critical points. ("Sociologia americană" 56)

Further, Galitzi provides details on the contribution of the U.S. sociological model in the development of civic awareness of U.S. citizens through the development of "a philosophical interpretation of the social phenomena subject to scientific research" (59), as well as in the science-based proposal and implementation of legislative reform

in the U.S. The article also reviews the distinctive branches of the U.S. sociological model, as well as the significant scientific developments of the established U.S. sociologists, as follows. Sociology of the individual (E. Cooley, E. Lee Thordike, W. MacDougall, J. Boradus Watson, E. Faris), sociology of the family and the evolution of this institution in terms of eugenics, racial fertility, and the inheritance of recessive Mendelian traits (E. Mowrer, Davenport, W. Goodsell, T.H. Morgan, J. Popenoe, R. Briffault, I.M. Rubinow, R. Latou Dickinson, G. Parkhurst, A.H. Estabrok, R.I. Dugdale), sociology of education (J. Dewey, W. Head Kilpatrick, Ch. H. Judd, S. Duggan, P. Monroe), sociology of juvenile delinquency (W. Healy, M. Van Waters, Sheldon Gluck and Eleanor T. Gluck, E.W. Sutherland, T. Mott Osborne), sociology of migration and "Americanization problems" (H.G. Duncan, H.P. Fairchild, G.M. Stephenson, I. Thomas, F. Znaniecki, L.G. Brown), sociology of "racial antagonisms between Blacks and Whites" (B.T. Washington, B. Brawley, B.W. Doyle), social reintegration of offenders within criminal sociology (J.L. Gilin, F.E. Haynes, R. Pound, H.H. Lou, H.H. Hart, R.W. Holland, L.E. Lewis), sociology of religion (R. Fosdick, J.H. Leuba, E.W. Hopkins, L. Browne, H.M. Robinson), sociology of public health, social security, and child welfare (H. Emerson, I.V. Hiscock, H.T. Devine, R.W. Kelso, J. Addams, P. Lee, G. Hamilton, C. King, E. Abbot, K. Lenroot), and demographic studies (S. Harrison, I. Thomas, E.W. Burgess, R.S. Lynd, H.M. Lynd) ("Sociologia americană" 58-59).

The field of rural sociology at various U.S. universities is featured in a separate series of articles or notes. For instance, *Sociologie românească* announced in its issue 10 (1936) that "the department of rural sociology of the American Sociological Society publishes, from March 1936, a quarterly review dedicated to the scientific study of rural life" (*Notes* 48) and in the article "Economia dirijată în regiunile rurale ale Statelor Unite" ("Planned Economy in the Rural Areas of the United States") Galitzi analyzed U.S. society at the time of the Great Depression, as well as the New Deal whose objective was "to move people from overcrowded urban areas to rural areas; to use every piece of land, including forested land which can be watered, reclaimed, drained and provided with electricity; to improve farmers' standard of living by better managing the price of grain and the salaries of farmers; to take measures against the isolation of the rural US-American population and to develop social cohesion among farmers through the establishment of cooperatives, as well as through social and economic development" (301). Further, Galitzi posited that

For us, Europeans, it is difficult to imagine the isolation of the rural US-American population, which is not organized in villages. The Yankee farmer — a *sui generis* type of farmer — is most of the times a Puritan who relies only on his own strong will and on the protection provided by his religion, often that of the Quaker religion. The US-American farmer has no social life because he is separated from his peers by vast open spaces. This geographic isolation also provides some sort of cultural superiority, as many farmers, Quakers in particular, have university degrees. This has caused the development of the spirit of initiative and conquest, as well as that of self-control and of something else that is called "self reliance." That is why it is impossible to compare the small or big US-American capitalist farmer with our European peasants, barely freed from the oppression of their feudal lords with whom they only share their love for land and open spaces. ("Economia dirijată" 301).

I should also mention F.C.S. Schiller's 1930 article "Eugenics as a Moral Ideal: The Beginnings of a Progressive Reform": this programmatic article is in line with the concerns of U.S. personalities of the time and with the developments of research in the field of genetics by promoting "eugenic ethics in practice" and this is how Golopenția read Schiller's contribution: "his writings are fully in line with US reforms and seem entirely practical in particular in the 100% US-American world of California. They also open new and impressive horizons for Europe — so much trapped in nineteenth-century realities and so little aware of the events in the Soviet Union — when leaders who behave like philosophers, Platonic kings, or great Campanellan priests will lead the masses with an iron fist in their pursuit of ideals only known to them or even little known to them" ("Noua Arhivă" 463). Some of the personalities cited in Golopenția's article are Giddings and Robert M. MacIver, both from Columbia University, Pitirim Sorokin, former President of the International Institute of Sociology, Charles Horton Cooley (University of Michigan), Allport E. Ross (University of Wisconsin), Howard W. Odum (University of North Carolina), and William F. Ogburn (University of Chicago).

With regard to the American Sociological Society, established in 1905, mention should be made of one of its most significant achievements, the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* published 1930-1967: it was reviewed in *Arhiva* and Comarnescu described it as "a synthesis of studies, some of considerable scope, with respect to social sciences and their implications ... mostly drafted and prepared in the United States, universal in nature and international in source" (Comarnescu, Rev. of *Encyclopedia* 953-54). The "Notes" column in 1 (1936) of *Sociologie românească* makes reference to the work of Mosley who conducted research in Romania with a Rockefeller scholarship and who "was involved in September [1935] in the research conducted by the Romanian Institute of Sociology in the village of Șanț, Năsăud county. During the course of the whole year of 1936, Mr. Mosely will study

the issue of "neighborhoods" in Ardeal (62). Stahl thinks of Mosely as "the most prominent" foreign contributor to the Bucharest School, "a genuine scholar, a historian who wishes to study the social history of peasants with sociological methods" (353). The young scholar had been recommended by Tracy B. Kittredge, head of the European Office of the Rockefeller Foundation, in a letter to Stahl dated 20 June 1935. Kittredge asked Stahl to support the young U.S. scholar's effort to study the "evolution of the peasant economy in Eastern Europe" (353). Mosely came to Romania after having completed his Ph.D. dissertation in Russian history. Stahl wrote that they [Stahl and Mosely] "liked each other from the very beginning and would soon become good friends" (354) owing to their shared interest in science. After becoming familiar with the method used by the Bucharest School, Mosely went on to conduct individual studies in several villages in Albania, Serbia, Macedonia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Slovenia. He was particularly pleased with the findings of his fieldwork in Albania and which he returned to Romania and was assigned by Gusti to the team involved in the study conducted in the village of Șanț. According to Stahl, Mosely got involved in the fieldwork carried out by all the members of the research team.

Issue 7-9 (1936) of *Sociologie românească* features an article by Mosley entitled "Lumea psihologică a unui 'american' din Șanț" ("The Psychological Universe of an 'American' in Șanț Village"). The article is an attempt at profiling an inhabitant of the village of Șanț, Vasile Marti (76) who after sixteen years spent in the United States returned to Romania. The second part of the article deals with the transformation of Marti as a result of his experiences especially with regard to the superstitions, traditions, celebrations, and customs of Romanian villages. Mosely points out that the "U.S. lifestyle has left deep marks in Vasile Marti's mentality; he has lost connection with the spiritual life of his native village and got interested in cars and sports — i.e., the two types of entertainment in the life of common workers. ... His greatest wish is to go back to the U.S., a country which he sees as the ideal place to live" (78). Another local inhabitant, Timoftei Filipoi, whom Mosley interviewed for his study manifests the opposite to Marti's behaviour and is described by Mosely as someone who "was not at home there [i.e., the U.S.]. He thought the epithet 'Hunky' — a name given to him, as well as to other East European immigrants — was offensive. Filipoi was appalled by what he found in the U.S. and was happy to return home to find his ancestral roots" (78). Further, Marti's statements also include comparisons between the standard of living, traditions, habits, and customs of Romanian farmers and those of U.S. industrial laborers. Personal judgement is also present: "Chevrolet organized an exhibition on American lifestyle 200 years ago. What I saw there was very similar to how we live now in Romania. 200 years ago the US-Americans used oxen and carts; now they only use machinery ... In Romania, you only go dancing on Sundays. In the U.S., you work eight hours a day and you have eight hours free. In the United States, you can go dancing every day" (77).

In the years to follow, Mosely published a series of articles dedicated to Romanian sociology with careful consideration of the specific features of the rural sociological studies conducted by Gusti. For example, the first article of this series, "The Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti," appeared in *The Sociological Review*, the journal of the Institute of Sociology in London, in April 1936. The article is referred to in a note published in 5 (1936) of *Sociologie românească* with a promise to come back with details in the next issue of 6 (1936):

with the exception of two personal opinions on the system (i.e., the possibility of reducing the historical framework to a mental framework as well as ethical and political manifestations to spiritual manifestations) and of two expressions which are not ours (i.e., legal and administrative manifestations as well as ethical and political manifestations instead of ethical and legal manifestations and administrative and political manifestations), but which we shall explain shortly, Mr. Mosely warmly embraces our findings and shows thorough knowledge of our studies. He explains with precise details the sociological system of Professor Gusti, the monographic theory and technique and makes reference to all the monographic studies published so far by the Sociological Library of the Romanian Institute of Sociology and by *Arhiva*. He also mentions the sociological dimension of the cultural endeavors of the Prince Carol Foundation. Mr. Mosely thus succeeds in his attempt to inform the English audience and the scientific world of the sociological achievements of the Bucharest School, which he considers "unique in Europe." (47)

And in her notes on Moseley's studies, Galitzi concurs: "Professor Mosely shows that farmers play a significant role in the development of society due to the fact that they belong to a social community where integration in national communities is the slowest. The whole world should focus more on the development of the rural individual and environment in line with the development of urban centres ... According to Professor Mosely, this significant issue for the geopolitics of the United States, where population is mostly rural, is solved in a very wise and successful manner in Romania, where Professor Gusti's school has an important role in the national authorities' decision-making process" ("Studii americane" 96).

From theory to practice and from rural to modern, the attempt by Gusti's School to understand and develop farmers' lifestyles is explained by Mosely in the pages of *Sociologie românească*. In his opinion, the journal is "the link between theory and practice, ideal and reality ... Professor Mosely concludes with a praise to Romania, a

country which, in the author's opinion, is bound to advance given that the principle of 'self-awareness' is not only applied by the Romanian school of sociology, but is also considered a scientific method and a large-scale popular movement" (Galitzi, "Studii americane" 96). Mosely returned to Romania in 1938, but World War II seems to have ended the relationship between the representatives of the Bucharest School and the U.S. sociologist. A letter sent by Golopenția to Mosely in the summer of 1946 tells us that good news had nevertheless traveled during the years of war: "I had the great pleasure of hearing news of you in the past eight years" (Golopenția, "Copie scrisoare" 356). During this time, Mosely was involved in the U.S. State Department expert team sent to London "in view of preparing the Peace Conference in Paris" (Golopenția, *Copie* 802). The letter includes a detailed presentation of the current state of Romanian sociology in terms of structure, institutions and scientific achievements: "scientific activities were only resumed last summer" [1945] ... nothing significant has happened as far as social sciences are concerned, we have followed the directions already established" (Golopenția, *Copie* 357). The last part of the letter highlights Golopenția's intention to resume academic relations with specialized institutions in the United States "concerned with the study of southeastern Europe ... in order to provide you with up-to-date information on Romania, I, Professor Gusti and Doctor Manuila have prepared two full boxes of recent Romanian publications, plus a few other papers. Please find enclosed a copy of the inventory list" (*Copie* 359).

We also find information about the representatives of the Bucharest School of Sociology and the events which had often changed their lives. For instance, Gusti "had been repudiated by the former King Charles II in Oct[ober] 1939, because the king's advisors [also known as the Camarilla] disliked the left-wing and right-wing radicalism of Gusti's students" (358). In the letter's *post scriptum*, Golopenția tells Mosely about the "concerns" of the "relentless strategist" (360) Gusti, who was "thinking about establishing a United Nations Institute of Social Sciences, with members or National Institutes of Social Sciences in every country of the world and having him as supervisor of all the studies conducted" (360). In a response letter written in French and dated 26 September 1946, Mosely shares with his "dear friend and colleague" Golopenția his doubts about Gusti's latest project, "his idea of a great international institute is not compatible with the ideas of the Americans, who are reluctant about centralization and care a lot about autonomy and partial involvement as far as social and other sciences are concerned" (Mosely, "Scrisoare" 372). With regard to the two boxes of documents sent from Bucharest to the United States via London, Mosely was happy and grateful to have received them and informed Golopenția of his intention to send the boxes on to Columbia University as soon as possible. Meanwhile, the Social Science Research Council had already authorized Mosely to provide the countries which had been under German occupation during the war with important books on social sciences (250 volumes per delivery), published in the period between 1939 and 1946. By the time the response letter was written, some of the volumes had already been shipped to the University of Bucharest. The next package was to be shipped to the University of Cluj. The packages were accompanied by a list of other 500 books of which the universities could request a further 100 to 125 volumes ("Scrisoare" 372).

The letter also confirms the Rockefeller Foundation's intention to resume its "direct involvement with cultural institutes in Romania" (Mosely, "Scrisoare" 371). The Foundation was also contemplating the possibility of sending one of its grantees to Bucharest in the next spring (1947). This item of information is disclosed by Mosely in strict confidence as Mosely himself was considering the idea of returning to Bucharest in 1947 and agreed to the suggestion that he act as middleman between the National Institute of Statistics in Romania, whose substitute director general was Golopenția, and similar institutions in the United States. Mosely suggests the drawing up of bibliographical lists with the aim to facilitate the exchange of specialized literature — periodicals included — between the two countries. In a draft letter Golopenția advises Mosely in August 1946 of the joint initiative of the Institute of Social Sciences and the Institute of Statistics regarding the establishment of "permanent" cooperation with similar institutions in the United States. Romanian institutions were also contemplating the possibility of signing an agreement with the Military Division of the U.S. Delegation to Romania as a first step in the process. The agreement would concern the shipping of documents between the two destinations, thus avoiding "the financial and political obstacles" which could prevent effective exchange. The reason behind the whole process is expressed by Golopenția: "we thought it would be better for us to get acquainted with US scientists in order to earn their trust" ("Ciornă" 360). Golopenția's letters — confiscated by the communist regime and subsequently restored by his daughter Sanda Golopenția — also includes an official letter sent by Mosely to Golopenția on 15 March 1947. The sender shows appreciation for a book which had been given to him by the Institute, one of "the long series of valuable scientific studies which have been prepared by the Institute or under its auspices" (Mosely, "C.P.-tip" 391). Mosely's Romanian adventure ends here. He returned to the United States as advisor to the Department of Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation, as we learn from a report issued by the Foundation in 1952 (see Rhoades, *A History*). He was later appointed President of the Eastern European Fund and continued his career as professor of

International Relations at Cornell and Columbia universities. Mosely's personal archives are kept by the University of Illinois and comprise, among others, manuscripts and letters which may be of interest for further research.

Works Cited

- Comarnescu, Petru. "Franklin Henry Giddings (1855-1931)". *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 1-4 (1932): 892-94.
- Comarnescu, Petru. "O încercare americană de constituire a unei monografii sociale" ("An American Attempt to Set Up Social Monographs"). *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 3-4 (1933): 475-95.
- Comarnescu, Petru. Rev. of *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vols. I, II, III, IV. *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 1-4 (1932): 953-54.
- Comarnescu, Petru. Rev. of *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vols. IV, V, VI, VII, VIII". *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 1-4 (1933): 364-65.
- Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan 1930-1967.
- Galitz, Christina. "Economia dirijată în regiunile rurale ale Statelor Unite" ("Driven Economy in Rural Areas of the United States"). *Sociologie Românească* 7-9 (1938): 299-307.
- Galitz, Christina. "Sociologia americană și rolul ei în organizarea Statelor-Unite" ("American Sociology and Its Role in the Organization of the United States"). *Sociologie românească* 1-3 (1938): 56-61.
- Galitz, Christina. "Studii americane despre sociologia Școlii dela București" ("American Studies on the Sociological Model of the Bucharest School"). *Sociologie românească* 1-3 (1938): 95-97.
- Golopenția, Anton. "Ciornă de scrisoare Anton Golopenția-Philip Mosely (August 1946)" ("Draft Letter Anton Golopenția-Philip Mosely [August 1946]"). *Ultima carte*. Ed. Sanda Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 2001. 360-61.
- Golopenția, Anton. "Copie scrisoare Anton Golopenția-Philip Mosely (vara 1946)" ("Copy of Letter by Anton Golopenția-Philip Mosely [Spring 1946]"). *Ultima carte*. Ed. Sanda Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 2001. 356-60, Editor's notes 801-02.
- Golopenția, Sanda. "Începuturile imigrației românești în Statele Unite: Christina Galitz" ("The Beginnings of Romanian Immigration to the U.S.: Christina Galitz"). *Emigranții Carter*. București: Paideia, 2008. 147-68.
- Golopenția, Sanda. "Marginalii la cuprinsul numărului de față [al *Sociologiei Românești*]" ("Notes to the Current Edition [of *Sociologie Românească*]"). *Opere complete*. By Anton Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 2002. Vol. 1, 645-53.
- Golopenția, Anton. "Noua Arhivă" ("The New Archive"). *Opere complete*. By Anton Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 1931. Vol. 1, 463-65.
- Gusti, Dimitrie. *Opere*. București: Academiei, 1968. Vol. 1.
- Gusti, Dimitrie. *Opere*. București: Academiei, 1970. Vol. 3.
- Mosely, Philip E. "A New Romanian Journal of Rural Sociology." *Rural Sociology* 2 (1936): 457-65.
- Mosely, Philip E. "C.P.-tip Philip Mosely-Institutul Central de Statistică" ("Letter by Philip Mosely: Central Institute of Statistics"). *Ultima carte*. Ed. Sanda Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 2001. 390-91.
- Mosely, Philip E. "Lumea Psihologică a unui 'american' din Șanț" ("The Psychological Universe of an 'American' in Șanț Village"). *Sociologie românească* 7-9 (1936): 75-78.
- Mosely, Philip E. "Scrisoare Philip Mosely-Anton Golopenția" ("Letter by Philip Mosely-Anton Golopenția"). *Ultima carte*. Ed. Sanda Golopenția. București: Enciclopedică, 2001. 370-72.
- Mosely, Philip E. "The Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti." *The Sociological Review* 28.2 (1936): 149-65.
- Petrescu, Nicolae. "A. W. Small (1854-1926)". *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 3-4 (1927): 514-15.
- Petrescu, Nicolae. "Conceptiunile sociologilor americani" ("Concepts of American Sociology"). *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 2-3 (1921): 324-34.
- Petrescu, Nicolae. "Învățământul superior în Statele-Unite" ("Higher Education in the United States"). *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 4 (1921): 471-77.
- President's Research Committee on Social Trends. *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933. 2 Vols.
- Pricopie, Valentina. 2004. *Recunoașterea internațională a Școlii Gusti (International Recognition of Gusti School of Sociology)*. Bucharest: Tritonic.
- Rhoades, Lawrence J. *A History of the American Sociological Association 1905-1981*. New York: American Sociological Association, 1981.
- Rouček, Joseph Stabey. *Contemporary Romania and Her Problems*. Ph.D. diss. Stanford: Stanford U, 1932.
- Rouček, Joseph Stabey. "Sociology in Romania." *American Sociological Review* 3.1 (1938): 54-62.
- Schiller, F.C.S. "Eugenics as a Moral Ideal: The Beginnings of a Progressive Reform." *The Eugenics Review* 22.2 (1930): 103-09.
- Shotwell, J.T. "L'Organisation de la paix." *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* 3-4 (1927): 231-40.
- Stahl, Henri H. *Amintiri și gânduri din vechea școală a "monografiilor sociologice"* (Memories and Thoughts about the Old School of "Sociological Monographs"). Bucharest: Minerva, 1981.
- Trestieni, Ion Dan. "Cercetarea de teren în perspectiva Școlii Sociologice de la București. Analiza conținutului studiilor publicate în revista *Sociologie Românească* (1936-1943)" ("Fieldwork in the Perspective of the Bucharest School of Sociology: Content Analysis of Studies Published in *Sociologie Românească* [1936-1943]). *Semnificația documentelor sociale*. Ed. Septimiu Chelcea. București: Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1985. 237-57.

Author's profile: Valentina Pricopie conducts research in the Institute of Sociology of the Romanian Academy. Her interests in scholarship include media studies, European communication policy, and the history of sociology. In addition to numerous articles in Romanian and French. Pricopie's recent book publications include *Lire l'adhésion européenne à travers les medias roumains. Etudes de cas* (2012) and *La Turquie en Europe? Construction discursive de l'altérité* (2012). E-mail: <valpricopie@gmail.com>