

INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR DOCTOR ILIE BĂDESCU,
DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY,
ROMANIAN ACADEMY

CULTURAL RESISTANCE AND SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES
DURING THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN ROMANIA.
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES FOR A SPIRITUAL SOCIOLOGY,
I. E. THE NOOLOGY

ANGELICA HELENA MARINESCU¹

Question: Professor Ilie Bădescu, thank you for your generosity in granting me this interview, as part of the research I started on culture, art and sociology during the totalitarian regime in Romania. You are born in 1948, and in 1972 you graduated from the Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Sociology. Your life covers this period after the Second World War, that of the totalitarian regime in Romania and the transition to a democratic society after 1989. I am interested in two thematics: the first is the evolution of the discipline of sociology, from what the Sociological School in Bucharest had built, the survival of this discipline during the communist regime and the research perspectives it approaches in the post-communist period; the second is the evolution of the cultural-artistic field in Romania in this historical framework.

*Periodization: from the regime of occupation
to the “dictatorship of development”*

Ilie Bădescu: I would first suggest that we clarify the chronology, that is, the periodization. The end of the Second World War brought an occupation regime based on an ideology and a political system led by the Bolsheviks. This system was, as we well know, a structure of the Bolshevik party in Russia, which was inspired by an ideology, the Leninist one, with an anti-Christian orientation, opposed to the national idea, traditions and, of course, essentially opposed to the

¹ Associated researcher, Institute of Sociology, Romanian Academy, email: angeli.marinescu@gmail.com



Jewish-Christian configuration of the whole of Europe, that is, of the European civilization itself. *Republica Christiana*, which represents the foundation of Europe, is, as you know very well, the “soil” from which the creativity of European civilization is nourished. The regime of occupation, the communism, was established in the East European countries through a process of military, political and ideological occupation. The ideology that initiated this process was, as I stated, and I emphasize this, one with an anti-Christian orientation, in fact contrary to the biblical foundation of European civilization; secondly, it acted against the idea of nation, against the traditional system of life and the European property system as well. The property system that the Bolshevik regime brought was a system based on the process of violent expropriation of small and large property alike. It is not about the *devălmaş* type property, traditional in Vrancea county of Romania, and more generally in the so-called peasant republics. It is simply about a regime of merciless violent dispossession of the peasant household, the destruction of any form of private property and, strangely, even of the livestock of the peasant household. Immediately after the establishment of the occupation regime and the initiation of the communist collectivization program, for example, horses were slaughtered (because all the work of a family and therefore private farm depended on horses, and this form of economic power of the peasant household had to be eliminated according to the Leninist theory that peasants fatally generate capitalism). The Bolshevik regimes promoted an anti-peasant policy, following the experiment in Bolshevized Russia, a politics against the peasant system based on the sovereignty of the peasant household, that is, on the autonomy of peasant holdings in agriculture. The entire agro-system was disrupted, disaggregated.

The Bolshevik regime, a regime of malefic orientation

Through its anti-Christian orientation, the occupation regime had devastating, disastrous effects throughout all the Eastern Europe, including Russia. In Russia, the church – not the faith, but the church, as an ecclesiastical institution – was almost suppressed. Though faith itself became weaker in all Bolshevized countries. However, resistance did not fail to be present. In all of Eastern Europe, a cultural war, an unseen war against the church, has been unleashed. The order to suspend monastic activities hit the church’s strongest layer: the monasteries were emptied of monks and nuns. In Russia, some churches were turned into stables, which confirms once more that Bolshevism did not spring from the souls of the Bolshevized peoples, but had an evil source and was brought to the countries of the East on the wave of anarchy caused by war, despair and collective poverty, by the Luciferian sect of the Bolsheviks and by the cunning work of the European powers. Lenin was financed by Germany to work in Russia in the direction of class anarchism, which he was good at, like all Marxists of a nihilistic orientation.

The war against Romanian culture. The secret funds

In relation to such a twist and frightening reversal, after the installation of the occupation regime, a cultural war began, which the late historian and literary critic Mihai Ungheanu included in what he called “the holocaust of Romanian culture”, a war against Romanian culture. A booklet was published then, in fact a “book of forbidden literature”.

“The seal of the four post-war years, that is, 1944–1948, is the volume PROHIBITED PUBLICATIONS until May 1, 1948, issued by the Ministry of Arts and Information, Bucharest, 1948. None of the books in this volume could circulate without special approval. Those who circulated the prohibited prints were liable to punishment. Many Romanian citizens went to prison for reading or borrowing books listed in the cited index. The work is the result of the Armistice concluded between the USSR and Romania in 1944, where it was stipulated that until August 1, 1945, all fascist, legionary, nazi, hitlerist, anti-soviet publications were to be removed from circulation. A commission formed for this mission received in its ranks people from the S.S.R., M.A.I., the Ministry of Arts, etc. The commission was guided by the former Ministry of Propaganda, now Ministry of Information. The first list of banned publications appeared in the Official Gazette (*Monitorul Oficial*) in March 1945. In July 1946, a 156-page booklet appeared, containing 2,000 banned book titles. Between December 1, 1947 and May 1, 1948, another commission, this time of the Ministry of Arts and Information, the Literature Direction (*Direcția literară*), added another 6,000 titles to the list in the Official Gazette and the 1946 brochure. The PROHIBITED PUBLICATIONS book contains 522 pages, in which the titles are arranged alphabetically by sections, with author, without author, periodicals. It must be added that, in reality, the number of books banned in Romania after the war was higher than that indicated in this volume. The files in the Romanian libraries reveal a greater number of prohibited titles. Here are some names: Hitler, Mussolini, Churchill, Trotzky, Ion Antonescu, Traian Brăileanu, Octavian Goga, Armand Călinescu, Pamfil Șeicaru, Mircea Vulcănescu, Mircea Cancicov, Radu Gyr, Alexandru Marcu, Iuliu Maniu. The simple string of names, however, raises questions. Mircea Cancicov was not a theoretician or writer of the right wing. As neither was Winston Churchill. Iuliu Maniu cannot be assigned to the right. Just as Charles de Gaulle, also on the prohibited list, cannot be included among the nazis. For clarification, it should be added that not only Romanian authors are prohibited, but also foreign ones, either translated or in the original language. The banned books have editions either in Romanian, French, Hungarian or German. Religious themes were also prohibited. Classics, such as Cantemir and Eminescu, will be banned. Lists are amazing by extension. A large area of the culture put to the index. Blaga and

Cotruș and Călinescu and Iorga are also listed. Everything that was autonomous Romanian thought was banned”² (Bădescu and Ungheanu 1997).

So-called secret funds of the libraries were set up, i.e. funds with prohibited access, accessible only with special approvals and only to special persons, who carried out documentation based on some directives or thematic guidelines intended to prove the reactionary, “anti-humanist” character of some works, writers, currents. Only the ideologically verified persons and selected to prove the reactionary nature of these works, writers, cultural currents received approvals. The list of incriminating labels was then elaborated: orthodox, nationalist, reactionary, *sămănătorist*, legionnaire, mystic, paseist, anti-progressist, not or anti-marxist, anti-soviet, etc. Later the system somewhat relaxed, and in this way, although the secret fund at the libraries was maintained, still accessing the secret funds became somewhat more flexible.

Romania before and after 1989: neocominternism

Unfortunately, the war against Romanian culture did not end in 1989. Rather, it only partially changed its clothes. The labels remained. On a larger scale, I would say planetary, this war against classical culture, religiosity and even the human being, was placed under the sly semasiology of a neocominternism. The innovative terms used in the new form of war against against culture and spirituality with Judeo-Christian foundations are “cancel culture”, “woke”, “political correctness”, “reset”, “transhumanism”, etc. Returning to the period of our discussion, I will resume one more page from the work already cited (which, obviously, the Tismăneanu Report bypasses), edited in 1997 in 2 volumes of 500 pages each, in order to outline the profile of the era more clearly:

“The more than 8,000 titles that, immediately after the Second World War, the list of Prohibited Publications intended to remove from circulation, were indexed for an absolutely bizarre form of “incarceration” in the strange “prisons” of the “funds forbidden”, “imprisonment of ideas”, of works, not only of authors. This system is no longer widely known in the West and this very truth, i.e., its hidden signification, is eschewed, eluded by the Tismăneanu Report on Communism. The communist system established in Romania after the war was a system of occupation. The report circumvents the essential fact that the communist regime imposed in Romania through military and political-ideological occupation was an anti-Romanian and anti-Christian regime. Having these features, such a regime could only be maintained through a long-term culture war, and this explains

² From the *Encyclopedia of Repressed Values*, 1997, coordinator Ilie Bădescu and Mihai Ungheanu, Pro Humanitate The Publishing House.

why it resorted to the technique of the camp and the prison system into which all the great interwar intellectuals and all the virtual opponents were thrown. Instead, the report suggests that collaborationist intellectuals of the postwar generation were to blame for communism, so the phenomenon of culture warfare and resistance to communism through culture is completely circumvented. By such subtlety, the report induces the impression that it was also used to open another stage of the cultural war, which I would call “the second Bolshevization” of discourse on communism and not only. The labels of “orthodoxist”, “nationalist”, “reactionary”, “obscurantist”, “dughinist”, „ceaușist”, “putinist” are used in the media to label authors and works from before 1989 and beyond and the stake is, as I’ve just mentioned, the second bolshevization of the public discourse and therefore of the consciousness of the new generations. Another method used in the process of soul falsification applied to the Romanian people yesterday and, in part, today was and is the censorship and the falsification of mental maps. The censorship of maps began at the time of the instauration of the occupation regime through the establishment of a “falsifying interpretative formula”, intended to change, by overturning, the meaning of the political, ideological and military occupation regime. The occupying army was put under the perverse label of “liberating army” through the widely disseminated theme of “liberation by the glorious Red Army” (“idolatry of a foreign army” and occupiers). In reality, following this “liberation”, Romania lost the ancient territories of Basarabia and Bucovina and this reality was to be *hidden*. “The country being enslaved and militarily occupied, assaulted and ruled by an elite of Muscovite puppets, the geographical realities could also be subject to the “defascist” retort” (C. Pantelimon, “Prohibited Publications”, in mss, page 3). The same procedure is used in the case of the falsification of the ethnopolitical map: to present black as white and white as black, i.e. to present the occupation as liberation and the territorial abduction as a return to “natural” borders, a restorative act (restitution): “Any maps that include between the borders of the Republic Popular Romanian territories that do not belong to it are prohibited” (cf. “Prohibited publications”, apud. C. Pantelimon, “Bibliographic files on repressed values”, mss, p. 3, databases of the same institute, Buc. 1997). “An entire people had to be lied to about the boundaries of its own being, and entire generations of young Romanians grew up with the mental image of a Romania, without knowing that parts of it were abducted and without ever suspecting that, on the map, the big letters “USSR”, hide, in fact, also millions of Romanians living within the soviet empire.” (Archives, C. Pantelimon, 1987, File “mental maps”). The anti-Romanian post-war “elite” “buried under the hatches” territories that had always been Romanian: “The maps contained in the various scientific works will be brought into line with the new borders of the country, through various procedures (hatching, clipping, etc.), but only when they cannot be *totally eliminated*” (apud., *ibidem*). It was the beginning of *the falsification of the*

Romanian space and the Romanian collective memory, i.e. the Romanian *time*, because the occupier also demanded the *falsification* of cartographic documents, manuals and old books, respectively those that would make *references to previous epochs*. These *references* did not have the freedom to reflect the maps of the epoch according to the *past reality*, but either to cross out, or to cut out, or to bypass (“eliminate altogether”) the topic, which many historians have done. By the way, the last one who refused this *mystification* of the mental map and therefore the disfigurement of the memory paid with his life in the Sighetul Marmăției prison: Gh. Brătianu. He was offered release from prison if he agrees to admit the lie that Basarabia is not Romanian land, but territory of the USSR. The vile historical lie was offered to him in exchange for his freedom, which was also the price of his life, because at that time Brătianu was very ill and the cell regime subjected him to a sure and quick extermination. Although exhausted by the detention regime, by the moral humiliation and by an illness that would have claimed an urgent hospitalization, Gh. Brătianu refuses the vile lie at the cost of his life and, a few days later, he is found dead in his cell. The long extermination of the Romanian intelligentsia and the falsification of the collective memory at the cost of life was beginning. All this is part of a strategy of cultural ethnocide against the Romanian people, because all Romanian intellectuals, without exception, from the country teacher to the university historian, were either annihilated, silenced or even forced to falsify their memory. The teachers of geography, history, literature, philosophy, all were summoned to lie at the cost of their lives. When the occupier uses the immediate physical liquidation or annihilation, in a carceral (concentration) regime, of all cultural segments through which *the truths of being and historical existence* of a people could be expressed, we say that we are dealing with *acts of genocide*, which the tragic sociology of communized nations names with the established term: *cultural and political ethnocide*. These are actions to annihilate the *soul and mind* of a people”³.

The war of the “mountain people”. The armed resistance

In relation to this regime, which was anti-Christian, anti-Romanian and anti-peasant at the same time, a movement was triggered in the Romanian space that I classify in what I would call resistance to the communist system and regime. It also took on a military form through the resistance in the mountains, as was the case of the partisans in the Făgăraș Mountains, in the Banat Mountains, in the Semenic area, in general all the Carpathians became a kind of war citadel, a real citadel of military resistance against the regime, resistance

³ *Ibidem*.

that was betrayed by some kind of arrangements between the secret services and the regimes in Washington, Moscow, London, etc., and in this way the so-called “hope of the coming of the Americans” was shattered. And this resistance in the mountains practically remained a resistance without a back, without logistical support, because the idea, the thought that the Americans might come and that these countries might be taken out from under the occupation and from the anti-human Bolshevik regime, this hope shattered. In parallel with this organic resistance movement, within the political grouping with a Romanian orientation at the top of the state, an initiative aimed at a de-satellization from Moscow, i.e. to get out of the total control of the Bolsheviks in Moscow, took root, because, at its core, Moscow’s control was totalitarian.

Question: Since 1958? Or earlier?

Ilie Bădescu: Around 1958. In 1956, as you know, there was the movement in Hungary. After the movement in Hungary, there was a repressive reaction, the regime of repression worsened in all satellite-type countries, that is, under totalitarian Soviet control, in the entire communist camp. In relation to this situation, a second wave of arrests followed.

*The beginning of de-satellization.
The Valev Plan and the 1964 Declaration*

In relation to this turn, a kind of initiative was born, including in certain segments of the political class from Bucharest, to search for ways out of Moscow’s absolute control. It is about Romania’s subtle de-satellisation politics. In the analyses made by the American historian Larry Watts, this movement of de-satellisation, of getting out of the control of the Soviet advisers and of removing the Soviet troops from the Romanian territory is very deeply and complexly analyzed. This process started as early as the Gheorghiu-Dej period, and this reaction intensified, became explicit and gained an ideological platform in 1964, through the famous Declaration of April 1964, in which the clear principles of independence, or the relative independence of Bucharest, and therefore of Romania, were formulated in relation to the Valev Plan. The Valev Plan was a plan adopted by the Soviets, for the reorganization of the entire socialist space, of the socialist countries, in a system of international socialist division of the communist gulag economies, in such a way that, for example, the Romanian economy was supposed to become fully agrarian. It was directed towards a calming of the industrialization process and eventually towards the elimination of industrialism, following that the Romanian space will be primarily a space specialized on agriculture and therefore on the development of the integrated agrosystem of the

entire gulag. Consequently, the industrial areas will be placed in other areas of the system as by the Valev Plan to fortify the skeleton of a unified space⁴. He obviously relied on the C.A.E.R. system, on the Warsaw Treaty. So the system was very well codified and obviously it was very difficult to get out of Moscow's control. And yet, in 1964, the Bucharest Declaration was adopted, through which the principles of Bucharest's new politics of de-satelliteization and exit from Soviet control, from Soviet totalitarian obedience, were clearly stated.

As you see, I say "Soviet", not Russian, because we are talking about an occupation regime, a regime with a pronounced ideological character, which was also against Russian Christian traditions and spirituality, and, of course, against the peasant world in Russia, which was also exposed to a real exterminating movement, so that, from this point of view, we can say that the Bolshevik-Soviet regime was a repressive regime in the entire area in which it operated. So it should not be strictly related to the ethnic element, Russian or non-Russian, because everywhere it has the profile of an occupation regime. It is true, the system used the Russian army, which became an occupying army, that is, it ensured the imposition of the occupation system and guaranteed the emergence of this dependence and this totalitarian control of Moscow.

***From the de-satellization plan to the "development dictatorship"
and back to the "liquidation" of Romanian industry***

In relation to this movement from April 1964, a new period was established and appeared in Romania, both politically and especially culturally, namely the period that a Romanian specialist from Bremen, Germany, Viorel Roman, named the "developmental dictatorship" period. That is, a policy based on massive loans. The International Monetary Fund supported the new policy of Ceaușescu, which was a de-satellisation from Moscow policy. In this way, Bucharest played an important role, regionally and internationally, in relation to the reaction against the system of domination, contributing enormously to the shaking of the totalitarian control system of Moscow, which was perceived positively by the Western powers, and in this way it created a very strong openness, an availability of the Western states, of the Western system, towards Romania. Thus, the foundation for access to loans was established and therefore a formidable opportunity for Romania appeared. In my opinion, the loans were used intelligently, i.e. for the construction of a very strong industrial system, even if

⁴ See E. B. Valev, "Problems of economic development of the Danube districts in Romania, Bulgaria and U.R.S.S.", Bucharest, 1964, and the "Declaration regarding the position of the Romanian Labor Party (Partidul Muncitoresc Român) regarding the problems of the international communist movement", Plenary of the C.C of P.M.R. from 15–22 April 1964.

this industrial system had in some places an irrational character, in the sense that its proportioning with the real power of the Romanian society was indeed a critical problem; but beyond that, a very strong industrial system was built, which is attested by the approximately one thousand five hundred enterprises with significant power in the world trade system. Romanian navalism had the fifth position in the international naval system; after 1990 it was liquidated. The special steel company from Târgoviște was also liquidated after 1990. The energy system, mining, extractive industries in general were at least damaged. The conclusion is clear: the Romanian industrial system was liquidated even though it was a competitive system on regional markets and with some companies even on the world market. The IMGB, for example, was producing on a world competitive scale.

***Restitutions policy. The thaw. The spring of culture.
“The Labiș generation”***

Finally, let's return to the question of culture. In the context of the same de-satellisation movement towards Moscow, a new orientation and a new cultural direction appeared, the so-called “restitution policy”, oriented towards the recovery, towards the restitution of Romanian values. The approach at the time was limited, in the sense that it did not include the recovery of right-wing writers or philosophical writings of a spiritualist orientation. For example, *trăirism* was not accepted, Nichifor Crainic was accepted with poetry, with literature, but not with his philosophical writings. The same with regard to Nae Ionescu, who was not accepted on the restitution lists⁵. Instead, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, Lucian Blaga, D. D. Roșca, Camil Petrescu and other authors with monumental works were recovered.

Constantin Noica edited his system of philosophy at this very moment, etc. This movement of restitution was one of the very powerful movements in culture, and it is due to the energeticism of one of the miraculous, extraordinary generations, the so-called “Labiș generation”. It was named so by the late scholar

⁵ ‘The Volume *Prohibited Publications* (1948) was the police cordon of protection of the ideological commissars of communism. Many of the arguments that could bring them down were locked in the forbidden volumes. The title pages of the Index functioned like a Chinese wall. The sky of Romanian culture was blocked by these lists and is often still so after 1989. The cultural war had to start with them. And the partial and truncated reissues so far must be revised. Especially the cultural monopoly law, which actually worked until 1989, gave only politically “advised” writers the gradual restoration of values. No author has been fully returned. Not even Gherea. Nothing was to be taken in “block”. And the restitutions, revalorizations, reconsiderations, reissues were done stingily, on the spur of the moment, according to political calculations of strategy or conjuncture. Generally, those who had publicly condemned a writer were called to “reconsider” him, *ibidem*, p 103.

Edgar Papu, the great comparatist, historian of civilizations and art, and philosopher of culture who gave the Labiș generation this name after the name of the extraordinary poet, that is, Nicolae Labiș. Which is still unappreciated, unresearched, unrecepted, a brilliant poet, with lyrical work of great value. The entire Labiș generation is a generation of high creativity. The prose is comparable to that of the Russian “Siberians”, i.e. a prose of extraordinary expressive power. The novels of Lăncrănjan appeared, which *depict the apocalypse of the peasant world*, as expressed by another great writer of genius, Paul Anghel, the literature of Marin Preda, of Dinu Săraru with the trilogy *Some Peasants*. At the same time, a movement appeared in the lyrical area, in the visual arts. In poetry, the poet Ioan Alexandru created a brilliant work, his poetry is part of the great restorative spiritual current that has its roots in the Old and New Testaments and in the three functions that accompanied the song in all the major eras of human history: the *augural*, the *oracular* and the *exorcist*. The genres born in the environment of testamentary sensibility, from the Jewish *midrash* and “*targum*”, to the *psaltic poem*, to the *homilies* and, further to the *akathist* genre, or to the type of prayer book, to the *apophthegm* or to the type of *hagiographic story* and to the *hymns* that underline one of the axes of the Christian literary-religious creation⁶, from the hymns of the liturgical environment to the “Hymns of Heaven” of Saint Ephrem the Syrian and, closer to us, to the *Hymns* of our great contemporary Christian poet, Ioan Alexandru, attest to a *stylistic horizon* of an extraordinary richness. Ioan Alexandru recovered and relaunched the hymn poetry in the Romanian literary space. A Christian poet of universal value, had appeared in the midst of the communist era! Even only at this threshold of the discussion, we can realize that the creative act attested by Ioan Alexandru’s lyrics supports and becomes somewhat intelligible through its three functions, to which I have already referred: the *augural*, the *oracular* and the *exorcist*. *The hymn was born from the first function, the prophetic poem from the second, the psaltic poem, from the third, the chants of St. Basil the Great, recited in the cathedral every day of the Christian New Year* (which shows an original type of incantatory collective reading) and satirical poetry, however paradoxical it may seem⁷. A poet like Tudor Arghezi mainly developed the three genres, the psaltic genre, the prophetic and the satirical poetry, although the hymn genre is not missing either, as in the lyrical series of “praises”. Ioan Alexandru promoted and developed (innovated, we could say) the first two genres, related to augural and oracular, i.e. *hymn* and *prophetic poetry*, in a different way than Arghezi in psalms or in “praises”, but not unrelated with Arghezi’s daring innovations in relation to the

⁶ According to Pr Ioan Ică jr., *Introductory Study to Saint Ephrem the Syrian, the Hymns of Heaven*, Deisis Publishing House, p. 8.

⁷ Paul Anghel, *A Possible History of Romanian Literature. The Magic Model*, Augusta Publishing House, Timișoara, 2001.

artistic genres related to the liturgical space. Ioan Alexandru combines “praises” with the testamentary species of “weepings” and “curses” as in “Transylvania” (“Transylvania mute bell/ Your tongue has been torn from its roots/ While your speech was babbling/ At the crossroads pray on the hill// All that you said, your few words/ It’s a scream of confession/ You had not yet seen on earth/ But tears and cemeteries//”).

The works we are commenting upon, this extraordinary creative emulation, attest to a spiritual insurrection of great power in the Romanian space even under the occupation regime. Labiş was only the tip of the spear. The entire generation was brilliant, with a formidable creative power. Their literature is not yet fully accepted at the moment, there have appeared even those who deny the creative power of the Romanian culture, promoting the thesis of the cultural and spiritual desert in Romanian culture after the war. In reality, the literature of the period is a literature of high value, it is not about a provincial literature, it is a literature of universal height.

In all directions, in all domains, the space of Romanian culture is intelligible through a kind of cartography of miraculous creation. The manifestation of Romanian creativity covered absolutely all fields of culture. The medical school, the mathematical school, the literary movement, the novel of the obsessive decade, the mystical literature, the literature of Cezar Ivănescu, hermeticism in the Verlainian direction. Not to mention that this movement of restitution appeared, through which there were recovered, for example, including the poetic work of Octavian Goga, Aron Cotruş, Lucian Blaga, the Arghezian psalms that were not accepted in the first part of the communist regime.

The restoration of sociology

Question: What happened to the Sociological School from Bucharest, in this historical context? Sociology was banned in 1948, with the education reform, when was it restored?

Ilie Bădescu: In sociology, starting from 1966, the Romanian sociological education was restored, thanks to one of the people of the regime, Miron Constantinescu, who brought personalities from the old Gusti School into the system, in education, such as Professor Henri H. Stahl. This great sociologist taught at the time; I myself had him as Professor, I attended his seminars. At that moment, sociological education was restored and so sociology was relaunched as a field of study.

***A Romanian scientist under investigative surveillance:
the case of D. Gusti***

Question: What happened to Dimitrie Gusti, who was the President of the Romanian Academy in 1946?

Ilie Bădescu: Gusti was banned and annihilated. We published a book dedicated to this case of the operative investigation of Dimitrie Gusti. His house was confiscated, his library was confiscated, so basically he was annihilated by being sentenced to a kind of civil death. He rented another modest house, asked for his personal books, but he was not allowed to get them back. He was met with hostility by the new rulers. I suggest that we read together a brief presentation of the sociologist I.C. Popa from volume II of the *Encyclopaedia of the Sociological School of Bucharest*, a volume that bears the title “A Romanian scholar under informative surveillance”: “In his last work, “The Autosociology of a Life”, D. Gusti mentioned: “*He who does not tell the Truth, when he knows the Truth, becomes an accomplice of liars and forgers*”. “Completely isolated, sick and poor, banished from his own home, far from his library and books, Dimitrie Gusti nevertheless has the strength to write, in the last two years of his life, a voluminous autobiography (titled *Autosociologia une vieți 1880-1955*) which he leaves it in the manuscript. First published in 1971 with some censorship intrusions. His file as a person (not of the work as well) was classified only 6 years after his death. Gusti, therefore, remained under surveillance for six years after his death” (cf. Ion C. Popa, *A Romanian scholar under informative surveillance. The case of the sociologist Dimitrie Gusti*). As reasons for classifying the file, comprising 92 files, it is mentioned: “overage, deceased”. But the insurgent profile of his work is attested by a special column of the informational surveillance file. The file has a heading requiring either “maintenance of the individual on the record or removing him from the record of hostile elements”. Under this heading, the operative fills in as follows: “with maintenance under evidence”. Today, 72 years after his departure for the abodes of saints, D. Gusti is still kept on the alert of “hostile elements”. A more striking proof of the meeting of the criteria justifying the classification of his work in the category of „confessing science” (that confesses truth at the cost of life) cannot be found. Gusti is included, by the dark forces, into the class of true confessors, whom those nocturnal forces know as the enemy. This is the background on which Gusti wrote the *Autosociology*, a monumental, extraordinary work; however, as I stated, the work was published only in 1971, within the framework of that restitutive movement that I mentioned. At that time appeared the series of Gusti’s *Selected Works*, in six volumes, published by Ovidiu Bădina, one of the new sociologists of the time, in collaboration with Octavian Neamțu, from the old Sociological School in Bucharest, who used to work together with Henri Stahl and with Golopenția. Octavian Neamțu is the one who made the critical apparatus for this series of works by Gusti. The critical apparatus is absolutely

fabulous, it's excellent, it's really made according to the Western model. Let's consider Pascal's *Opera omnia* as an example of comparison, I had all the volumes in my hands, I kept them with me for a year, the critical apparatus is amazing. Unfortunately, in restitutions such as that of D. Gusti's works, the system of removing from the text the parts not in line with the ideology was then used, i.e. the passages that the censorship, still active, considered not in line with the ideological direction, were removed from the page, and in this way all the theoretical, ideational construction was "wounded", to say so. After 1990, I edited a work by Gusti, dedicated to *The Sociology of the Nation and War*, and recovered the censored information. I also wrote a preface, in which I commented on the typology of texts removed by the censorship. It was a very strict censorship, which was still maintained until late, including after 1966. However, in 1966 this action of editorial restitution also begins, that is, monumental editions are made; in the field of fiction, of novels written in the interwar period, for example, the Rebreanu, Sadoveanu, etc. editions were published, the works of the great creators were returned, brought back to the literary circuit in very large editions, in the form of complete works. So, this restitution movement was a very strong movement, a true cultural restoration, a cultural reconquest of the spiritual territory usurped by the anti-Romanian and anti-Christian political-ideological power. All these, including the restitution policy, are such undoubted arguments that attest to the victory of culture against the political and ideological occupation regime. We can say that in the second phase of the communist era a real cultural Reconquista took place. The de-satellization in relation to Moscow, the shift of emphasis from repressive dictatorship to development dictatorship, the restitution policy, the vigorous rise of the "Labis generation" are proofs of this national Reconquista.

The three national centers of sociology

During the same period, the sociological research was reinstated. Along with the restart, relaunch of sociological education, through the establishment of a section within the Faculty of Philosophy – the Department of Sociology, with an independent chair – the field research campaigns dedicated to urbanization were also relaunched. The concept was that we should no longer study villages, as was done in the Gusti School, but instead study the process that encompasses both the city and the village, namely urbanization. Research was then organized in three areas: the Slatina/Olt area, the Braşov area and the Iaşi area. The Sociology Laboratory was set up, which included researchers such as Mihai Cernea (who later went to the World Bank) and he dealt with rural sociology, agrarian sociology, studying, for example, the cooperativisation process, etc. At the same time, the university and academic centers became autonomous in the three big centers, namely Bucharest, Cluj, Iaşi. In Cluj, within University and the Cluj research

system, Professor Achim Mișu distinguished himself, who, after a scholarship in the United States, launched his own kind of academic program of broad assimilation of American sociological ideas in the bibliography from the Romanian sociological space, editing a monograph dedicated to sociometry and his famous work, the *ABC of Sociology*, illustrative of that process of transculturation. At the same time, Henri H. Stahl resumed his activity in Bucharest. Within the Department of Sociology, several research teams have been established. Having Traian Herseni at its center, there was established an industrial psychosociology laboratory, where Academician Cătălin Zamfir and Professor Septimiu Chelcea carried out their research for a while. Academician Cătălin Zamfir relaunched, together with Elena Zamfir, his wife, the direction of psycho-sociological research of organizations, and after 1990, the new research paradigm of the quality of life, which is entirely due to them. At that moment, a new direction of research was established in Iași, mainly focused on the problems of regional and agrarian sociology, related to the work of Professor Vasile Miftode. Started as early as 1966, in 1968, sociological tuition was already strong, it had reached the second promotion, so sociology had gained momentum at that time.

The second stage of the “developmental dictatorship”.
Paying off the loan and the austerity regime

Following Ceaușescu’s visit to China, after the moment when he returned, adopting the system specific to the second stage of the “development dictatorship”, somehow imposed by Western pressure, because the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank began to exert pressure for the restitution of loans, against the background of the oil crises in the 1970s, of the suspension (in 1970) of the Bretton Woods system (Nixon proceeded then, against the background of the petrodollar crisis, to suspend the convertibility of the dollar). Against this background, a serious crisis appeared which precipitated the pressure on Romania for the restitution of the loans. Until then, Romania had enjoyed a preferential regime, but the country started to lose it about that time and, based on this, Ceaușescu decided to return the loans, cover the debt. Thus, a situation of strong austerity appeared throughout that interval of time. In the same setting, a kind of new regime of ideological control over education and research was introduced. Sociology was suspended as a system of training and fundamental research around 1975. All regimes founded on ideological control (be it communist, red-colored, or “libertarian”, as Mihail Manoilescu qualifies it, blue-colored, like the one induced after the integration of the East into the current neo-corporatist system) bring about the suspension of fundamental research. The signs of such a regime reappear in the East with the introduction of the Bologna system and seem to worsen so that the current attempts to reorganize research, if they will be applied in the terms

announced by the recent Ordinance, will induce an implosion in the system. Going back to the moment we discussed, that is, 1975, we will remember that the Sociology Laboratory was maintained, the Department of Sociology survived being integrated with that of economics, thus becoming the Department of Economics and Sociology, with sociological teaching disciplines on the profiles of university institutions. Industrial sociology was taught at the Polytechnics, in the area of artistic education – sociology of culture and art – I myself taught industrial sociology, sociology of art, and sociology of music at faculties with this profile. So, sociological education was institutionally suspended, but applied teaching, by disciplines as such, was maintained. I, for example, was doing a seminar on *Methods and techniques of sociological research* – although I had a special regime because of the political file. My father and brother were politically detained, I was in danger of being eliminated, removed from the University, but I was saved by a circumstance. Professor Aurelian Bondrea, who was also the Director of Personnel for all the Romanian education, needed a collaborator for his courses on the sociology of culture and art – he was a professor of the sociology of art and culture – and, through that circumstance I was saved, one might say. My Ph.D. application has been accepted. Up to that point, despite my attempts, the political case was stronger and I was always rejected. Professor Bondrea accepted me for the doctorate, at that time, and obviously for that I owe him gratitude, because that saved me from being expelled from the university.

From the “European Synchronism” to the “Noology System”.
Immanuel Wallerstein in Romania

But, coming back, it can be said that that period was no longer under the sign of a suppression of sociology. Sociology had a certain continuity, prestigious professors, of outstanding and indisputable value, continued their activity. I no longer say that the system of American scholarships worked, from which many people benefited, I myself benefited from the IREX scholarship in the United States in 1983. In 1984, I edited *European Synchronism and Romanian Critical Culture*, which became a polemic book. I argued then to reject the incorrect allegations aimed at minimizing, even falsifying the analysis by which I brought to the actuality Eminescu’s political writings, through the theoretical ideas of the brilliant Romanian poet and thinker, not those with an ethno-political nuance, although these are interesting as well. And then, amidst the discussions related to the process of restitution of the entire work (*Opera Omnia*) of Eminescu, which aroused oppositions related to the restitution of his publicistic work, I myself sparked a real *teutonic furor*, triggered without me realizing it, as I found out afterwards, so I found myself in between the fires, I was on the front line without wanting it – but there I was, and there I stayed.

After 1990, sociological education was refounded, in which the late Professor Ion Ungureanu, Professor Ion Mihăilescu, Academician Cătălin Zamfir made outstanding contributions, I myself was involved after I returned for the second time from the United States (as part of a Fulbright scholarship). After I had translated Wallerstein's book, *The Modern World System*, along with Dorel Abraham and Marcel Ghibernea, it was published in four volumes at the Meridiane Publishing House, the Art and Civilization Collection (it is a wonderful collection, and the edition we published is remarkable). Afterwards, I took the initiative of inviting Immanuel Wallerstein to Bucharest to be awarded the title of Doctor Honoris Causa of the University of Bucharest, taking into account the fact that in his volumes dedicated to the genesis of the modern world system, he quotes Romanian scholars: he quotes Henri H. Stahl, he quotes the historian Daicoviciu, quotes Gherea. Immanuel Wallerstein is an absolutely outstanding scholar, I have used, including in *European Synchronism and Romanian Critical Culture*, the Wallerstein's bibliography and of the group from CEPAL, the European Commission for Latin America, led by Paul Prebisch, with the new orientations dedicated to the study of peripheralization. I presented all these orientations, schools, paradigms, etc., in my volumes on the history of classical and modern sociology, and in the two volumes of the encyclopedia of universal sociology that I published later.

After 1990, sociology returned in a new form and, in my opinion, valuable sociologists appeared. This matter must be researched independently, because this period is not known either. Works related to the three centers appeared, but in the meantime sociological education diversified, centers appeared in Timișoara, Oradea, Sibiu, Brașov; the academic network of sociological education has diversified with quite interesting researches, with interesting research directions, and with theoretical directions.

The system of noological sociology, which I launched – and which is framed in an Eastern line of thought, the one that descends deep into the Hesychast tradition and the movement of Palamite thought (of Saint Gregory Palamas), articulated in the fertile polemic with Varlaam, and so with the western paradigm – illustrates a new direction, a whole problematic that us, as Easterners, can assume. That way we could benefit from our advantage, that of the position we are holding, in the Eastern context; such a position is not a fall, it is not a minus, it is a plus, it belongs to a specific difference; the areas are not confused, the differences are important, they are differences within the unit, but they are still diversities. Through such a direction, this whole problematic was reassumed, which concerns the Eastern specifics, after all, to the tradition and roots of the spiritual Byzantium, strong in the Eastern area, and which really makes the Romanian space a bridging space between the East and the West, if we were to refer even only to the work of Mircea Eliade. The great historian and hermeneutic of religions has grasped within his thought the whole of India, but not only; Mircea Eliade is only one of those

who illustrate the series of “Orientals” in Romanian culture; in the poetry of Ion Barbu, for example, there is at the same time all the East without missing the West. I want to say that, here, Romanian culture is not a parochial culture, it is not a small culture, it is a culture of universal scope, of universal coverage; to give an example, let’s recall the monograph on Eminescu, by Amita Bhowe, which clearly shows how connected Eminescu was to the Indian culture. So Eminescu had this universal understanding. As the late Petre Țuțea, the Christian thinker, said: “from Atlantic to Vladivostok, Eminescu lays blessings on”, that is, in Eminescu’s work, there are the three great spaces of culture and civilization (tricontinental matrix) from the ferment of which the grandiose European civilization was born. A brilliant monograph by another monographic thinker, Mrs. Svetlana Paleologu-Matta, has appeared, dedicated to the phenomenological seam in Eminescu’s work (anticipating, in its fullness, the current of phenomenology). This divine book by Svetlana Paleologu was also translated into Romanian and is completely remarkable.

All Romanian culture, and with this I conclude our interview, is the mirror of universal culture. Romanian culture is not a parochial culture, it is a culture that can be considered a miraculous mirror of the entire universal culture. It is a Romanian language culture, but the Romanian language par excellence has the vocation of universality, as a neo-Latin language, and at the same time as a language that capitalizes on the old, Thracian, Pelasgic, substratum. So here is all the Old Europe, the first Europe, the primordial one, overlapping largely to the Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic space, as Marija Gimbutas demonstrated in her world-famous book.

*Guiding ideas in teaching the sociology of culture
and arts in the last phase of the communist regime*

Question: I would like to ask you one more question, as you said that you remained in the educational system due to the sociology of culture and art, how did you teach at that time and what would be the theoretical possibilities in the sociology of culture to use its own authors, how would we position it along a line of thought developed in a Romanian theoretical framework?

Ilie Bădescu: It is true that a discontinuity has occurred in the sociology of culture and art. For example, I developed a research direction in which I capitalized on the Eastern and Romanian traditions, because the Western one is more easily accessible, it is well known. You can’t work without it either, there is no doubt, but for example in explaining the cultural phenomenon you have to take into account the autonomy of the spiritual. In sociology there is somehow the temptation, the *hubris*, to link spiritual phenomena to certain dependencies, to conditionalities, related to economics, sociology, etc. However, in order to see what happens in the

dynamics of the spiritual, you have to accept the thesis of the autonomy of the spiritual, and then you can notice, for example, that a writer like Flaubert diagnosed a terrible disease of the spirit, which is *Beauvarism*, the disease of image (*chip*). The moment when the human being loses connection to God, he becomes “self-delusive”, that is, he loses the power of the divine image in him. As someone said: “in the question addressed by God in Heaven, when he calls: Adam, where are you?” the whole history of humanity is included. In this question, we understand that God is looking for us and we are hiding, like Adam after the fall. So, the moment you admit that society is not outside art, but inside it, it is not outside culture, but inside culture, you realize what the power of the spiritual really is.

By researching this matter, I was able to bring the phenomenon of the ethno-historical fatigue of peoples into debate, discussion and analysis. It is a spiritual fatigue. This theory belongs to Nicolae Iorga; he showed that the decline of some nations can be explained by an extraordinary ethnic tension in relation to some targets that are of an arrogant type. For example, he says, Bulgaria or Serbia assumed the pride of restoring the Byzantine Empire; and from this strain arose the decay of the Bulgarians or the Serbs, who fell into the Turkocracy for three hundred years afterwards, that is to say, they exhausted their energies for a long time. The same happened in the case of France, through Napoleon, says Iorga. That proud man, the self-crowned emperor, used French blood, that is, French soldiers, in the service of a British idea, of the British parliamentary form; he pushed France into an extraordinary ethnic tension; this is probably where what happened in the Franco-Prussian wars, when France, as we know very well, loses, but that same France initiates the reform of the textbook, through the spirit as well, through the spiritual. The famous *Lavisse* textbook of history brings back the historical glory of France in the minds of children – guiding them to go down deep into history till Clovis, thus reawakening in the French people mind the idea of a glorious, monumental, major France, and this simply regenerates the energies of France, the soul latencies, of the French soul. Thus, starting with this, France becomes again what it was, is, and will be, to the extent that it does not fall from what holds us all, namely from the Christian spirit, from the relationship with God.

This is the second idea that I brought to the sociology of art and culture, and which later became a fundamental idea in the noology system that I built as a system of thought, of noological or spiritual sociology, namely the idea that human being is not a conditioned being, that is, we do not define him as defined by Marx, in whose vision, man is the product of social relations; no! Man is a gifted being, he as a gifted being is the bearer of soul latencies, i.e. uncreated energies, which he actualizes through creative activity, faith, prayer, love in general, through virtues, and these, for example, make him a being that can rise. That is, these soul latencies, these virtues or gifts, place him on the vertical dimension. Otherwise, the human being is seen by the materialist sociology on a horizontal dimension, in the system

of conditionalities. Even freedom is wrongly defined. Freedom is a gift, that is, man is born free, God created him as a free being. But we lose our freedoms because we assume all the conditions in exchange for it, for the freedom, and in this way, as we can say, we get lost, that is, we get lost in such conditionings. There is a Russian film “Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears”, very beautiful; In Eastern patristic literature, the power of tears is extraordinary, tears are of seven types, seven kinds of tears. The tear has more power than any other power. In my studies, which I have dedicated to the continuity of tears in the Romanian culture, in the dynamics of Romanian society, I have shown that here the tear never dries up, and the candle never goes out. A person trained in the school of economic determinism does not notice these things or their great significance.

Thirdly, what is extremely important is that the historical world actually rests on a deep structure, which is the world of archetypes, as Jung says. It is more than the world of archetypes, it is the world of beginnings, of what gives ground, background, foundation, of everything that exists. These are not perishable, they endure, they last. Even when the phenomena fall into decay, these foreshadowings survive, and give the chance of rebirth, as happened with the European Renaissance, for example. It is true that the Renaissance took place, as Sandu Tudor says, on the foundation of the Greek error, that is, on the rupture of the sign of mystery, this is the European rationalism of Greek origin. This is how modern rationalism appeared, the direction in which the temptation of autonomy conquers, that is, the pride of the autonomous man, without God, without relation to the mystery. He is a closed, solipsistic man.

In culture and through culture you can recover what through economics, for example, and through other materialistic determinisms, you can lose and, in any case, through these determinisms taken separately, you cannot recover. This is the function, if we want to say so, of these disciplines, of art, of culture, that they allow you to recover what in all other fields is invisible, imperceptible. All these have a decisive power for the destiny of man as a being in the Universe.

Ilie Bădescu (b. 1948) is a Romanian sociologist and geopolitician, University Professor, Doctor Honoris Causa and Member of the Romanian Academy, Director of the Institute of Sociology of the Romanian Academy. He graduated in Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Sociology Section of the University of Bucharest. During the period 1992-2008, he was the head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Bucharest. In 1983, as part of an IREX scholarship, he carried out a research at the “Ph. Mosely” archives from Columbia University, New York and University of Illinois, Urbana. The same year, he participated in the activities of the Summer Seminar of the Department of Anthropology in Amherst - Massachusetts University – USA. In 1992 he was present at the Fernand Braudel Center – SUNY Binghamton in a program dedicated to studying the methodology of analysis of the modern world system, a paradigm launched by Professor Imm.

Wallerstein, the director of this center, whose work he translated (in collaboration with Dorel Abraham and Marcel Ghibernea) into Romanian (Editura Minerva, four volumes). He participated in inter-academic projects and programs developed together with professors and specialists from the University of Bucharest, Umea University in Sweden, England Polytechnic University in Cambridge – Great Britain, the State University of Barcelona and the Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru. In 2000, January – February, he participated in the project on Community Administration of Justice initiated together with professors and specialists from Tiffin University, USA (seminars, study visits, group discussions with specialists, etc.). In 2002, he coordinated the research project in the Republic of Moldova on the peasant's relationship with the land following the reforms carried out within the National Program "Land" elaborated by the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova and financed by the American Government (assisted by the renowned American expert, Vincent Morabito). He is the author of several studies and monographs (including *Treaty on Geopolitics*, 2004), as well as co-author and coordinator of the books *Geopolitics of European Integration* (2002), *Sociology and Geopolitics of the Frontier* (2 volumes, 1995), *The Encyclopedia of Repressed Values* (2 volumes, 1000 pages). In 2002 he founded the *Journal of Sociology, Geopolitics and Geohistory*. He is the author of the *Noology System* (*Noology. Knowledge on the Spiritual Order of the World. The System of Noological Sociology*, published in 2000) and one of the founders of the field of research with the same name. Distinctions: "Dimitrie Gusti" Award of the Romanian Academy for the work *Sociology and Geopolitics of the Frontier*, "Lucafaurul (Morning Star)" Magazine Award (Romanian Writers' Union) for the work *European Synchronism and Romanian Critical Culture*, "Dimitrie Gusti" Award of the International Foundation of Religions, for the work *The Theory of Latencies*. He coordinated (in collaboration) the project regarding the evaluation of the social and psychological impact of the risk scenarios of the 10 natural "hazards" (conducted at the behest of IGSU – Romania). He coordinated research programs in the fields of sociology, noology and geopolitics. In the framework of the PER ("Project on Ethnic Relations") program, USA, he coordinated (in collaboration) the inter-ethnic relations research project completed with the drawing up the International Report on this thematics.