

The Interlinkage between Sociology and Politics in Monographic Research in Interwar Romania

BOGDAN BUCUR

IN HIS *Dialog neeterminat* [Unfinished Dialogue] with Zoltán Rostás, sociologist Ioan Mihăilescu, a former rector of the University of Bucharest (1996-2005), notices how close politics gets to European sociology, in contrast to American sociology, considered much more pragmatic. Of course, this finding about European sociology also applies to the Romanian case. Furthermore, Professor Mihăilescu calls the reader's attention to the potentially adverse effects of sociology and politics coming too close together, which he compares to the *temptation of a butterfly drawn by light*. If “you come too close, your wings will burn”¹. During the historical periods which Ioan Mihăilescu and Zoltán Rostás compared, sociology was used to legitimate the fair-weather holders of political offices and their regimes².

Such proximity between sociology and politics existed between the Sociological School of Bucharest and the political regime of King Carol II³. The entire organizational structure devised in the interwar period by Academician Dimitrie Gusti was financed from Romania's state budget and under the Civil List arrangements of the Royal Family. The ability of Professor Gusti to support his sociological research work by using public resources—particularly through Royal Cultural Foundation “Prince Carol” (under the patronage of King Carol II) —increased in the 1930s. For sure, Gustian monographers did more than sociological research during the interwar period—out of a sincere desire to get more knowledge and rescue the abandoned and forgotten Romanian village from financial and cultural disaster; they also did social engineering and political propaganda work in favor of Carol's regime, turned authoritarian as of 10 February 1938⁴. Dumitru Sandu is right in saying that reading just a couple of pages from *Curierul Echipelor Studentești* [Student Teams Courier] and *Curierul Serviciului Social* [Social Service Courier] would suffice for one to easily perceive the manifestly pro-royal ideological orientation of the Gustian movement. Wherever one looks, King Carol II appears as the “great initiator” of community development projects carried out by the Gusti School⁵.

Building on the studies of Professor Zoltán Rostás, Antonio Momoc also unavoidably notices that, during the interwar period, Dimitrie Gusti failed to develop a Romanian sociology fully independent from the political power⁶. Having reviewed the political dimension of the Sociological School of Bucharest, the study entitled *Capcanele politice*

ale sociologiei interbelice: școala gustiană între carlism și legionarism [The Political Pitfalls of Interwar Sociology: the Gustian School between the Carlist and the Legionary Movement] takes stock of the individual or group ideological options, orientations and re-orientations, political opinions and preferential views of Gustian monographers, and also investigates the cooperation, or better said the subordinate relationship, between scientists and politicians⁷. For most of the cases researched by Antonio Momoc, one cannot speak only about a straightforward cooperation between sociology and politics. In his capacity as General Manager of the Royal Cultural Foundation “Prince Carol” (1933-1938)⁸ and chairman with the rank of State Minister of the Social Service (1938-1939), the founder of Romanian sociology was to place the Gustian organizations into the service of King Carol II’s social monarchy, and support “the national-royal cultural propaganda” deployed by the king’s regime⁹.

Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the Monographic School made a conscious decision to assume this interlinkage between sociology and politics. Considering that the modernization of the state was seen as a top priority, monographic research—which had recently taken roots in Romania—addressed a legitimate expectation of interwar society. Furthermore, each of the entities involved in this exchange had something significant to gain: the state—technical expertise, and sociology—political support and funding. This explains the protection that the Sociological School of Bucharest enjoyed from the Romanian State during the interwar period. The paternalistic attitude of King Carol II towards the monographic movement started by Dimitrie Gusti should be looked upon from the same perspective¹⁰. While the Western scientific world could have qualified this as the subordination of scholars to the political power, in interwar Romania the dependency between sociology and politics was seen as a mutually-beneficial exchange from which sociology had a great deal to gain (being able to come into shape and enjoy funding as scientific discipline). The founder of the Sociological School of Bucharest had the exceptional ability to secure financial resources from the state for his project of social research and cultural reformation of the Romanian society, which coincided with the political interest of the state to strengthen Greater Romania during the interwar period. But one needs to know a country before starting to strengthen it. Thus, monographic sociology was the scientific branch that best addressed such an ultimate national goal. And Dimitrie Gusti was a man of a reasonable compromise who almost flawlessly brokered the complex relation between monographs and the political power (in the sense that sociological research needed to become useful to the political decision makers, in order for the latter to produce items of legislation and public policies that were appropriate for the state of affairs). Dimitrie Gusti mastered the necessary managerial skills and theoretical concepts, could count on high-quality human resources (recruited from among his students), and was skillful enough to raise the interest of King Carol II and convince him of the countless and mutual benefits of his project. The close relation between the Monographic School and the political power should be construed against this metric, too.

Thus, it is true that the Gusti School promoted the political agenda of King Carol II’s regime, even after the establishment of monarchical authoritarianism on 10 February 1938. However, it is equally true that the monographers used the king and the state appa-

ratus of Greater Romania to deploy the social reform and establish the first Romanian sociological school. Of course, the Gusti School, and particularly its founder, had to pay political tribute to the king for the financial support they enjoyed, but, reportedly, this compromise paid off, because if Romania can now claim a sociological tradition in field scientific research, credit should be given to Academician Dimitrie Gusti and his monographic movement. This opinion is equally shared by Professor Dumitru Sandu¹¹, who believes that the Gusti-Stahl School—as he calls it, building on a strong belief, also expressed by Anton Golopenția¹², that Henri H. Stahl “is the most genuine monographer”—should be given full credit for having laid “the foundations of a sociology that was built on facts and methods”¹³.

Having emphasized these few introductory thoughts about the good cooperation between Romanian monographic sociology and the political power during the interwar period, we will dwell hereinafter on the two main theoretical approaches to the relationship between sociology and the political power found within the Sociological School of Bucharest, those of Dimitrie Gusti and Anton Golopenția¹⁴.

The Interlinkage between Sociology and Politics in the Approach of Dimitrie Gusti

IN THE foreword to the first edition of his *Sociologia militans*, Professor Gusti defines the harmonious cooperation between monographic research (*sociologia cogitans*) and political action (*sociologia militans*), and rightly notices that, in the absence of a thorough scientific substantiation of sociological nature, reasoned political decisions could have been neither passed, nor devised. For the Sociological School of Bucharest, monographic research was expected to substantiate the political intention of the state to promote social and cultural values. Building on the knowledge acquired from field scientific research, monographic sociology—known as *the science of the Romanian nation*—was supposed to help pre-form the interwar social reality, and articulate the sense of identity of the Romanian nation. In a nutshell, monographic research had a twofold purpose for the Bucharest School: both sociological and political, to an equal extent¹⁵.

In *Sociologia monografică, știință a realității sociale* [Monographic Sociology, the Science of Social Reality], Dimitrie Gusti gives a definition to the political mission of Romanian sociology. By conducting a monographic research of villages, the social scientist is expected to make available to political decision makers the information and documentation materials required for a sound administration of the Romanian social space. Building on the rational assumption that, in the Modern Era, the state cannot be run in the absence of a thorough and prior understanding of the Romanian society, the academician Dimitrie Gusti believed that social monograph reconcile politics with the social reality, in an effective and objective manner. But monographic sociology often has its own political agenda. The scientist, by interacting personally with the social reality, ends up discovering and understanding the development trends and the ideal the society is heading for. Then, they devise politically-adequate means to operate the social changes deemed necessary. Thus,

the sociologist—*swept away by the torrents of life*—becomes a man of political action driven by the desire to have a direct contribution to addressing the problems in society¹⁶. Dimitrie Gusti justifies the political engagement of sociologists, as well as the need to put the Romanian social science in the service of the political power, by claiming the serious lack of administrative competence of the interwar Romanian politicians. As perceived by the founder of Romanian sociology,

*the Romanian leading stratum, with very few exceptions, is often driven by habit and routine—without either ideas or information—, only sometimes by empiricism—that is to say, using non-systematic information [...]—, and in the best case scenario, by a sentimental utopianism, i.e. with ideas inspired by sympathy, but lacking sound underlying information*¹⁷.

Considering that the late 1930s saw the international political scene starting to escalate, and a new world war seemed to take hold of Europe, Academician Dimitrie Gusti concluded that the domestic organization of a nation could not be left to its internally-driven development alone¹⁸. Such exceptional circumstances demanded a more dynamic domestic and foreign policy, at a time when nation leading all over Europe seemed to be significantly helped by the social sciences that only became critically necessary when the social reality seemed to experience a total transformation in the aftermath of the outbreak of the Second World War. Against such an exceptional background, involving tens of research institutes and study offices, able to demonstrate to the ruling party the potential of foreign states and the urgent needs due to be considered in the domestic administration of a nation and an inspired orientation of its foreign policy, in the strategic political decision-making becomes critical. Therefore,

*those who, in the existence of a nation, have the function of pursuing the social sciences, are entrusted with a threefold mission: with their research, to ease the governing of the nation; with their publications, to help articulate the sense of identity of the nation; and, eventually, to raise young men and women able to take further the research of the national reality*¹⁹.

The Interlinkage between Sociology and Politics in the Approach of Anton Golopenția

IN A letter sent on 26 August 1936 to Ștefania Cristescu, Anton Golopenția voiced for the first time his fundamental concern about shedding more light on the relationship between sociology and politics²⁰. Monographic research was supposed to be a thorough scientific tool used to provide information about the Romanian social and economic reality to the political leaders of the state. And again for the first time, he stated the possibility—which became reality with the campaign *Identificarea Românilor de la Est de Bug* [Identification of Romanians East of the River Bug] (deployed between

1941 and 1944)—that sociological research would reveal the political representations of the population in terms of social government or the administrative functioning of the state.

Such a theory was further developed by Anton Golopenția in his PhD thesis entitled *Die Information der Staatsführung und die überlieferte Soziologie* [Information of State Leadership and Traditional Sociology], defended in Germany on 27 November 1936 at the School of Philosophy of Leipzig University²¹. On that occasion, Anton Golopenția produced theoretical arguments in support of his belief, previously voiced by Professor Gusti as well, that the ultimate role of the social sciences, which are in a relation of quasi-interdependence with the political leadership of the state, is to strengthen one's own nation²². Also known as *the informational science of political reality*, sociology may decisively help render the governmental and administrative performance of the public institutions more efficient and better performing, by providing professional, reliable and permanent information about the evolution of their nations and that of other peoples to the state leadership, so that the measures the latter would eventually adopt be consonant with the social reality²³. As such, sociology should be prospective in nature and able to produce forecasts²⁴. In order to carry through these duties of providing information to the state, Anton Golopenția believed that the many stand-alone institutions that were operating in isolation, such as technical committees, study teams, statistical offices, research departments or reporting services, required better and more efficient coordination under the umbrella of a single administrative structure²⁵.

Particular attention is paid to the manner in which social science research could help substantiate the foreign policy decisions. In a survey on the *Contribution of Social Sciences to the Conduct of Foreign Policy*, published in the *Sociologie Românească* magazine in May-June 1936, Anton Golopenția took the view that the results of sociological research could complete the information contained in diplomatic reports or press articles on the situation of our fellow nationals living outside the country's borders, as well as the of neighboring countries or the great powers²⁶. This theoretical conception developed by Golopenția about the relationship between social sciences and the domestic or foreign policy is also summarized in an article—“*Reflecțiile și îndoielile*” *cu privire la știința națiunii românești* [“Reflections and Doubts” about the Science of the Romanian Nation]—, published in May-June 1937 in the *Sociologie Românească* magazine, as a reaction to the criticism concerning the Gustian monographic method included in *Însemnări sociologice* [Sociological Notes] (April 1937), under the title “*Știința Națiunii. Reflecții și îndoieli asupra noilor inițiative ale Profesorului D. Gusti* [“The Science of Nation”. Reflections and Doubts about the New Initiatives of Professor D. Gusti] by Dumitru Cristian Amzăr²⁷. In arguing the case of Academician Dimitrie Gusti and in support of his abovementioned theoretical conception, Anton Golopenția points out that

the purpose of social sciences, of the sciences that concern the communities where man lives, is to help the leaders of these communities. Thus, to my mind, the purpose of social sciences is [...], first and foremost, to facilitate the running of one's own state and people through the information provided by specialists to the political leaders. Social sciences perform their function by shedding light, in special researches, on the then current situa-

*tion and on the evolutionary trends of the nation, both at domestic level and in relation with either hostile or friendly nations*²⁸.

For one last time, Anton Golopenția tackled the issue of the relationship between sociology and politics in the work *Îndrumări pentru monografiile sociologice* [Guidelines for Sociological Monographs] published in 1940 by the Office for Sociological Researches within the Romanian Institute of Social Sciences, under the scientific coordination of Professor Gusti and the technical supervision of Traian Herseni²⁹. Golopenția believed that the ultimate aim of monographic research was to document the political decisions that the persons holding leading positions in the state intended to make. As such, efforts should be made to gather information and carry out research on the social reality, from a monographic perspective and in a scientific manner, to the benefit of that state's institutions. Specifically, the sociological monographs that look into the demographic, economic, social, cultural or political and administrative situation of the social units are material contribution of the social science researchers to the political running of their country. Among the work tools that characterize a modern administrative system, Anton Golopenția listed the recourse to social science specialists (to research the then current reality), the drawing up of multiannual plans that would provide a long-term direction for economic development and political actions, and the establishment of study offices, institutes and research committees within or attached to certain public institutions of the state, called upon to provide the technical and scientific support required for governance³⁰. Relying on these tools, towards the end of 1939, in the light of the international developments that seemed to confirm the reorganization trend in society, following the model of the European totalitarian states (Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Soviet Russia), Anton Golopenția devised a *national plan for the organization of Romania*³¹. But the onset of the Second World War put an end to the Gustian initiatives and concerns about the reorganization of Romanian society, intended to make more efficient the functioning of the state. To conclude, the question *Who do we work for?*—which also gives the title of an article published on 25 June 1939 in *Curierul Serviciului Social* [Social Service Courier]—could only be answered by Anton Golopenția as follows:

*we have a state mission, we are trailblazers working with state-of-the-art methods of administrative technique, we work to strengthen the Romanian state*³².

Conclusions

DIMITRIE GUSTI and Anton Golopenția provided theoretical arguments—as seen above—for the interlinkage between sociology and politics. Thus, the political involvement of Gustian monographers was neither random, nor accidental. The political orientation and reorientation of the sociologists within the Bucharest School enjoyed a strong theoretical support and was accepted by the Romanian intellectual elite. The deliberate departure of social scientists from the principle of axiological neutrality³³ cannot and should be treated otherwise than by accepting and comprehending a

European thinking trend that crossed the borders of the Greater Romania, and that qualified as legitimate—or even a debt of honor—the political engagement of the intelligentsia. Like their European peers, the public intellectuals of interwar Romania enthusiastically embraced the political partisanship and enlistment. In the late 1930s, they allowed themselves to get caught in the *web of totalitarian fascination*, and became obedient servants of the power³⁴. Perhaps in some cases, without even being aware of this, the Romanian intellectuals, including the sociologists, fell into a *trap of history*³⁵ or a *political trap*³⁶, and accepted to justify ideological attitudes, political behaviors and governmental decisions that were also authoritarian, dictatorial or totalitarian³⁷. As it follows also from the research conducted by Zoltán Rostás³⁸, Antonio Momoc³⁹, Lucian Boia⁴⁰, and Cristian Vasile⁴¹ on the political and ideological choices of Gustian monographers, the personality profile of the Romanian intellectual is still dominated by an outstanding capacity of political *conversion and reconversion*. The adaptability of the elites to all non-democratic regimes that Romania has experienced, either between or after the wars, was truly remarkable⁴². On top of this *transactional mindset*, as Academician Răzvan Theodorescu calls it, comes also an amazing capacity of the intellectual elites to find justifications (for themselves) for all political orientations and reorientations⁴³.



Notes

1. Ioan Mihăilescu and Zoltán Rostás, *Dialog neterminat*, Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2007, 32.
2. *Ibidem*, 53.
3. For more information, see the book *Sociologia proastei guvernări în România interbelică* (Bogdan Bucur, Bucharest: RAO, 2019).
4. Ioan Mihăilescu and Zoltán Rostás, *Dialog*, 33.
5. Dumitru Sandu, “*Ridicarea satului*” *prin el însuși. Ideologii și practici în interbelicul românesc*. In *Secolul 21*, no. 1-6/2012. This article was consulted on 3 February 2020 by accessing <http://secolul21.ro/bkp/numere/scoala-sociologica-bucuresti/ridicarea-satului/index.htm>.
6. Antonio Momoc, *Capcanele politice ale sociologiei interbelice: școala gustiană între carlism și legionarism*, Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2012, 11.
7. *Ibidem*, 8, 355.
8. Anton Golopenția, *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950)*, vol. I, Bucharest: Albatros, 2004, 186.
9. Antonio Momoc, *Capcanele*, 17.
10. Zoltán Rostás, *Atelierul gustian: o abordare organizațională*, Bucharest: Tritonic, 2005, 57-58.
11. Dumitru Sandu, *Atlasul Social al României: obiective, metode și tipuri de rezultate (I)*. In *Sociologie Românească*, IV(1), 1993, 7. This article was consulted on 3 February 2020 by accessing https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242654648_Atlasul_Social_al_Romaniei_Obiective_metode_si_tipuri_de_rezultate_I.
12. Anton Golopenția, *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950)*, vol. III, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2012, 352.
13. Dumitru Sandu, *Gândirea regională în mișcarea gustiană de ridicare a satului*. In *Revista Transilvania*, no. 11/12, 2012, 11. This article was consulted on 3 February 2020 by access-

- ing https://sas.unibuc.ro/storage/downloads/scoala-sociologica-de-la-bucuresti-cssb-60/Gandirea_regionala_Gusti0001.PDF
14. A detailed analysis of the relationship between state and sociology, in respect of the repeated attempts made to rehabilitate sociology during communist times, was published by Zoltán Rostás under the title *O istorie nefărdată a reabilitării sociologiei românești* (*Revista Transilvania*, no. 11/12, 2012, 88-102). This article was consulted on 3 February 2020 by accessing <https://revistatransilvania.ro/zoltas-rostas-o-istorie-nefardata-a-reabilitarii-sociologiei-romanesti>.
 15. Biblioteca Academiei Române (Library of Romanian Academy), Arhiva Dimitrie Gusti, m. VI, v. 54, f.d. 18-19; Dimitrie Gusti, *Introducere la cursul de istoria filosofiei grecești, etică și sociologie*, Bucharest: Institutul de Arte Grafice “Carol Göbl”, 1910, 16-17; Dimitrie Gusti, *Sociologia militans. Introducere în sociologia politică*, vol. I, Bucharest: Institutul Social Român, 1934, III, VI-VIII, 10-12, 94-95; Dimitrie Gusti, *Un an de activitate la Ministerul Instrucției, Cultelor și Artelor: 1932-1933*, Bucharest: Tipografia “Bucovina”, 1934, 488; Dimitrie Gusti, *Învățăminte și perspective din munca echipelor studențești*. In *Sociologie Românească*, I(2), 1936, 5; Dimitrie Gusti, *Cunoaștere sociologică și acțiune culturală: însemnătatea lor pentru viața națională și de stat*. In *Sociologie Românească*, I(4), 1936, 3-4; Dimitrie Gusti, *Cunoaștere și acțiune în serviciul națiunii*, vol. I, Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală “Principele Carol”, 1939, 131; Dimitrie Gusti, *Cunoaștere și acțiune în serviciul națiunii*, vol. II, Bucharest: Fundația Culturală Regală “Principele Carol”, 1939, 157; Dimitrie Gusti, *Opere*, vol. II, Bucharest: Academia Republicii Socialiste România, 1969, 39; Mircea Vulcănescu, *Dimitrie Gusti, profesorul*. In *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*, XIV, 1936, 1233.
 16. Dimitrie Gusti, *Sociologia militans. Introducere în sociologia politică*, vol. I, Bucharest: Institutulu Social Român, 1934, 85-86.
 17. *Ibidem*, 19.
 18. Dimitrie Gusti, *Plan de acțiune pentru 1938*. In *Sociologie Românească*, III(1-3), 1938, 1.
 19. *Ibidem*.
 20. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, vol. I, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002, LXXIII.
 21. The article *Rostul actual al sociologiei*, published in January 1937 in *Sociologie Românească* magazine (year II, no. 1, 12-19), introduces for the first time, and also further develops for the Romanian audience, the main ideas featured in the PhD thesis of Anton Golopenția.
 22. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, 7,596.
 23. *Ibidem*, 24-25.
 24. Sociology should produce forecasts and foresee the likely developments in population movement (demographics), economic life (economy), social processes (society), and the spiritual state of the population (spirituality). There was a need for sociological research that aimed to highlight the difference between the rural and urban environments, the industrialization and urbanization processes, or the multiple strategies that could be pursued in terms of foreign policy (Anton Golopenția, *Rostul actual al sociologiei*. In *Sociologie Românească*, II(1), 1937, 12-19; Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, 68-76).
 25. Anton Golopenția believed that a large public institution should be established and tasked with the provision of information to the state authorities, after the merger of the Romanian Social Institute with the Central Statistics Institute and the Conjunction Institute. Besides all these, other similar organizations, the purpose of which was to research issues such as population hygiene, agronomy or animal rearing, could be added (Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, 29-30, 77-78).
 26. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Statistică, demografie și geopolitică*, vol. II, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică & Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2002, 527-529.

27. Dumitru Cristian Amzăr, *Studii etno-sociologice*, Cluj-Napoca: Eikon, 2013, 194-208.
28. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, 80.
29. Regarding the political manifestations, Traian Herseni sought the scientific advice of Anton Golopenția in a letter of 25 June 1940 [Anton Golopenția, *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950)*, vol. III, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2012, 517].
30. Anton Golopenția, *Problemele sociologiei politice și administrative: introducere*. In *Îndrumări pentru monografiile sociologice. Redactate sub direcția științifică a d-lui prof. D. Gusti și conducerea tehnică a d-lui Traian Herseni de Biroul Cercetărilor Sociologice din Institutul de Științe Sociale al României*, Bucharest: Marvan, 1940, 365-367.
31. Anton Golopenția, *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950)*, vol. III, Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2012, 447-449.
32. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Sociologie*, 172.
33. As to the methodological recommendations—accepted in scientific research under the name of the principle of axiological neutrality—that sociologists should refrain from a biased engagement in the universe of social knowledge, see the chapter on *Sociologia între neutralitate și emanciparea: două abordări metodologice fundamentale*, by Alfred Bulai (2017, 327-331), in the book *Fundamentele sociale ale cunoașterii* (Bucharest: Trei).
34. Daniel Șandru, *Intelctuali și "capcane politice" în România interbelică*. In *Sociologie Românească*, vol. X, no. 2, 2012, 9, 17.
35. Lucian Boia, *Capcanele istoriei: elita intelectuală românească între 1930 și 1950*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2011.
36. Antonio Momoc, *op. cit.*
37. Daniel Șandru, *op. cit.*, 17.
38. Zoltán Rostás, *Monografia ca utopie: interviuri cu Henri H. Stahl (1985-1987)*, Bucharest: Paideia, 2000; Zoltán Rostás, *Sala luminoasă. Primii monografiști ai Școlii gustiene*, Bucharest: Paideia, 2003.
39. Antonio Momoc, *op. cit.*
40. Lucian Boia, *op. cit.*
41. Cristian Vasile, *"Ne trebuie oameni!": elite intelectuale și transformări istorice în România modernă și contemporană*, Târgoviște: Cetatea de Scaun, 2017.
42. Furthermore, the capacity to adapt and the willingness of all intellectuals to cooperate with virtually all non-democratic regimes and totalitarian foreign powers that had an influence on Romania between 1938 and 1989 (Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia), had to be factored in if one wanted to explain the manner in which the complete control over the entire country could be gained, in such a short period of time, by states and parties with structurally antagonistic ideological orientations (Oliver Jens Schmitt, *România în 100 de ani: bilanțul unui veac de istorie*, Bucharest: Humanitas, 2018, 32). Finding themselves in a similar "no way out" situation, "the Finns, the Baltics and the Poles [...] fiercely fought back," which is something we cannot say about Romanians as well (Oliver Jens Schmitt, *op. cit.*, 32).
43. Răzvan Theodorescu, *Din nou despre mentalitatea tranzacțională a românilor*, s.a. This article was consulted on 3 February 2020 by accessing http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/general/articol/nou-mentalitatea-tranzactionala-romanilor.

Abstract

The Interlinkage between Sociology and Politics in Monographic Research in Interwar Romania

The close relationship that prevailed between the two World Wars between the Romanian intellectuals and the political power, combined with the departure of social scientists from the principle of axiological neutrality, represented, during the reference period, a fact of life at European level and not in the least just accidents for Gustian monographers. During the period under review, the Romanian (and European) intellectuals seemed fascinated with the illusion of power. The political engagement of the Gustian monographers was a widespread phenomenon during the interwar and postwar periods. Being aware of the fact that field sociological research, no matter how scientifically robust, had but a limited spread and an immaterial impact on the population, the Gustian monographers ended up believing that the political activism of university students remained the only solution for the evolution of Romania. In this regard, sociology was perceived and understood as a science of the Romanian nation, and was used for the benefit of the state apparatus.

Keywords

Sociological School of Bucharest, interwar Romania, monographic research, Anton Golopenția, Dimitrie Gusti, King Carol II of Romania