The Unknown Michael Cernea at 90

Zoltan ROSTÁS

Universitatea din Bucharest, Facultatea de Jurnalism şi Ştiinţele Comunicării
University of Bucharest, Faculty of Journalism and Communication Studies
Personal e-mail: zoltan.z.rostas@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper is written for Professor Michael Cernea' 90th birthday. However, I did not perform an in-depth analysis of his work as a sociologist of development because his contributions are worldwide known. What is less known is his activity before his employment at the World Bank, in 1974. He did his studies during a period when sociology was banned in Romania. Despite this, he became one of the pioneers of the process of rehabilitation of sociological field research in Romania. First, he dealt with industrial and urban sociology. Then, under the influence of interwar sociological traditions, he turned to rural sociology. The activity after 1974 cannot be fully understood without knowing the Romanian background of this sociologist who has recently turned 90.
Keywords: Michael Cernea, Dimitrie Gusti, population resettlement, applied anthropology, rehabilitation of sociology, sociology of agricultural cooperation, industrial sociology

Citation suggestion: Rostás, Zoltan. "The Unknown Michael Cernea at 90." *Transilvania*, no. 11-12 (2021): 91-98. https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2021.11-12.14.

Introduction

The anniversary of a great sociologist is a ritualistic evaluation exercise, even if this exercise is done with the means and competency of science and is based on a modern view. The evaluation carried out either by peers or by science historians refers usually to the analysis of the important works, to theories and methodologies that brought notoriety to the respective personality. But could great results be explained through themselves, through the internal analysis of the mature work of the sociologist? As a historian interested in the social mechanisms of sociology, and being familiar with the work of Michael Cernea, I can state: his career and work can only be understood through an external approach.

Naturally, one can firmly opt for this type of a sociologizing approach, yet one has to concretely decide on the external point from which one approaches the personality who authored this work. And for this reason, I wondered: from which aspect of his activity should I begin my investigations in order to reach first the creation mechanisms and then the mature work itself?

I probably should analyze his pursuit of organizing scientific research throughout his sociological career. Because he was elected to be part of many international scientific associations such as the European Society for Rural Sociology, the International Sociology Association, the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration, the Advisory Group for the International Research on Agriculture and he participated in the management of organizations such as the Swiss Academy for Development, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, *Bibliotheca Alexandrina* of Egypt... Obviously, these research and organizational positions are extremely important, not to mention the fact that this experience in the world of science is in itself interesting. Nevertheless, this was not the main reason of my current investigation.

Then maybe Michael Cernea's hundreds of voyages to and studies on the most diverse regions and communities in the world – some of them hard to access – should be the motive behind my article? He carried out research in a series of countries: from Mexico and Brazil to Tanzania and Kenya, from Algeria and Senegal to Pakistan and India, from Syria and Yemen to Togo and Mozambique, from Nepal and Burma to China, West Papua and Indonesia.

It could be rightfully considered that the explanation behind my analytical exercise is the fact that, in 1975, Michael Cernea was hired by the World Bank. The notoriety of this international organization would validate my decision to take interest in the activity of the first sociologist and, at the same time, the first Romanian to be hired by this organization. He brought prestige to the professions of sociologist and anthropologist because he succeeded in changing the strictly economist and engineering

approach of the World Bank projects, by introducing rules of sociological analysis and social policies meant to protect indigenous communities and populations affected by the "collateral" effects of the development projects financed by the Bank. It is easily understandable that his activity of over a quarter of a century in a supranational institution would lead to finding those intimate mechanisms of scholarly creation.

And, of course, it is worth approaching in an article the career of a man whose creative work has been acknowledged through scientific awards granted by American social sciences institutions such as the Bronislaw Malinowski Award of the Society for Applied Anthropology, or the Solon T. Kimball Award of the American Anthropology Association. In recognition of his merits, he was elected a corresponding member of the Romanian Academy, while the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj and the Al. I. Cuza University in Iaşi awarded him the title of Doctor Honoris Causa. Michael Cernea was also awarded the title of Honorary Professor by the Hohai University in Nanjing, China. Moreover, books he authored or coordinated were translated into French, Japanese, Spanish, Chinese, Turkish and Bahasa.

Or maybe I should rather write about the roots of his important theoretical contributions, related to the concepts of development, to the sociological theory and models of forced displacement and resettlement of populations, risk assessments, agrarian development models, and also the background work for saving the cultural patrimony as an integral part of investments in development, to the theoretical and applied approach of social problems in the irrigation systems and in forestry, or to the development of applied research methodology? No wonder he was included in a selective dictionary that gathers intellectual portraits of the most important 50 thinkers on development.[1] "Cernea's contributions to development are many – writes Anthony Bebbington, the author of the dictionary entry – reflected in a long list of publications, advisory roles and academic honors. Perhaps the most important among them, however, was to have changed an institution through the sustained and forceful insistence on a few ideas: that social science knowledge is critical to development, that induced development will fail in any meaningful sense if ordinary people are not involved in shaping the forms it takes, and that the cherished disembodied concepts of so much development theory cannot be considered separately from the social structures in which they are embedded."

All these are important aspects, but in order to understand why, in 1974, Cernea was able to adapt immediately to the radically different working conditions at the World Bank in Washington, to be capable of scientific and organizational performance, one needs to know the Bucharest background of the person in question.

A lot of empathy is needed to understand that the university education of Michael Cernea's generation in the 1950s took place under difficult circumstances. Instead of the positive learning of knowledge, there was the fight against any form of social sciences which did not comply with the Stalinist ideology. It is, therefore, no wonder that later on, the first timid attempts to apply sociological methods in the field, which Cernea and his small group at the Institute of Philosophy at the Academy of the People's Republic of Romania (PRR) carried out were verifications of the concepts of historical and dialectical materialism (the Stalinist version). Publishing their results was not risk-free either. A relatively legal basis for those who studied sociology emerged only in 1965 – under the control of the communist party, of course.

Naturally, going through the Romanian magazines where Michael Cernea published his studies, and reading the books he wrote or coordinated during this period is not enough. Those who think that the activity of a sociologist in Romania could be correctly assessed only based on the published results do not know that the members of Michael Cernea's generation did not have an easy start when it comes to scientific research, compared to their colleagues in the West.

1. A chained beginning

The period when Michael Cernea had to choose which college to attend was the most unfortunate possible. After the state power was taken by a single party, the communist party, a radical reform took place in education in 1948. One of the consequences was that sociology simply disappeared from universities, being also chastised as a bourgeois pseudo-science. Those who had been practicing it were either excluded, or forced to choose another field, or even jailed under various pretexts. Therefore, the only way one could develop one's interest in knowing the reality was through journalism. Cernea chose journalism very early also because he needed to contribute to the frail income of his family. But the 1950s Romanian media was not in the least dedicated to serving the reality and the public, as it was simply a propaganda tool of the communist party. For Michael Cernea it was nevertheless important, because it allowed him to get to know various social environments and it taught the young man from Bucharest how to get through in the country, how to communicate with a world unknown to someone who grew up in the city.

But this life as a journalist negated any professional satisfaction because of the schematized writing and of the censorship. After his studies in philosophy, which he completed while also practicing journalism, Cernea decided to pursue doctoral studies, giving up his career in the press without any regrets. The academic status allowed him to further his studies in certain fields of the social sciences (especially the history of philosophy), but the dogmatism of the era did not allow him to unshackle his own creative capability in contemporary fields of research. Neither at the Institute of Philosophy, where he ended up after completing these studies, in 1958, could he find a free atmosphere that would encourage writing.[2]

Yet, in the beginning of the 1960s, when the systematic unmasking of sociology was still in full swing, but some signs of opening towards the West were beginning to emerge, Michael Cernea tried to use sociology in order to clarify some fundamental themes of Marxist philosophy: the class consciousness of the workers at the plants in Bucharest and Braşov. It was the only way to introduce sociology in research

without taking too many risks. It was a bold attempt, given the still fresh memory of the failure of the first initiative to resuscitate sociology by a group of agrarian economy researchers.[3] However, preparing this investigation was anything but easy. Romania had not yet started to import sociology books from the West, not to mention the lacking research methodology for the industrial environment. A book used by the young researchers to learn the steps of the research was obtained with great effort, and the investigation as such was mapped. The research could not have been launched and carried out without the prestige of the Academy, which endorsed the investigation. It was a research endeavour that tried to observe the rules of empirical sociology. Questionnaires were drawn up; a sample of the target population was established. In Cernea's group there were other researchers as well: Honorina Cazacu, Gheorghe Chepeş, Maria Micu (later Larionescu).

This research could not be free of party ideology dogmas, and Michael Cernea was aware of this. In retrospective, he confessed that "besides its merits, the work was not consistently sociological, in the sense that the amplitude of some of the generalizations went beyond the span of the data investigated. Some of the statements were based more on deductions than on the factual material."[4] However, the true merit of this work – in my opinion, historical – was that of having re-established sociological research in Romania.

Due to the fact that Nikita Khrushchev stepped up the pace regarding the opening towards the West, which was followed by the other leaders of the "sister" parties from Eastern Europe, the book published in 1964[5] was no longer attacked, but it set a favorable precedent, legitimating also the unchaining of sociological research.

In 1965, after the death of Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, the leader of the party, the 9th Congress of the Communist Party continued more visibly the opening initiated by the old leadership and rehabilitated sociology – this time officially. The gesture of the new party leader, Nicolae Ceauşescu, was not meant for the discipline of sociology itself. Sociology *had to* be rehabilitated because the opening also meant international communication, relationships with international scientific organizations, with foreign universities, etc., and it would have been inconceivable that sociology would be the one discipline missing. At the same time, the intellectual groups close to the leadership of the Romanian Communist Party (PCR) managed to convince the party leaders that restarting sociology would benefit "the building of socialism". Thus, in 1966, there started a process of clarification of the relationship between sociology and Marxist and Leninist ideology – which remained unfinished.[6] On the other hand, there also started a fight between the intellectuals close to the party vying for the leadership in institutionalizing the sociological education. The winner was Miron Constantinescu,[7] who was, at that time, the closest to the top of the party pyramid. Under his leadership the recruitment of teaching staff and researchers followed rather political and not professional criteria in most of the cases. For instance, neither the sociologists who had completed their studies before WWII,[8] nor those like Michael Cernea and his colleagues, who had been in the field since 1962, were taken on board. Normally, Cernea's group, with their pioneering achievements, should have been considered the "ice breaker" of the field of sociology reinstated in the 1960s.

Despite these problems, the second half of the '60s can be considered favorable to sociology. Yet, Miron Constantinescu and the sociological studies undertaken at the University of Bucharest did not have the monopoly over organizing the science, and several independent workshops emerged, where important specialized sociologies developed.[9] Even the industrial sociology research of the group led by Michael Cernea abandoned the themes related to the concepts of historical materialism. Other investigations followed, still in the industrial field, meant to convince the authorities of the usefulness of sociological research for – according to the new doctrine of the party – "the scientific management of the economic processes." The innovators' movement research topic,[10] besides the assessment of this phenomenon of industrial creativity, offered Cernea and his colleagues the opportunity to formulate an implicit social criticism. It was demonstrated that the movement to promote innovation had been inherently compromised by the immoral practices of the state companies' management. This research covered several companies in several cities in Romania, therefore it was much more representative than the previous one.

The next research dealt with workforce fluctuation in state companies in Romania. Here, Michael Cernea and his team demonstrated the structural reasons of the massive fluctuation and its human and economic effects.[11]

Alongside these investigations, the Sociological laboratory from the University of Bucharest, led by Miron Constantinescu, began a large project on the urbanization process in the Olt county area.[12] The (uneven) results of these research studies involved tens of students, experts and party activists and document the beginnings of the still immature field of academic sociology.

Another important research of the group led by Cernea was the participation in Miron Constantinescu's program on investigating the urbanization process in Romania. Acknowledging the expertise and skills of this group from the Academy's Institute of Philosophy, Miron Constantinescu invited them to the second investigation of the urbanization process, focusing on the city of Braşov.[13]

Another sign that Miron Constantinescu acknowledged Michael Cernea's and his group's competence was the fact that he invited them to take part in the activities of the Sociological laboratory from the University of Bucharest and in the books it published.

But Cernea's group went beyond field of sociology of industry, sociology of work or sociology of urbanization. From 1966, they also started to do research in the field of sociology of mass culture – unknown in Romania until that moment. Members of other recently established groups were also invited to this research. The first result of this research was a book with several co-authors, edited by Michael Cernea.[14] Later on, this direction of research diversified very much in Romania.

In 1965, the new party line legitimated itself also by accepting cultural and scientific personalities who had not been leftists, but who had a democrat and humanist behaviour

and did not belong to the camp of fascist ideologies. Among these personalities there were historian Nicolae Iorga, philosophers Constantin Rădulescu-Motru and Lucian Blaga, sociologists Dimitrie Gusti and Petre Andrei. It is within this context that Cernea discovered the works of Dimitrie Gusti and his interwar school of sociology focused primarily on the village, a difficult issue in Romania for hundreds of years. Moreover, he also discovered the still active representatives of the sociological monographic school, famous for the rural research it carried out, most notably Henri H. Stahl.

2. A driving past

This can be food for thought, one of the – many – absurdities of those years: in 1962 Michael Cernea and his group started field work without being familiar with the empirical sociology carried out in the interwar period. Not being familiar with the interwar inheritance was due not only to the fact that this research was placed in a secret stock of books in libraries, but also to the ban on reading, using and referring to these books and journals. How could one explain the desynchronization between the rehabilitation of sociology and the rehabilitation of the Bucharest Sociological School led by professor Dimitrie Gusti? The reason is relatively simple: for almost two decades, the interwar elite and its representatives – with the exception of the very few communists – was chastised as reactionary and "enslaved to the bourgeoisie." Starting from 1962–1963, a slight change in the approach regarding the interwar past slowly began to emerge. After the 1965 congress, the party publicly changed its basis of legitimation to also include personalities with entirely or partially rehabilitated works. Within this context, Gusti and his sociological school were also rehabilitated. On the other hand, due to his international prestige in the 1930s, there was an international pressure for his reinstatement.

In order to understand what the discovery of the rural dimension of Romanian society meant for Michael Cernea, we need to take a quick look at the history of sociological thinking in Romania. Its elements are to be found with nineteenth century philosophers, economists, statisticians and literati of the Old Kingdom of Romania. But the first professor to start a university sociology course *per se* and a program for its institutionalization was Dimitrie Gusti, in Iaşi, in 1910. After obtaining his PhD at the University of Leipzig in 1904, under the supervision of Wilhelm Wundt, Gusti conceptualized his own program for implementing sociology. In his view, sociology, politics, and ethics were elements of the same system of thought, meant to support the beginning of a series of reforms aiming at modernizing the country. In other words, Gusti was absolutely convinced that modernization objectives and policies for the implementation of reforms could not be formulated in the absence of thorough sociological knowledge. In order to reach these strategic purposes, after the Great Union of the Romanian provinces, professor Gusti created an extra-university institutional system, which was still connected to the University in Bucharest. The first step was the establishment, in 1920, of the Romanian Social Institute, with the purpose to professionalize higher state bodies, but also to responsibly draw up and disseminate solutions to the social, economic, cultural and international problems of the era. Under the patronage of this institution, and also in cooperation with the Sociology Seminar from the University of Bucharest, under his leadership, in 1925 he initiated the series of annual summer campaigns of monographic sociology in villages.

These campaigns had the objective to introduce the youth (students and graduates) to field research, but also to carry out (for the first time in Romania) interdisciplinary field studies.[15] In contrast with the autochthonist and isolationist spirit of the greater part of the humanist elite, this institutional framework was open to the West, Gusti strongly championing the integration into international scientific associations. Many of the young sociologists who came out of this real nursery authored works of authentic value, but the most important were H. H. Stahl[16] and Anton Golopenţia.[17]

After developing an original theory and methodology for field monographic sociology in the mid-1930s – when Gusti became director of the Royal Cultural Foundation "Prince Carol"[18] –, village research was supplemented by social intervention. Following monographic research, Gusti's younger colleagues perfected the new village "cultural" work technique, putting together a set of methods which resembled – to an astonishing degree – *community development* strategies in use today. The student teams were trained by Gusti and his colleagues to encourage the development of "work culture", "health culture", "body and soul culture." But, compared to the old practice of "illuminating" the peasants, the Gustian strategy proposed supporting the self-development of the village. *Sociologia militans* – as Gusti would call his scientific strategy[19] – was turned into an actual state policy during the period 1938–39, when King Carol II promulgated the Social Service Law.[20] This movement spearheaded by Gusti and implicitly anti-fascist, was suspended in October 1939 because of the outbreak of the war. For the same reason, the 14th International Congress of Sociology was postponed and later cancelled. The congress, with a confirmed participation of 200 sociologists, was organized in Bucharest under Gusti's chairmanship, and it would have internationalized the expertise of the Gustian school. Thus, the official validation of the methods was cancelled, but the self-development techniques were taught to hundreds of young sociologists, economists, agronomists, foresters and high-school teachers.[21] Despite the entire decade-and-a-half ordeal that sociology and all those connected to this school went through, the members of this generation were able to pass on the teachings of the Gustian experience to Michael Cernea and his colleagues in the 1960s.

Therefore, by reading the old texts that had been inaccessible for a decade and a half, through the direct contact with the members of the Gustian school, most notably though the cooperation with professor H. H. Stahl, Cernea refocused his scientific interest on rural sociology, on agricultural development and on family anthropology. It was not an intellectual whim that Michael Cernea indulged, on the contrary, he acknowledged the fundamental problem

that Romania had had and was still having after the process of forced collectivization – that of rural communities. The deepening of these interests was also facilitated by the reopening of Romanian and French academic relations, with an old interwar tradition, in the field of rural sociology. French sociologists did not forget the results of the Bucharest School of Sociology. Cernea's first scholarship to France was a success, since the famous Henri Mendras, the leader of European rural sociology, took him under his wing. Stimulated by this new orientation, Michael Cernea organized his first rural research – a comparison between two villages in two different regions of Romania, Comana in the Constanţa county and Belinţ in the Timiş county[22]. The latter had also been researched in 1938 by the team of the Banat Crişana Social Institute, an organization independent of Gusti's School, but with which it cooperated consistently. This research strengthened his interest in the peasant family and its economic behavior. The results enjoyed the appreciation of the Romanian scholarly community, but not of the local ideological authorities. At the same time, the research in this field attracted the interest of foreign academic circles, and Cernea was invited to take managing positions in some European scientific associations and was offered short research internships in several European countries. After the setting up of the Vienna Centre, Michael Cernea was involved in its activity and rural sociology research in Romania became part of the international projects supported by the Centre. Moreover, Cernea carried out research on the history of Romanian rural sociology and wrote an original study about it.[23]

This is when he had his first contact with American sociology and a few personalities who shaped his future evolution. Among them, R. K. Merton. The beginning of his relationship with Merton is connected to a dramatic period in Cernea's life: it was due to a book written by Stela Cernea – Michael Cernea's wife, who died suddenly and tragically – on American functionalist structuralism[24]. Stela Cernea, an excellent professor of sociological theories at the University of Bucharest, was also the one who stimulated her husband's efforts to start and expand sociological research in Romania. Her death at the height of her creative force, aged 35, in 1968, shook not only Cernea's family, but also the small sociological community in Romania. As a spiritual tribute to her memory, Michael Cernea managed to finish the manuscript of her last book, using her notes. At the International Congress of Sociology in Varna (Bulgaria, 1970) he handed the book to Merton, who appreciated it very much. This friendship established with the "help" of Stela Cernea stimulated Michael Cernea for many more years, on his way to becoming a prominent scholar in the fields of development sociology and anthropology.[25]

But despite the opening announced in 1965, the circulation of scientists from Romania, especially of those in the field of social sciences, was not trouble-free. Thus, accepting the invitation to Stanford for 1970–1971 was quite an ordeal for Cernea. After several American interventions, he obtained a passport for the research year for which he had been invited. The Stanford internship was probably the most important learning period for Michael Cernea. He was able to complete his studies in a high-level academic environment and in research conditions he had never known before. During this period, he wrote his first paper in English, a turning point for his future career.[26]

From Stanford he returned to a visibly different Bucharest from the point of view of the ideological atmosphere.[27] He worked intensely and published the volume *Sociologia cooperativei agricole*[28] [The Sociology of the Agricultural Cooperative], the most modern work on the main rural form of association imposed by the communist regime since 1962. The novelty of this work consisted in approaching this social unit from the perspective of organizational sociology, instead of a purely economic perspective. Alongside with the writing of this paper, Cernea was invited to teach a rural sociology course at the Agronomy Institute in Bucharest, and he started to coordinate PhD theses in sociology. In 1974 Michael Cernea also published a volume of interviews, in which he introduces American sociology to the Romanian public. It is more than simply an introductory work, for it is a book of discussions and debates.[29]

Despite the informal success of these books, despite Cernea's international recognition, the ideological atmosphere that settled after 1971 started to marginalize him. Within this general atmosphere marked by an intensifying party propaganda even within scientific institutions, Michael Cernea could discern a reduction of the importance of the 1962 moment, when sociological research restarted, compared to the 1965 moment (when Ceauşescu was posing as the savior of science). On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the 1962 rehabilitation of sociology, Cernea was allowed a miniscule article in the sociology journal *Viitorul social* [The Social Future].[30] The article was so well hidden among several others that there is no mention of it in the summary.

There were other signs of malevolence towards Michael Cernea as well. Even though he was considered one of the top ten sociologists in Romania, he was not included in the official delegation of his country to the International Congress of Sociology in Ottawa, in the summer of 1974. Yet, at that time he was invited to another congress in the USA. Within this context came the World Bank's offer for a sociologist position. Accepting such an offer should have been a personal decision. And anyway, it would have meant the beginning of an American internship for Cernea. But as the individual and the scientist did not enjoy sovereignty during the communist regime, the Romanian authorities insisted that Michael Cernea return to Romania. The Bucharest officials "invented" another person – probably more "trustworthy" – to work at the World Bank. As the Bank management and Robert McNamara personally remained very firm regarding their preference for Cernea, the Romanian authorities were left with no other options but to make it more difficult for his family to obtain passports in order to leave for the USA. Cernea's "indiscipline" had other consequences as well. His books were withdrawn from bookstores, the others "enriched" the secret stock in libraries, his name was erased from all bibliographies, as if he had never existed.

3. The Gustian inheritance

It could be said that with Cernea's first missions to Africa a

whole new period started for the Romanian sociologist. The beginning of the American period at the World Bank truly represented a huge change. It required an "organizational learning" of probably unsuspected proportions for Michael Cernea. When it came to learning the World Bank structure and its organizational culture, he had to start "from scratch." But when he had to research and solve social issues triggered by the Bank's projects, Cernea quickly found support in H. H. Stahl's theories about the traditional village, in Traian Herseni's research on livestock herding and generally in Gusti's militant sociology. And, of course, he was able use his Romanian experience regarding the cooperative village when he met similar forms that national authorities in several African countries introduced after conquering their independence. Michael Cernea preserved the inheritance he brought from his homeland, he enriched it with his own experience and with the literature which was emerging around him. Even though in Ceauşescu's Romania he was long forgotten, when he was awarded the Malinowski prize, in 1995, he wanted to remind his colleagues the gratitude he had for the fact that his career as a sociologist was completed due to the teachings of Gusti's school, that same Gusti who obtained his PhD under the supervision Wilhelm Wundt, just like Bronislaw Malinowski.

Obviously, the Romanian sociologists who forgot Michael Cernea were not the appreciated ones, but those who advocated for the Ceauşescu regime. The valuable sociologists, themselves marginalized in their own country, were aware of the success enjoyed by Cernea's books. Therefore, it was no wonder that soon after December 1989, when the first free elections took place at the Romanian Academy, H. H. Stahl himself recommended that Michael Cernea be elected corresponding member of Romania's highest scientific forum.

Conclusions

The reestablishment of Romanian sociology in the 1960s is obviously closely connected to Michael Cernea. Undoubtedly, it would have occurred naturally a few years later, but Cernea's ability to fight the inertia of the communist regime triggered its start earlier. His merit was that of knowing how to choose his research topics so as not to endanger the method (as it happened in the case of the attempts done at the Institute of Economic Sciences). Therefore, despite the ideological control of the party, he knew how to carry out correct projects which, in conjunction with casting light on some aspects of industrial work, were also a social criticism of the system.

Besides rereading and recovering the inheritance of Romanian interwar sociology, Michael Cernea successfully became an active and critical part of the international rural sociology movement. The synthesis of recovering and internationally disseminating this approach determined the professionalization of research in this field, but also establishing a humanist sociology, a socially sensitive perspective on interventionism. His decade-and-a-half activity was decisive for Romanian sociology. Michael Cernea was a pioneer of field research, he established industrial sociology, and he professionalized rural sociology.

Notes:

1. David Simon (ed.), *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development* (London and New York: Routledge Key Guides, 2006), 67-73.
2. Based on my interview with Michael Cernea on November 6, 2007, at Bethany Beach, DE.
3. The Bucharest Institute of Statistics had the idea of the rural economic monographs in 1955. The idea was adopted and carried out by the Institute of Economic Research of the Romanian Academy. During the period between 1957 and 1958 the researchers tried to carry out economic monographs in villages, without officially using the interwar sociologic tradition. After two years of intense activity, in 1959, the ideological magazine of the communist party unmasked and chastised the research as deviating from the party line. The investigations were banned, and the group was disbanded. It was a paradoxical repression, because in the Soviet Union – which the Romanian leaders of the time were following religiously – the first steps were taken towards institutionalizing sociology.
4. Mihail Cernea, "Cercetarea sociologică la Institutul de Filozofie al Academiei Sociale şi Politice din România, 1962-1972," *Viitorul social* II, no. 2 (1973).
5. H. Cazacu, M. Cernea, Gh. Chepes, and C. Vlad, (eds.), *Profilul spiritual al clasei muncitoare în socialism: pe baza unor cercetări sociologice în uzine* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1964).
6. The debate – like in all the countries of the soviet block – started with the aim of improvising a Marxist sociology, in compliance with the regime. For some, historical materialism was completely distinct from sociology, for others they overlapped. There were not few those who tried to retrieve the Romanian interwar sociology and to "revamp" it through an infusion of historical materialism in the spirit of the 1960s. See Zoltán Rostás, *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuri cu H.H. Stahl* (Bucharest: Paideia, 2000).
7. Since his youth as a militant of the Communist Party of Romania, Miron Constantinescu (1917–1974) studied under Dimitrie Gusti and participated in the sociological research of 1939 in Dâmbovnic (Argeş) led by Anton Golopenţia and Mihai Pop. After 1944 he held important positions within the party and the state. In 1957 he clashed with Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, lost his party functions and worked in historical research. He returned to the first line of the party after the death of Gheorghiu-Dej, as a member of Ceauşescu's team. After 1965 he held important positions in the field of social sciences education and research.
8. It refers to those members of the Bucharest School of Sociology who had accumulated an important expertise in the field and in publishing academic papers, who were also good sociology professors, such as Traian Herseni, Mihai Pop, Coriolan Gheţie, Gheorghe Reteganu, George Serafim and others. The only one accepted was H. H. Stahl – as an acting professor.
9. Such as Centrul de Cercetări pentru Problemele Tineretului, Oficiul de studii şi sondaje al RTV, Laboratorul de sociologie al Municipiului

Bucharest, the sociology centres at the Universities of Iaşi, Cluj etc.

10. Mihail Cernea, *Mişcarea inovatorilor. Sociologia muncii*, with Maria Larionescu and V. Dumitrescu (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1967).
11. Mihail Cernea, Maria Larionescu, and Haralambie Ene, *Resursele umane ale întreprinderii. Sociologia muncii* (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1971).
12. It is Miron Constantinescu, *Procesul de urbanizare în R. S. România: Zona Slatina-Olt* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1970).
13. Tiberiu Bogdan, Mihail Cernea, Miron Constantinescu, and Petre Cristea, *Procesul de urbanizare în R.S. România: zona Braşov* (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1970).
14. Mihail Cernea, Francisc Albert, et al., *Contribuţii la sociologia culturii de masă* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1970).
15. See the articles by P. Ch. Loomis, "The Group Method in Rural Studies," *Sociology Research*, vol. XX, no. 2 (1935) and Philip E. Mosely, "The Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti," *Sociological Review*, vol. XXVIII (1936).
16. Henri H. Stahl, *Traditional Romanian village communities. The transition from the communal to the capitalist mode of production in the Danube region*, translation by Daniel Chirot and Holley Coulter Chirot, preface by Daniel Chirot (Cambrige: Cambrige University Press, 1980).
17. Sanda Golopenţia, "The Romanian Social Institute of Bessarabia in Light of the Correspondence between Petre Ştefanuca, Anton Golopenţia, and Dimitrie Gusti," in *The Tragic Plight of a Border Area: Bessarabia and Bucovina*, ed. Maria Manoliu-Manea (California: Humboldt State University Press, 1983), 181-198; Sanda Golopenţia, "Romanian Sociologists in Paris in the 1930s," *Sociologie romaneascã*, no. 1 (2005): 72–93.
18. Dimitrie Gusti, *The royal foundations of Rumania* (Bucharest: Prince Carol Royal Foundation, 1939).
19. Dimitrie Gusti, *Sociologia militans: Introducere în sociologia politică*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Social Român, 1934).
20. See Dimitrie Gusti, *Considerations on the Social service law in Romania* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939).
21. Zoltán Rostás, "The Gusti's Empire," *Martor*, vol. 3 (1998); Zoltán Rostás, "An Oral History Experiment," *Martor*, vol. 3 (1998); Zoltán Rostás, "The Bucharest School of Sociology," *East Central Europe* 27, no. 2 (2000).
22. Mihail Cernea, *Două sate: structuri sociale şi progres ethnic*, with Gh. Chepeş, M. Larionescu, H. Ene, V. Constantinescu and El. Gheorghe (Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1970).
23. Mihail Cernea, *Monographic Research on Rural Communities in Romanian Sociology* (Viena: CEUCORS, 1974).
24. Stela Cernea, *Structuralismul funcţionalist în sociologia americană* (Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică, 1970).
25. Based on my conversations with Michael Cernea on November 6, 2007 at Bethany Beach, DE.
26. Michael Cernea, *Changing Society and Family Change: The Impact of the Cooperative Farm on the Peasant Family* (Stanford, CA: Center for Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences, 1971).
27. Known as Nicolae Ceauşescu's 1971 "mini cultural revolution"; it meant the end of the "liberalism" period that started in 1965, cancelling or diminishing the concessions made to several categories of the Romanian society, mainly to the intellectuality, strengthening party discipline, amplifying propaganda and the cult of personality.
28. Mihail Cernea, *Sociologia Cooperativei Agricole* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1974).
29. Mihail Cernea, *Sociologia americană. Tendinţe şi controverse* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974).
30. See note 4 above.

Bibliography:

Cazacu, H., Cernea, M., Gh. Chepes and C. Vlad, eds. *Profilul spiritual al clasei muncitoare în socialism* [The Spiritual Profile of the Working Class under Socialism]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1964.

Cernea Michael M. and A. Kassam, eds. *Researching the Culture in Agri-culture. Social Research for International Agricultural Development*. Oxford UK: CABI, 2006.

Cernea Michael M. and H. M. Mathur, eds. *Can Compensation Prevent Impoverishment? Reforming Resettlement through Investments and Benefit-Sharing*. London, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Cernea, M., D. Frans, C. Rughiniş et al. *Romania Danube Delta Biodiversity Project: Local Benefits Case Study*. Washington DC: GEF, 2006.

Cernea, Michae. *Monographic Research on Rural Communities in Romanian Sociology*. Viena: CEUCORS, 1974.

Cernea, Michael and Benjamin Tepping, *A System for Monitoring and Evaluating Agricultural Extension Projects*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1977.

Cernea, Michael M. "A Sociological Framework: Policy, Environment, and the Social Actors for Tree Planting." In *Managing the World's Forests: Conservation and Development*, edited by N. P. Sharma. Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1992.

Cernea, Michael M. "Anthropology and Family Production Systems in Africa". Foreword to *Anthropology and Rural Development in West Africa*, Michael M. Horowitz and T. Painter, eds. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1986.

Cernea, Michael M. "Farmer Organizations and Institution Building for Sustainable Development." In *Regional Development Dialogue*, vol. 8, no. 2, Nagoya, Japan, 1987.

Cernea, Michael M. "Macrosocial Change, Feminization of Agriculture and Peasant Women's Threefold Economic Role", *Sociologia Ruralis*, vol. XVIII, nos. 2–3, 1978.

Cernea, Michael M. "Re-tooling in Applied Social Investigation for Development Planning." In *Rapid Assessment Procedures*, edited by Scrimshaw and Gleason. Boston: INDFC, 1992.

Cernea, Michael M. "Sociology in Romania: The View of an American Historian." In John W. Cole, ed., *Society and Culture in Modern Romania*, University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst Research Report Series No. 20, 1984.

Cernea, Michael M. "The 'Production' of a Social Methodology." In *Applied Anthropology in America*, E. Eddy and W. Partridge, eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
Cernea, Michael M. "The 'Ripple Effect' in Social Policy and its Political Content: A Debate on Social Standards in Public and Private Development Projects." In *Privatizing Development: Transnational Law, Infrastructure and Human Rights*, edited by M. Likosky. Leiden, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2005.
Cernea, Michael M. "Understanding and Preventing Impoverishment from Displacement. Reflections on the State of Knowledge." Keynote Opening Address, International Conference on Development Induced Displacement and Impoverishment. University of Oxford, England, January 1995.
Cernea, Michael M. and Chris McDowell, *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*. Washington DC: The World Bank, 2000.
Cernea, Michael M. and K. Schmidt-Soltau, "Biodiversity Conservation versus Population Resettlement: Risks to Nature and Risks to People". Paper presented at the International Conference on *Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity*". Bonn, Germany, May 19–23, 2003.
Cernea, Michael M. and Scott Guggenheim, eds. *Anthropological Approaches to Resettlement: Policy, Practice and Theory*. Boulder-Oxford: Westview Press, 1993.
Cernea, Michael M. *Cultural Heritage and Development – A Framework for Action in the Middle East and North Africa*, Washington DC: The World Bank, 2001.
Cernea, Michael M. *Hydropower Dams and Social Impacts: A Sociological Perspective*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1997.
Cernea, Michael M. *Involuntary Resettlement and Development: Policy Guidelines for Bank-financed Projects*. Washington DC: World Bank, 1988.
Cernea, Michael M., ed. *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development Projects*. New York Oxford University Press, 1985 & 1991.
Cernea, Michael. *Changing Society and Family Change: The Impact of the Cooperative Farm on the Peasant Family*. Stanford, CA: Center for Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences, 1971.
Cernea, Michael. *Cooperative Farming and Family Change in Romania*. Stanford, CA: Center for Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences – CASBS, P. 130, 1970.
Cernea, Mihai, "Cercetarea sociologică la Institutul de Filosofie al Academiei Ştiinţe Social-Politice" [Sociological Research at the Institute for Philosophy of Social and Political Sciences Academy]. *Viitorul Social*, II, no. 2 (1973).
Cernea, Mihail et al. *Două sate: structuri sociale şi progres tehnic* [Two Villages: Social Structures and Technical Progress]. Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1970.
Cernea, Mihail et al. *Contribuţii la sociologia culturii de masă* [Contributions to the Sociology of Mass Culture]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1970.
Cernea, Mihail et al. *Mişcarea de inovator. Sociologia muncii* [Movement Innovators. Sociology of Work]. Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1967.
Cernea, Mihail. *Sociologia americană. Tendinţe şi controverse* [American Sociology. Trends and Controversies]. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974.
Cernea, Mihail. *Sociologia Cooperativei Agricole* [The Sociology of the Agricultural Cooperative]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1974.
Cernea, Stela, *Structuralismul functionalist în sociologia americană* [Functional Structructuralism in American Sociology]. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică, 1970.
Constantinescu, Miron et al. *Urbanizare în R.S. România. Zona Braşov* [Urbanization in RS Romania: Brasov Area]. Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1970.
Constantinescu, Miron et al. *Urbanizare în R.S. România. Zona Slatina-Olt* [Urbanization in RS Romania: Slatina-Olt Area]. Bucharest: Academia RSR, 1970.
Golopenţia, Sanda, "Romanian Sociologists in Paris in the 1930s", *Sociologie romanească*, nr. 1, 2005, 72–93.
Golopenţia, Sanda, "The Romanian Social Institute of Bessarabia in Light of the Correspondence between Petre Ştefanuca, Anton Golopenţia, and Dimitrie Gusti." In *The Tragic Plight of a Border Area: Bessarabia and Bucovina*, edited by Maria Manoliu-Manea. California: Humboldt State University Press, 1983, 181-198.
Gusti, Dimitrie, *The Royal Foundations of Rumania*. Bucharest: Prince Charles Royal Foundation, 1939.
Gusti, Dimitrie. *Considerations on the Social Service Law in Romania*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.
Gusti, Dimitrie. *Sociologia militans: Introducere în sociologia politică* (vol. 1). Bucharest: Editura Institutului Social Român, 1934.
Koch-Weser, Maritta, Scott Guggenheim, eds. *Social Development in the World Bank. Essays in Honor of Michael M. Cernea*, New York: Springer, 2021.
Loomis, P. Ch. "The Group Method in Rural Studies." *Sociology Research*, vol. XX, nr. 2 (1935).
Mosely, Philip E. "The Sociological School of Dimitrie Gusti." *Sociological Review*, vol. XXVIII (1936).
Rostás, Zoltán. "An Oral History Experiment." *Martor*, vol. 3 (1998).
Rostás, Zoltán. "In Search of the Lost Interwar Sociology." In *Recalling Fieldwork. People, Places and Encounters*, edited by Raluca Mateoc and Francois Ruegg. Münster, Germany: Lit Verlag, 2020.
Rostás, Zoltán. "The Bucharest School of Sociology." *East Central Europe*, vol. 27, nr. 2 (2000).
Rostás, Zoltán. "The Gusti's Empire." *Martor*, vol. 3 (1998).
Rostás, Zoltán. "The Monographic Sociology of Dimitrie Gusti." *Eastern-European Coutryside*, no. 26 (2020).
Rostás, Zoltán. "The Rehabilitation of Romanian Sociology after Stalinism." In *Social Sciences in the "Other Europe" since 1945*, edited by Adela Hîncu and Victor Karady. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2018.
Rostás, Zoltán. *Monografia ca utopie. Interviuri cu H. H. Stahl* [The Sociological Monograph as Utopia. Interviews with H. H. Stahl]. Bucharest: Paideia, 2000.
Simon, David, ed. *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development*. London, New York: Routledge Key Guides, 2006.
Stahl, Henri H. *Traditional Romanian Village Communities. The transition from the communal to the capitalist mode of production in the Danube region*. Translated by Daniel Chirot and Holley Coulter Chirot. Preface by Daniel Chirot, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.