

A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE GUSTI SCHOOL: ABOUT THE EVOLUTION OF PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DIMITRIE GUSTI AND ANTON GOLOPENȚIA

Cosmin Ionuț Patca¹

University of Oradea

Abstract: The reproduction of the image of the Sociological School of Bucharest (Gusti School) should be objective and comprehensive. Hence we must understand that the Sociological School of Bucharest had its moments of crisis, otherwise normal. It meant more than just Dimitrie Gusti and it was not only in Bucharest; there were not only friendship and cooperation relationships. There have also been tense relationships between its members. Such a tense relationship was between professor Dimitrie Gusti and his student, friend and collaborator, Anton Golopenția. Gusti noticed from the beginning the exceptional qualities of his student and put all his trust in him; a paternal-friendly relationship will develop between them. In time, the relationship will degrade both professionally and personally. The evolution of such a relationship between two leading intellectuals of the Romanian interwar period is interesting and dramatic at the same time. Its analysis provides us with valuable information especially about the Sociological School of Bucharest and about the Romanian interwar period in general. It can be a model for the relationships between intellectuals, in any field or time.

Keywords: Gusti School, Golopenția, intellectuals, interwar period, paternal-friendly relationship, gradual degradation.

¹**Author address:** Faculty of History, International Relations, Political Sciences and Communication Sciences, Universității Street, no.1, 410087, Oradea, Romania. **E-mail:** cosminpatca@yahoo.com

Introduction

Much has been written about the Sociological School of Bucharest. As Sanda Golopenția shows, there were four stages of critical assessment of the Sociological School. The first phase took place in 1936, on the celebration of Dimitrie Gusti's activity. The second one originates in the 1940s, when Gusti summarized the sociological work in a number of books and lectures and Golopenția published the major collective works of the School. A third moment of publication of the School's works began in the 1960s and ended in 1989. The Communists initially abolished and prohibited sociology but then it was partially rehabilitated. The year 1989 marks the beginning of the fourth stage. The works of Zoltan Rostas are followed by those published by Sanda Golopenția, Marin Diaconu and Ștefan Costea, as well as by those of young researchers such as Theodora Văcărescu, Antonio Momoc, Florentina Țone, Ionuț Butoi, Raluca Mușat (Juravle, 2012, pp. 142-143).

Professor Dimitrie Gusti started from a seminar of sociology and created a sociological school with an original theory and entered the Romanian culture with the famous monographic teams of young researchers and students. He founded the monographic research method focused on the integrated knowledge of social units, starting from the analysis of small units such as villages and towns, to the largest ones, such as regions, aiming to finally achieve a “science of the whole nation” (priority is given to social units: family, village, town, state, nation). But the research focused mainly on rural monographs, as villages are the most important and most widespread reality of our social life, making a fundamental contribution in the field of Romanian rural sociology.

The method involved a multidisciplinary and comprehensive approach of social units and phenomena, and targeted the frameworks and manifestations of social life and the connections between them. Teams of students and specialists for each framework and manifestation (economists, geographers, doctors, demographers, ethnographers, psychologists, lawyers etc) coordinated by Gusti, conducted monographic field campaigns consisting in both thorough sociological research of rural communities and in social intervention, seeking solutions for the Romanian village development. Community intervention campaigns were focused on four main themes of village life: work culture (economy), mind culture (education), health culture and the culture of the soul (spiritual life). During the activities of Gusti's School, 626 monographs of villages, towns and regions were made, 5.000 cultural houses and over 500 peasant schools were organized (Bădescu, 2009, p. 56). Other notable achievements of the School included the establishment of Village Museum in 1936 and the participation in international exhibitions in Paris (1937) and New-York (1939).

But the Sociological School of Bucharest meant more than just Dimitrie Gusti. It wasn't only in Bucharest. The relationships between monographists were not just cooperation and friendship. In recent years, there is an increasingly spread trend, composed of national and foreign researchers led by Prof. Zoltan Rostas, who proposed to write differently about the Sociological School, avoiding the

Manichean approach (Cernat, 2013; Rostas, 2012, pp. 1-3). We do not try at all to curtail in any way the School's prestige and role of Dimitrie Gusti, but try to be as objective as possible and discover the Sociological School as a whole, with its ups and downs. This is the only way to form a clear and accurate picture on the phenomenon represented by monographists and rediscover the national and international value of the Sociological School of Bucharest.

In this paper, I wanted to follow the evolution of personal and professional relationships between two leading members of the Sociological School of Bucharest: Dimitrie Gusti, School founder and leader and Anton Golopenția, the student, assistant, personal adviser and close friend of Gusti and the main reformer of Gusti's concept. We will see how Anton Golopenția turns from the youngest child of the School, the last in but the favourite of the founding father, into the a schismatic, stepson of the Sociological School of Bucharest. How could such a setback occur in the relationship between the two friends and prominent intellectuals, since each one of them wanted the best for the Romanian sociology? Was Golopenția's style the main and only reason why Professor Gusti had gradually estranged from his former student, in whom he had so much confidence? Was Gusti to blame as well? Were there other people involved?

In this analysis I mostly used primary sources, in order to find out what happened from the protagonists themselves. It is Anton Golopenția's correspondence, primarily the 79 letters to Dimitrie Gusti, and other letters revealing important details, especially the exchange of letters with Ștefania Cristescu, his collaborator and future wife. All this correspondence was published in Anton Golopenția's work, *Epistolary Rhapsody: Letters Sent and Received by Anton Golopenția*, in 4 volumes, published in 2004, 2010, 2012 and 2014. The work was published and edited by Sanda Golopenția, Professor emerita at Brown University (U.S.) and Anton Golopenția's daughter. The book is accompanied by *Introduction and Notes*, helpful in deciphering the letters and also a bibliographical source for this paper (Golopenția, S., 2012). The author chose to publish not only the epistolary exchanges consisting of finished letters sent and received, or just letters consistent in terms of content, but all the epistolary testimonies of the family archives, including simple greetings, official addresses of institutions, short formal or personal requests, postcards, drafts (sometimes incomplete) which at first glance may seem insignificant. In fact, they represent a total social history, achieved through a comprehensive process where each vestige, no matter how insignificant it may seem, is recovered and capitalized, as it has its own meaning, both for reconstituting unknown fragments and for obtaining an overall view of the personal and institutional reports and relationships in which Anton Golopenția was involved (Butoi, 2012).

I chose a different subject because, as the young researcher, Ionuț Butoi said “the evolution of the personal and professional relationships between Anton Golopenția and Dimitrie Gusti has something shocking in it. And also something paradigmatic for their personalities” (Butoi, 2012, p. 124). Before going into details, we should say from the outset that the relationship between the two leaders of the

Sociological School of Bucharest had always been based on a deep mutual respect and friendship, given that, as time went by, the relationship between them degraded both professionally and personally. From the youngest child of monograph, the younger son, the last in, but favourite of Gusti, in 1940 Anton Golopenția considers himself the *Stepson of the Romanian School of Sociology* (Butoi, 2012, pp. 125-126). It is interesting to see how it came to such a degradation of the professor-student relationship between the two partners and friends.

The presentation and analysis of such a relationship is useful because it contributes primarily to a better understanding, from the inside, of the phenomenon represented by the Sociological School of Bucharest in the interwar Romania. Such an article falls into the new wave represented in the last years by a group of national and foreign researchers, aiming to write differently about the Sociological School and interwar Romania, avoiding Manichaean approaches (Cernat, 2013). Secondly, such a theme offers broader information about interwar Romania and about the intellectual relationships in the interwar period, as well as about the interwar society - intelligentsia relationship. Thirdly, such a relationship can be generalized and can be a model for the relationships between intellectuals in general, from all areas or historical periods.

Dimitrie Gusti and Anton Golopenția

For a start, let us see some biographical information about the two intellectuals and how they got to know each other. Dimitrie Gusti (1880-1955) was one of the great figures of Romanian culture in the first half of the 20th century. Sociologist with multiple interests in philosophy, ethics, political science, great teacher, accomplished organizer, he knew how to draw near skilled young people for life, with whom he addressed the major issues of the Romanian society: reorganization of education and modernization of the country; sanitary condition of Romanian villages; seeking solutions for the Romanian village development; later, war and peace issues, etc. Dimitrie Gusti is deemed to be the creator of the Romanian sociology, being the founder and mentor of the action of monographic research of villages in Romania and of the Romanian village development by means of political action. Gusti and his internationally renowned School of Sociology performed their work not only at the University, with students, but also through the multiple institutions created by the professor: the Romanian Social Institute (1921-1948), the Village Museum (1936), the Social Services (1939), the National Research Council (1947-1948), or in the Ministry of Education and Culture and of the Romanian Academy, that he led temporarily. Prestigious journals founded by Gusti, such as *Archive for Science and Social Reform*, or *Romanian Sociology* and beside them, *Romanian Encyclopaedia* (4 vol.) animated and rallied the intellectual forces of the country in major projects (Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 459). Dimitrie Gusti was the charismatic leader of the monographic school that captured the interest of young intellectuals through personality and novelty of the type of research. As a good organizer, he knew how to attract the necessary funds for the research and publishing of papers resulting from these campaigns and to promote the image of his school, at home and abroad. Gusti stands out in the Romanian culture first as a

professor, coordinator and binder for an entire generation of researchers. The school of social monograph that he forms gets to be so comprehensive that it becomes a cultural trend of the interwar period (Voicu, 2013).

Anton Golopenția (1909-1951), sociologist, statistician, a close collaborator of Professor Gusti, as his Chief of Staff while he was a minister, honorary assistant, editor of the journal *Romanian Sociology*, inspector at the Prince Charles Royal Foundation. He was the director of the Office of Education, then managing director at the Central Institute of Statistics. He participated in the monographic research from Runcu and Cornova, he led the sociological survey of the 60 Romanian villages of 1938. In 1942-1943 he led the ethno-sociological survey in the Romanian settlements beyond Bug. He died in Jilava prison.

Anton Golopenția is known for the way he gave a new life to sociology as a science and for having managed to continue Gusti's School project by initiating new research methodologies and techniques. He introduced summary monographs instead of the complete monographs of social units, he carried out comparative studies based on data collection; he promoted regional sociological research, conceived as investigation of issues specific to the administrative and territorial units (Dumitrașcu, 2009, p. 74). For Golopenția, the role of sociology is to contribute to the information and leadership of a state. In his opinion, an independent sociology raised only to the rank of science without actively participating in the country's destiny is useless. Sociology should be oriented toward a social-political function. Golopenția advocated for sociology as a science of the entire social reality, with the purpose of enabling a good state leadership. In order to be fulfilled, these criteria required a methodology that combined qualitative and quantitative methods using appropriate methodological tools (Dumitrașcu, 2009, p. 75).

In the evolution of the relationship between Gusti and Golopenția we can identify several stages. The early period includes their acquaintance, Golopenția's employment as a librarian and the participation in the first monographic campaign. Then follows the crystallisation of their relationship: Golopenția's employment as Chief of Gusti's Staff Minister and study period abroad. In a third step their relationship starts to degrade: Golopenția's return to the country and giving up cooperation with Gusti.

The paternal-friendly relationship: beginning and crystallization

Golopenția meets Professor Gusti in 1927, when he enrolls at the School of Philosophy in Bucharest. In the summer of 1930 he graduated from the Law School, but gave up law and dedicated to the study of philosophy. Since autumn 1930 Golopenția attended the courses and seminars of sociology, ethics and politics of Dimitrie Gusti, Vlădescu-Răcoasa and H.H. Stahl. He became friend with Prof. Gusti since November 1930, when on Stahl's recommendation he was appointed library custodian at the Department of Sociology of the School of Sociology and Letters from Bucharest. Anton Golopenția was the liaison between Professor Gusti and his collaborators and PhD students; he corrected students'

exam papers and dealt with the cafeteria organized in the Student Cooperative by the Dean of the School of Philosophy and Letters, D. Gusti. In 1931, A. Golopenția participated in the monographic campaign from Cornova, which was his first monographic campaign. Shortly after returning from Cornova, he wrote to Prof. Gusti advancing two projects: a model museum at Cornova and a study on the region's religious painting (*Draft Letter No. 7*- Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 340-341). With this letter, Golopenția began to play one of the epistolary roles that he would frequently play for the Professor: that of offering carefully weighed suggestions, ideas and projects.

Golopenția's rise occurred in 1932 when, in addition to the librarian position at the Seminar, he was appointed Gusti's Chief of Staff, who became Minister of Education and Culture. Golopenția confessed that this decision snatched his normal student life, of philosopher familiar with books and libraries, bringing him amidst the political turmoil and foreground of public life. It is the time when the paternal-friendly relationship between the two crystallize (Butoi, 2012, p. 125). It is a paternal relationship because there is a significant age gap between them, i.e. 29 years; Gusti could be Golopenția's father. Then it is a teacher-student relationship based on sincere friendship and deep mutual respect that remains constant over time, regardless of differences of opinion or disagreements.

Golopenția's appointment shows the Professor's confidence. Golopenția is likely to become the youngest child of monographic school, the younger son, the last in, but favorite of the founding parent. The status that Golopenția seems to have in this period, as is clear from his letters, is similar to that of close and personal adviser of the Minister and Professor Gusti (*Letters No. 8-24* - Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 341-357). A number of letters are in line with a privileged dialogue between the young student, eager to be helpful, and his minister, who initially seems to have asked sincere reactions, beyond the limits imposed by hierarchy (Golopenția, S., 2012, p. L). Golopenția wrote to Ștefania Cristescu, his future wife, about this heavenly time of their relationship, when trust was sovereign and allowed deviations from the pre-established roles, about the late strolls with Gusti, the strong coffees drunk at the professor's home, the Moldovan cakes and wine: "I'm starting to write you a few words in the Professor's library. I'm waiting for my typewriter, in order to type a few copies of a statement that a journalist makes up after my notes. / I had coffee just now, a strong one, like all the Professor's coffees. I've had another one for lunch. It's not appropriate to refuse. As I don't even smoke." (03.03.1933, *Letter No. 79* - Golopenția, 2010, p. 123).

The first issues

With the confidence of someone who sees things objectively and can define exactly what to do or say and even how to say, Golopenția advises Gusti in a whole range of issues related to his ministry and public appearances and even to a possible resignation at the appropriate time (*Letter No. 12* - Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 304). Golopenția does not stop at political problems; he tries to intervene in the monographic issues in the same style as personal advisor.

In 1933 monographic school was in crisis, amid degradation of the atmosphere and growing rivalries between the key members of the School. On this background, Golopenția plays the mediator's role, which frankly, should have belonged to Gusti. It is the time of the first misunderstandings between the two. Golopenția is always offering advice, even if Gusti does not ask for it. They come from the paternal-friendly relationship and the special nature of Golopenția who cannot be silent when he thinks he has something substantial to say, at the risk of irritating and becoming disagreeable (Butoi, 2012, p. 125).

Golopenția's status of mediator between Gusti and monographists contributes to their distancing. After more than a year of service as a Chief of Staff, something goes wrong. Golopenția notes that “the small ambitions of independence” increasingly displease the professor and for the first time he asks for dismissal: “Mr. Minister, I feel and I know that you are unhappy with me. More and more each day. I find it natural, because I foresaw it a few months ago, as an inevitable fatality. Fear of it cornered me not long after you've given me this assignment, which I received gladly and I even coveted it. After becoming the Chief of Staff I was happy that I could be near you all day long for a long time and proud to give you months or years of my life, proud to be lucky to know you better. My sadness dowry troubled my youthful dream. From time to time, I understood that my constant being around you will make you tired of me; that this closeness will make me lose the later possibility of staying near you. Your overwhelming praise and recognition, that I did not deserve, have always made me freeze and drew out all these fears. Now Mr. Minister, after almost 330 days of Ministry, you got tired and I am spiritually weary. There were many events ... that dissatisfied you. And I'm getting increasingly insecure, lacking the guide of your confidence, and I'm longing for books more and more ... My dear Minister, please ask your feelings if I'm wrong. Because I'm not, but for the sake of my unwavering devotion, please spare me the humiliation of a slow estrangement. Have someone else in my place right now, until I become totally indifferent to you” (April-May 1933, *Letter No. 18* - Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 348). Unfortunately this is only the beginning.

Degradation relationship

For three years, during 1933-1936, on Gusti's recommendation, Golopenția goes to Germany for study, with Rockefeller (1933-1935) and Humboldt (1935-1936) scholarships. During this period, letters become scarcer and denser. Gusti sends four short letters, three of which (*No. 33-35*, Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 378-382), contain information or claims related to his imminent visit to Germany and one, the letter which instructs him to visit the Deutschland exhibition opened in Berlin during the 1936 Olympics, to get some ideas for the Romanian Pavilion at the Universal Exhibition (Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 396-397). Golopenția writes to the Professor sending useful information, but at the same time, suggestions and proposals on larger projects: The seminar of sociology, extension of monographs to cities, development of both slums and peasantry; educating youth through royal Teams (*Draft No. 36*); introduction of compulsory social service (*Draft No. 42*). They are formulated directly, bluntly, as had recently been the remarks of the

young Chief of Staff: “The Seminar of Sociology languishes and does not look much different from other seminars of the University. Since monographists are no longer students, it became a simple additional procedure for those who want to obtain a degree ... I think a reform of our university life must come soon...” (May-June 1934, *Letter No. 28* - Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 365-369).

Golopenția's long stay in Germany and the decision to complete his doctoral thesis there contribute to the estrangement between them. The estrangement is reflected in the fact that Golopenția's initiatives, otherwise welcome when the professor needed advice about his own academic links with the German academic environment or when he needed expertise on the international exhibition in Paris, were met with disbelief by the professor or even gave rise to irritation (Butoi, 2012, p. 125).

On his return home, Golopenția expected the Professor's decision for the role he was about to take in the School and Foundation. This is clear from the letter written to Ștefania Cristescu on 14 January 1937: “My situation is clarified slowly. The other day I talked an entire evening with Herseni.[...] Herseni offered me half of his seminary students. I would have liked more a political seminar with a few senior students. We'll see how the Professor will decide today” (Golopenția, A., 2010, p. 431).

Returning after three years of absence, Golopenția found the School as a tight structure, with no room for him or his ideas (*Letters No. 46-74*, from 1937-1940 - Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 409-455). O. Neamțu took care of the Royal Teams and their cooperation with the Cultural Centres, H.H. Stahl took care of the Social Services and the monographic research direction was provided by T. Herseni. He was appointed inspector at the Foundation in order to have a salary, but in charge with no problems: “I hate to ask but I know it's not good to leave the complaints gather quietly. Of course, you'll understand what hurts me. I studied intensively abroad, forgetting about everything, to clarify to the last implications the connection between Sociology and Politics ... And no future.” (Golopenția to Gusti, undated draft, *Letter No. 49* - Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 412).

Appointed by the professor as editor of Romanian Sociology, Golopenția faced from the beginning the doubts and suspicions of his colleagues T. Herseni and H.H. Stahl, that came to be shared by the professor. Golopenția's faith in Gusti's system and monographs was unexpectedly questioned, concerns were expressed about his transformation of the journal into an organ of a personal alternative system. Golopenția turned overnight into a heretic and put together with Petre Andrei, a student who broke up with Gusti and was deemed to be his opponent. The letters to Ștefania Cristescu convey this state: “Herseni started the offensive with all his truce offering. At the meeting convened by the Professor to talk about the journal, he asked me to state my position, as it seems I no longer believe in the “system” and I am on Andrei's side. I replied with dignity and sometimes firmly, still dealing gently with him. The professor talked a lot, he got lost in giant plans of 15,000 monographs in four years, without letting me argue and finally saying that I did not convince him. He would read my writing in the journal, so that I don't get

to make it the organ of my system” (20 January 1937 - Golopenția, 2010, pp. 433-434). These fears and suspicions of Gusti, maintained by rivals in the School, sometimes affected by self-interest, about Golopenția's loyalty to his theoretical system, have decisively contributed to the degradation of their relationship. Otherwise, the suspicions seemed to be well-founded (Golopenția, S., 2012, p. LXVIII).

The two interwar intellectuals had different views regarding the development of Romanian sociology. Golopenția saw things in a different manner and his innovation is well-known, that is to channel the monographic research on issues, regions, types of villages, unlike Gusti's exhaustive approach that clung to the utopian research of all 15.000 villages. Golopenția saw sociology as a system available to the state leadership, a system that was intended not only to internal sociological problems, but also to the geopolitical ones, Golopenția being an innovator in this regard. Thus it was an innovative reformist vision of Gusti's system. What Golopenția wanted is practiced in various forms today, when governments, decision makers, political and economic players use analysis and forecasts identifying the risks and opportunities of situations since their earliest stages (Butoi, 2012, p. 125).

As Sanda Golopenția shows, the Gusti-Golopenția report was, obviously, a Professor-student relationship, where the first conceived the collaboration as a polishing of the “system” that he had created and in which he believed passionately and Golopenția, on the contrary, saw in it the chance to amplify Gusti's vision under the pressure of the domestic and international political moment and in dialogue with the other sociologies practiced in Romania. Gusti perceived himself in an hierarchical scientific relationship; for Golopenția the scientific relationship was egalitarian, and useful research had the precedence. While Gusti still insisted on the demarcation of his system, which was important during its growth but no longer required after the generalized recognition it had achieved, Golopenția treated Gusti's sociology as a sociology fixed theoretically to the landscape of Romanian social research, that could evolve only assuming new objectives and functions (city, state administration, state, national and international politics, government information, dialogue with sociologists outside Bucharest etc.), at a magnified scale up to the state level, renewing itself methodologically by symbiosis with statistics and relating to the past and present sociological achievements in Romania (Golopenția, S., 2012, pp. LXXIX-LXXX).

The period 1937-1939 are years of tension for Golopenția in relation to Professor Gusti. It was an inconstant period when Golopenția oscillates between confidence and hope, mistrust and despair. Asked by Gusti to talk about the German sociology in his seminar, Golopenția had to face, at each seminar, a publicly manifested hostility. “It's getting worse with the Professor. He made me talk at his seminar with students who prepare their undergraduate and doctoral thesis, at every meeting, about a new German sociologist. Every time I describe someone he becomes sort of jealous. When I talked about Freyer, he almost quarrelled with me in front of the boys. Now he reproached me that I didn't mention the Social

Institute enough etc. Since Friday I'm thinking to finish No. 1 and then leave the Professor" (Golopenția to Șt. Cristescu, 15 February [1937] - Golopenția, 2010, p. 438). In a letter to Șt. Cristescu of 14 January 1938, Golopenția has better feelings: "A few hours after you left, I went to see the Professor. In his new house. We spent a pleasant hour. I don't take him too seriously anymore: thus, the multitude of his plans no longer disturbs me. He is full of praise for Romanian sociology ..." (Golopenția, 2010, p. 476). The same in the letter of 02 April 1938: "I am in the same good relationships with the Professor. As he is in tense terms with Herseni ... I even became his great hope ... I will help him, eager to get out of this era of stagnation" (Golopenția, 2010, p. 488).

In the good moments, Golopenția argues, advances plans. In the bad moments for the Professor, he recovers his role in the Ministry or in Germany, trying to prevent the bankruptcy of the Social Services. In *Letter No. 61* of 5 February 1939, he becomes again the devoted critic from the Ministry year, trying to share with the Professor "some thoughts on the Gusti team": "The Gusti team doesn't have high morale, which is needed in a fight with clever opponents and difficult circumstances. The slow clerical spirit dominates: but we are a Ministry, we have the State guarantees, the King supports us. The fighting spirit of the Team is missing, that knows it must impose significant innovations, fighting with high resistance" (Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 428). In the bad moments, Golopenția is thinking seriously of leaving both the Foundation and the honorary assistant position. In letters he carries in his pocket for days, or in outlines telling his suffering he tries to make himself heard by the Professor with whom he finds it hard to part and of whose real affection he has no doubts (*Letter No. 55* of 26 November 1938 - Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 422).

The Professor and the student are in an inverse relation. The Professor does not translate professionally the confidence he has in the person Anton Golopenția. In turn, Golopenția does not translate personally the professional disappointments he had from Gusti's behaviour (Golopenția, S., 2012, p. XCIV). Violence alternates with reconciliation. Tension reaches its climax and the three draft letters (*No. 72-74*) of Golopenția to Gusti, of 5 February 1940, describe this state. Golopenția ends up by calling himself stepson: "I know the ultimate cause of these vicissitudes is your distrust in me. You think I'm not faithful to the School where I was trained... I tried to learn how research could become more useful for organization and administration ... However; you always put me on the background and relentlessly humiliated me with your outbursts. You didn't allow me to contribute to the organization of Social Services, or of the Research Institute. The plans were drawn up by my colleagues alone; you asked them what they wanted to do and you just gave me a job. You never yelled at Vulcănescu, Herseni, Stahl, Neamțu as you yelled at me repeatedly. I asked you many times to let me go; things have settled every time, because I found it hard to leave what I held hold dear and you found it hard to let me go. But my situation towards you didn't normalize and it is not normal. Thus, the same pride forced me and compels me not to feel at home in the Romanian School of Sociology. I know I belong to it, but you treat me as a

stepson. This provisional state cut my enthusiasm and reduced my harvesting as a terrible drought” (Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 452-454).

Golopenția resigns from the post of inspector at the Foundation and editor of Romanian Sociology, and this marks the end of the professional collaboration with Professor Gusti inside the School. On the first of April 1940 Golopenția is employed as a General Statistical Inspector at the Central Institute of Statistic after not being supported by Gusti in obtaining a budgetary lectureship at the University. Certainly the friendship and mutual respect continues after 1940 but the dark episode of the years 1937-1939 left traces. In the fragment of *Letter No. 78* (Golopenția, A., 2012, pp. 457-459), of 14 August 1945, to D. Gusti, Golopenția writes: “Don't worry too much of what you believe my heresies. I love you as my father, I know I am your student. But I love Sociology and monographs and I am concerned with them. I would like them to be carried forward and improved. Too tenacious in this love for science, and for the scientific truth and, perhaps unfortunately, completely devoid of social adjustment skills, you think I am less fond...”

The political and historical context of 1948 (establishment of Communism in Romania and banning of sociology) leaves its mark on Golopenția's life as well. On 7 September 1948 he is required to resign from the Central Institute of Statistics. Then follows his unemployment that will last until his arrest in January 1950. We mention here of a single episode about his relationship with D. Gusti. This is *Letter No. 79* (Golopenția, A., 2012, p. 459), sent in this period by D. Gusti to Gromoslav Mladenatz, where he warmly recommended Golopenția for a postgraduate position.

Conclusion

In conclusion, over the years, the evolution of the relationship between Dimitrie Gusti and Anton Golopenția experienced a gradual degradation. From the youngest child of monographic school, the younger son, the last in, but favourite of Gusti, in 1940 Anton Golopenția considers himself the Stepson of the Romanian School of Sociology, abandoning all his positions in the School of Sociology in Bucharest. The causes of this degradation were multiple. First, the two sociologists had different views on the development of Romanian sociology. Gusti expressed since 1910 his conception about sociology, politics, ethics, laying the foundations of the Romanian scientific sociology. He had worked hard in the School project, he had a plan which he ardently pursued and was less willing to adopt new ideas or methods, even if sometimes some of his ideas proved to be utopian (see Sandu, 2012). Instead, Golopenția saw Gusti's system as merely one stage in the development of sociology, advocating for its continued development and modernization. His ideas were modern, innovative, but inverted the foundation of Gusti's concept.

Another cause is the reversal of the professor-student relation. Through his advice and ideas, Golopenția increasingly plays the professor's role in relation to Gusti. Gusti is more and more put in a position of receiving advice and suggestions, while

he had the feeling that Golopenția's ideas contradicted his own conception. It is also Golopenția's style, always offering suggestions even if not required, as he could not be silent when we believed he had something to say. It's Golopenția's inability to convince the professor about his ideas. He cannot raise a matter in a manner and in a tone that is not upsetting. On the other hand, it is also an inability of Gusti, who does not know and cannot settle conflicts and tensions arising within the School. Gusti does not know or cannot keep his student close, motivate him and highlight his qualities. And this is not the first such experience for Gusti. There was an episode somewhat similar between Gusti and his former student and collaborator, Petre Andrei (see Stan, 2012). But we can also find objective causes. The distance occasioned by his scholarship abroad, the very busy schedule and lack of direct communication appear to increase the tension and give rise to less real problems.

The degradation in the relationship between the two intellectuals was also caused by some members of the School (Herseni, Stahl), who deliberately and selfishly created and amplified the tension between them. Finally, we can discuss the extent in which the political involvement contributed to the degradation of relationship (see Momoc, 2012) The close Gusti's collaboration with king Carol II is well-known. Inside the school there were several political groups, but Golopenția was not part of any of them, as he was apolitical. We do not try to give verdicts or say who was more to blame. Instead we attempt to present a better understanding of how the relationships worked between members of the School and even in the Romanian interwar period in general. Such conflicts often arise between intellectuals from different areas and time periods. And it's a pity, because not only those directly involved have to lose by not collaborating, but the entire field of research and even society in general.

But regardless of the tensions and disagreements appeared over the years between the two interwar intellectuals of high moral and professional standing, there had always been a deep mutual respect between them, based on a paternal-friendly relationship.

Epilogue

In the Jilava prison where he was imprisoned by communists, Anton Golopenția wrote in Biographical Data, in 1950, reviewing in his mind the years when the collaboration with Dimitrie Gusti had been so harrowing: "Before leaving to study, I enjoyed the full confidence of Prof. Gusti, the sympathy of his assistants (Vlădescu-Răcoasa, Vulcănescu, Stahl, Herseni and colleagues). As a young boy, eager to learn, I listened to everyone and did not show my own opinions. After returning from school, when I began to despise the truth more than courtesy, I came to be distrusted by the Professor, because some assistants blatantly marked their orthodoxy against his system and provoked me to criticism. I could not find the right tone to make my ideas welcome and I have not been helped. I left myself pushed aside and I started to work alone, without any immediate prospect. I was looking for the road leading beyond the stage reached by Professor Gusti" (Golopenția, 2001, pp. 234-235).

References

- Bădescu, I. (2009). Școala Gusti: universalitatea paradigmei gustiene a sociologiei rurale [Gusti School: Gusti universal paradigm of rural sociology]. In I. Bădescu, O. Cucu-Oancea & G. Șișeștean (Eds.), *Tratat de sociologie rurală [Treaty of Rural Sociology]* (p.55-62). Bucharest: Mica Valahie.
- Butoi, I. (2012). *A. Golopenția, Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950) [A. Golopenția, The epistolary rhapsody. Letters received and sent by Anton Golopenția (1917-1950)]*, vol. III (Radu Crutzescu – Sabin Manuilă). Introduction and notes by Sanda Golopenția. Bucharest: Enciclopedică, 2012. Transilvania, 11-12, pp. 123-128.
- Cernat, P. (2013). Un desant gustian [About Gusti school]. *Observator cultural*, May, 674. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from <http://www.observatorcultural.ro/articol/un-desant-gustian-2/>
- Dumitrașcu, V. (2009). Portrete de sociologi care au continuat proiectul școlii gustiene [Portraits of sociologists who continued the Gusti school project]. In I. Bădescu, O. Cucu-Oancea & G. Șișeștean (Eds.), *Tratat de sociologie rurală [Treaty of Rural Sociology]* (p. 70-76). Bucharest: Mica Valahie.
- Golopenția, A. (2001). *Ultima carte [The last book. Inquest statements of Anton Golopenția, founds in the Securitate Archives. Edited, with an Introduction and Annex by Sanda Golopenția]*. Bucharest: Enciclopedică.
- Golopenția, A. (2010). *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1923-1950) [The epistolary rhapsody. Letters received and sent by Anton Golopenția (1923-1950)]*, vol. II (Ștefania Cristescu-Golopenția), letters exchange: Anton Golopenția and Ștefania Cristescu Golopenția, ed. by Sanda Golopenția and Ruxandra Guțu Pelazza. Bucharest: Enciclopedica.
- Golopenția, A. (2012). *Rapsodia epistolară: scrisori primite și trimise de Anton Golopenția (1917-1950) [The epistolary rhapsody. Letters received and sent by Anton Golopenția (1917-1950)]*, vol. III (Radu Cretzulescu – Sabin Manuilă), ed. by Sanda Golopenția, Ruxandra Guțu Pelazza and Lidia Bradley. Bucharest: Enciclopedică.
- Golopenția, S. (2012). Introducere [Introduction]. In A. Golopenția, *Rapsodia epistolară [The epistolary rhapsody]*, vol. III (p. XXIII-CXLIII). Bucharest: Enciclopedică.
- Juravle, A. (2012). Sanda Golopenția, coord., Școala sociologică de la București, în „Secolul 21” [Sanda Golopenția, coord., The sociological school from Bucharest, in „Secolul 21”], Bucharest, Romanian Writers’ Union and Fundația Culturală Secolul 21, no. 1-6/2012, Princeton University press, Oxford & New Jersey, 2011. *Transilvania*, 11-12, pp. 141-144.
- Momoc, A. (2012). *Capcanele politice ale sociologiei interbelice. Școala gustiană între carlism și regionalism [The political snares of Interwar Sociology: The Gusti school between*

- Carlism and Legionarism*], Preface by Zoltan Rostaş. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing.
- Rostas, Z. (2012). Despre Şcoala gustiană-altfel [A different perspective on the Gusti school]. *Transilvania*, 11-12, pp. 1-5.
- Sandu, D. (2012). Gândirea regională în mişcarea gustiană de ridicare a satului [Regional thinking in the Gustian movement of lifting up villages]. *Transilvania*, 11-12, pp. 6-13.
- Stan, D. (2012). Maestrul şi discipolul. Ipostaze ale relaţiilor dintre doi corifei ai sociologiei româneşti: Dimitrie Gusti şi Petre Andrei [The Master and the Disciple. Hypostases of the relations between two coryphai of Romanian sociology: D. Gusti and P. Andrei]. *Transilvania*, 11-12, pp. 37-46.
- Voicu, C. (2013). Şcoala monografică Dimitrie Gusti şi Drăguşul [Dimitrie Gusti monographic school and Drăguş]. *Ţara Bârsei*, 12, pp. 421-428.