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Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to highlight the social history of the Romanian Academy in order to build an overview of the continuities and discontinuities between the pre-communist, communist, and post-communist periods. The study analyses the RA and other research institutions which support the birth of groups around objectives related to their specific activities or intellectual interests, which emerge due to contextual related political objectives. It attached special importance to the evolution of sciences according to the place occupied in the RA, especially the social sciences and in order to show the two facets of this traditional institution, instance of consecration and place for scientific production.

The first section of this paper (I) deals with the history of the Romanian Academy from its very beginning (the 19th century) to the eve of the World War II in order to present the evolution of the RA from a “literary society” to a “national institute” and the initiatives to become a framework for research and not only an institution for consecration. Ever since the creation of the national state, in which the language and the local history played an important part, the Romanian Academy belonged to the national state project. Hence the members of the Academy were consecrated as the best among the nation. Relations between representatives of various types of culture show that there is a symbolic unbalance between the humanities (e.g. philosophy, history, literary studies, the Arts) and the preoccupations of those who claimed for them the authority of science. The objective is to see the institutional dynamics in the field of humanities and the evolution towards the establishment of research institutions in Romania.
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In this study I investigate the history of the Romanian Academy (RA) in order to sketch an image of its evolution in terms of continuity, rupture and innovations of the post-communist period especially compared to the previous period and to
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the history this institution since its very beginning. I am interested in the evolution of sciences according to the place occupied in the RA, especially the social sciences and humanities and the relations maintained by the RA members with political space (including the presence of those who are also politicians).

The study focuses especially on the Romanian Academy during the communist period and its evolution in the post-communist period in order to show the two facets of this traditional institution, instance of consecration and place for scientific production. It analyses the RA and other research institutions which support the birth of groups around objectives related to their specific activities or intellectual interests, which emerge due to contextual related political objectives.

I try to show the reflection of politics on the Romanian Academy and on other specific institutions (specialized academies, academic journals, etc). Under all political regimes, during all the historical periods, the politics interfere with the purposes that the institution has or the purposes that are being ascribed to it, to the authors and to their works. This influence and this influence’s representations vary from a period to another. Scholars in those times support those objectives assumed by the institution and also those objectives that were added along the time.

Whereas one can easily find many studies that focus on authors and literary productions, there are few concerning the university and the institutions of research within the RA – the two traditional scientific institutions. The studies on the construction of social science disciplines, or humanities are also scarce.

The study of cultural institutions seems to be perfect for documenting the relations established between the intellectual environments and politics which appear even more striking in some institutions that get involved in the conception of certain cultural policies. In the study of relations between the political space and the intellectual space, one must also look at the influence of the modes of organisation have on intellectual trajectories while one develops an analysis of works.

In the first part of my study I come back to roots of the Romanian Academy, in order to present its purposes and its structure, its relations with politics and relations between representatives of various types of culture. These progressively change in what concerns the literary culture and the scientific one from its very beginning to the eve of the Second War. The purpose is to follow the evolution of the RA from a “literary society” to a “national institute” and the initiatives to become a framework for research and not only an institution for consecration. I aim at sketching the institutional dynamics in the field of humanities and the evolution towards the establishment of research institutions in Romania.

1 The Writers’ Union is the central cultural institution attracting pretenders (to the status of a writer) as well as the communist power. Several studies are dedicated after 1989 to writers and literary life. Some are dealing with literary and artistic institutions. Two books only published after 1989 present the activity and the history of the RA. One book gathered documents, work of a researcher (working at an institute of the RA), documents used then by an historian, member of the RA, for a study realized by a historian: Dorina N. Rusu, Istoria Academiei in date (1866-1996) [The Chronology of the Academy in Dates...], Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1997; Dan Bernard, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2009) [The History of the Romanian Academy...], Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2006.
Academic Society as Literary Society

The first “literary society” was created in Brașov (Transylvania), in 1821, by the boyars from Walachia. In the years to come, it was redesigned and while this process of reorganisation took place in Bucharest, in Iasi a new society devoted to “medicine and natural history” was seeing the light of the day. A new “literary society” was established in Bucharest on the eve of the 1848 revolutionary movements under the name The Literary Association of Romania. Other cultural societies (literary and with educational purposes) were created in Transylvania plus other two “medical societies” in Bucharest during the same period of time (starting with 1843 and throughout the first decade of the second half of the 19th century). The histories of Writers’ Union and Romanian Academy show that during this time there were many attempts and few succeeded since no “literary society” survived. All of them aimed at developing the language and the national literature through the association of their authors and the creation of specific establishments. After the unification of Romanian historical provinces in 1859, other projects aiming at setting up societies (“literary, scientific and artistic” in Iasi; “scientific” in Bucharest) enter the public arena through cultural magazines. Simultaneously, Transylvania (provincial region of Austrian Empire at that time) hosted the very first associations for Romanian literature and culture enjoying a legal and institutional framework. At the beginning of the seventh decade of the 19th century the literary men (hommes de lettres) who were also involved in politics proposed the creation of a literary or academic society (and in one case, this was the conclusion of a commission for “writing the history of the country”) and they made various contributions that further became the material resource of the future academy. In 1865 a Society of Science and another society (of Romanian Atheneum) were established focusing on the popularisation of literary and scientific culture.

The politicians responsible with the public education assumed the completion of the idea to create a Literary Romanian Society through a governmental decree in 1866. The decree invested the society with a “special assignment”, namely to produce the orthography, the grammar and the vocabulary of the Romanian language. It opened its doors in 1867 with all symbols of power and of the nation. At the time of its first session, although it had been decided that the Romanian Literary Society should have enlarged its activities by becoming Romanian Academic Society organised in three sections (literary and philological, historical

---

3 The most significant was the Transylvanian Society for Romanian Literature and Culture of Romanian People (ASTRA) that was established in 1861.
4 Among the first and main contributors was Alexandru Ioan Cuza who reigned at that time both Romanian provinces recently united.
5 The project was resuscitated after 1989 when it facilitated a dialogue among the intellectuals, both social and cultural events hosted by the Romanian Athenaeum.
6 Created during the governmental coalition, which provoked the abdication of Alexandru Ioan Cuza.
7 With the participation of literary men from united Romanian provinces of Walachia and Moldova and also from Transylvania.
and archaeological, of natural, empirical, theoretical and medical sciences), its preoccupations related only to the Romanian language and literature. Concerned especially on matters of language and scarcely populated with literary men passionate by history, the Romanian Academic Society remained mainly a literary society. The historical section (created in 1867) addressed the issues raised by the development of a Roman language and literature (the translations were one of the main worries of those that served as members of the historical section). Although the scientific section was included in the structure of the Academic Society since its very beginning, it was created only in 1871 and 1872.

**Romanian Academy – Nation’s Institution**

After Romania obtained the independence from the Ottoman Empire (in 1877), the Academic Society received by law the statute of Academy “by providing it as an annual grant its independence [...] and a place to erect its own building.” Created from a legal point of view in 1879 as a “national institute”, it situated itself from the very beginning on the soil of “national culture, language and history, of literatures, of sciences and of fine arts.” The Romanian Academy (RA) kept its original structure in three sections (literary, historical and scientific) and its own president, but since that moment onwards it comprised permanent members, corresponding members (finding themselves among the titular members) and honorary members (the last two categories could have included foreigners too). Its activities were carried out on a regular basis (in the form of closed sessions for sections and public sessions). Its first honorary member was King Charles I, at the proposal of RA members (previously, members of the Academic Society). Two issues seem to draw attention in this early period of the RA (the last decade of 19th Century and the first from 20th Century). On one hand, the RA worked hardly to strengthen its influence, namely to increase its...
support among the representatives of the Romanian culture from abroad while its members appeared in the public space as representatives of the nation. On the other hand, the peasant question is the field where politicians and historians meet with scientists (physicians) during the peasant riots (from 1888 and 1907).

During the same period, prior to the First World War, the Romanian Academy sought to become popular among wider circles, to “make popular the science [through] editions for the people” while the writers (which belong to the RA) were praising the peasants and the popular culture. The literary section included writers, literary critics and philologists but nevertheless it was only the latter that stuck to the collective projects which formed the core of the institution’s preoccupations (the creation of a dictionary and one of orthography). However, from this period onwards the historical section became more famous, thus gathering a larger number of academicians. Moreover, the men of letters devoted themselves to the study of history, authors of historical writings. This tendency continued during the interwar period too. The ethnography counted to the “traditional” purposes ascribed to the Romanian Academy, as a place for nation building (the creation of a national language and of a national history – emphasis laid on Latinity and its continuation). During this period, writings for the use of the men of letters and their public were published, showing therefore their contribution to the creation of a national culture. The scientific section was created (at the time of the Academic Society) by including two physicians, an engineering mathematician and an economist. They were joined two years later by a mathematician who also was writer. They were all famous mostly because of their political activity (four among them were politicians and three seized the highest office within the state as prime ministers). In spite of the opposition on the part of those who controlled the Society (literary men), the section succeeded few years later in expanding through the integration of a military-technician, of a geologist and of two chemists. But the section was devoted from its beginnings to natural sciences (geology, botany and meteorology) in order to facilitate a better knowledge of the national territory. The purpose that was ascribed to the

14 Participation in celebrations to honour the former political leaders (donuți) of the Romanian provinces, icons during the communist regime.
15 The transfer of the Society of Romanian Athenæum (created for the purpose of organizing public lectures) under the administration of the RA (although a failed project) fit into that tendency of increasing its notoriety and fell within the mode of thinking of the academicians driving their efforts: education of the people of the Romanian nation, “shaping the personalities and orientation towards serious studies” (See Dorina Rusu, Istoria Academiei Române în date (1856-1996) [The Chronology of the Academy in Dates.], op. cit., p. 134).
16 Analele Academiei Române [The Annals of the Romanian Academy], II, tome XXXIX, pp. 142-147.
17 Several literary currents emerged at that time (poporanism și zâmânditorism) were reactionary. See the works of literary and intellectual history of Z. Ornea, Sâmădătorismul, Bucharest, Minerva, [1970] 1971; Id., Poporanismul, Bucharest, Minerva, 1972.
18 A new orthography under debate in 1880 was adopted in 1904 and was instituted by a decree-law in 1907 (Dan Berindei, Istoria Academiei Române (1856-2006), op. cit., p. 158 et 256).
19 The small activity of the literary section during that period is explained by the fact that writers and literary critics disseminate their work outside the RA (ibid., pp. 157-159). However, the historical section had always, since its creation in 1867 (within the Academic Society), a prodigious activity (ibid., pp. 99-107).
20 Catalogues, bibliographies and biographies but also historical works about the world of art and letters.
21 Ibid., p. 108-110.
scientific section of the RA: "the exploration of Romanian provinces from a geographical, physical, agricultural, medical and economical point of view."

The first ones elected in the RA (in 1879) were in their largest majority members of the scientific section: a physicist, a botanist, two physicians and two chemists. In the upcoming years (during the last two decades of the 19th Century) the section comprised a geologist, a mathematician who was at the same time politician, an engineer and a physician (Victor Babes). During the first two decades of the 20th century, were elected three representatives of the empirical-theoretical sciences (mathematicians and physicists), three representatives of the natural sciences (geologists and a biologist) and a physician as well. The historical section was more active than before and also the contribution of the scientific section was not at all negligible, but the preoccupations of scientists were at the "service of the nation". The translation of classics enjoyed an important place among the contributions of the historical sections ever since the time of the Academic society, while the representatives of natural sciences maintained more contacts with the countries from abroad. For "scientists" and for some areas within humanities (history, archaeology or anthropology), the cooperation projects and contacts from abroad meant the organisation of meetings at the European level.

Economists and lawyers (likely to become members of the RA between 1919 and 1948), philosophers and historians formed the historical section during the upcoming period: after the first world war, between the inter-war period and up to the investiture of the communist regime. Philosophers were included in the literary section as well, alongside with writers and literary critics or historians of literature and artists. One could find philosophers (according to their academic instruction) in the historical section as sociologists (one as permanent member and the other as corresponding member). A psychologist (Florian Ștefănescu...
Goață, rector and politician, a demographer-statistician (Sabin Manuilă) and two geographers, elected between 1919 and 1948 as corresponding-members, were also members of this section. The literary section incorporated just in the 30s some artists (especially musicians). The scientific section included, as before, representatives of the technical sciences and of the medical sciences (which were also the most likely to integrate in one or another way to the Academy, after representatives of the natural sciences) but no economists.

Exactly as before, politicians joined the RA, intellectuals well-known for their militant activity (some of them would enjoy political offices as a consequence) and clergy as well.

The preoccupations and contributions of the literary section were not very different (new debates on orthography, confirmed efforts to create a dictionary of the Romanian language, the creation of working instruments) and so were those of the historical section, still standing out (the number of communications and the periodicals proves it), but especially the historians, of which the tutelary figure N. Iorga (famous politician).

30 Members of the literary section, titular members were mainly writers but also specialists in the field of literature, language and arts, and philosophers. The only specialist in arts was a corresponding member within the literary section. George Opreseu was full professor in the history of arts department of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at the University of Bucharest during the interwar period. He was elected corresponding member in 1938. A sculptor was also elected corresponding member.
31 Gheorghe Brătianu, one of the leaders of the National Liberal Party during the 30s and Ion I. C. Brătianu's son (former president of this party since 1909 until his death in 1927), was corresponding-member since 1929. Following an attempt to become permanent member on the recommendation of historian Nicolae Iorga which failed in 1933, he was elected in 1942 on the place that was freed by Iorga's assassination (1940). Nicolae Tălăneanu, former minister of finance and for several times minister of foreign affairs was elected in 1933, after Gheorghe Brătianu's failed attempt. Dan Brătianu, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2006), op. cit., p. 262-263.
32 Two notorious anti-Semites became titular members of the Academy: A.C. Cuza in 1936 and Nichifor Crainic in 1940. Proposed in 1939, the latter did not gather the qualified majority of votes in order to become member of the literary section. Philosopher and theologian, he was member of the "national-legionary" government and of the government chaired by the military dictator Ion Antonescu, respectively. In 1945 he was condemned and sentenced to prison in 1947 (being liberated in 1962). He was excluded from the Academy following his condemnation, but in 1994 he was rehabilitated and his membership restored post-mortem.
33 Among the clergy, one is historian. The election of another is explained by political reasons. It is the case of Nicolae Colau, who was the Bishop of Cluj, elected titular member in 1942 (Dan Brătianu, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2006), op. cit., pp. 192, 198, 263). We count even more members of the clergy among the honorary members alongside politicians and the Royal Family: Queen Elisabeth and Mary, Kings Ferdinand I, Charles I, Michael I (Ibid., pp. 135 and 201, 219-222). In 1936, the first patriarch presented the new translation of the Bible (made by himself and two theologians, Vasile Radu and Gala Galatca, who is also a writer (Ibid., p. 210). The first two patriarchs of the Romanian Orthodox Church were honorary members of the Romanian Academy, Miron Cristea (from 1919, patriarch from 1925) and Nicolae Munteanu (the second patriarch from 1939). But also the patriarchs after 1989 were elected members of the RA. That was not the case of patriarchs during the communist regime.
34 As in the past, the King Charles II was prorogued with the recognition of the Romanian literature by the Academy (Ibid., p. 257 and 259).
35 In the series mentioned above, Studii și cercetări [Studies and Researches], published at the same time with the series Études et recherches of the scientific section. The series Studii și cercetări, were at the beginning dedicated to the publications of the literary section, but later included also texts signed by the members of the scientific section (Ibid., p. 263 and 266).
Besides the commemoration of historical events and political figures of the past and present (and above all the kings) which contributed to the creation of a national tradition, there were the commemorations organized or joined by members of the historical section in order to prove that the RA worked at its own identity-construction by commemoration of its predecessors, which proved that the RA had already occupied its own place in the national building process.

Romanian Academy, Consecration Instance and More...
Attempts in Constructing the Scientific Research

Two characteristics, that influenced each other, formed the distinctive mark of the interwar period, and the post-war period until the installation of the communist regime. One of it consisted in a larger opening toward the international space, especially through the participation in an international scientific space in the process of creation. The other one consisted in the competition coming from the initiatives of other intellectual professionalized environments and the claims stated within the RA by those who considered science as their own.

Its opening toward the international space was expressed at all levels, but concerned mainly members of historical section, especially the historians, and those of the scientific section (in the medical sciences, and also in the natural and empirical-theoretical sciences). At the level of their work, historians, who had always been interested in constructing national history, were interested during that period in collecting archives from abroad about Romanians’ history. They were also in charge with “schools” created abroad, in Rome and Paris, which functioned under the RA ward ship. This opening toward the foreign space followed and had often been provoked if not encouraged by the process of organisation of an intellectual space at the international level and by the communication frameworks created in the benefit of those who called themselves “scientists”.

When several international societies were created (between 1919 and the first half of 1920s), the RA participated as the central cultural institution of the national State, enjoying the full recognition by the State. The RA sent its representatives which participated in the activities of several international organisms. In 1919, two of its representatives participated in the conference which gathered representatives of the Allies and which helped at the creation of the International Council of Researches for the Cooperation in the Exact and Natural Sciences. The scientific section of the RA adhered to it in June 1920. The RA also participated in the events preparing the creation of the International Union of the Academies for the Cooperation in Historical Sciences (during 1919). The representatives of the

36 The interwar period (until the installation of the communist regime) is seen as the most prolific period of the RA when its prestige reached the highest point.
37 On these two societies and other professional organizations created at international level in the intellectual space, see Gisèle Sapino, «L’internationalisation des champs intellectuels dans l’entre-deux-guerres: facteurs professionnels et politiques», in Id. (dir.), L’Espace intellectuel en Europe. De la formation des États-nations à la mondialisation (XXe-XIe siècle) [Intellectual Space in Europe. From the Formation of National States to Globalisation (19th-21st Centuries)], Paris, La Découverte, 2009, p. 111-146.
38 The first representatives of the RA were a numismatist, Mihai Şuţu, and a linguist and poet, Ovidiu Densusianu (Dan Berindei, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2006), op. cit., p. 228).
RA within the International Union of the Academies for the Cooperation in Historical Sciences were mainly well-known historians (especially the archaeologist Vasile Pârvan and his former professor, Nicolae Iorga, ten years older than him). In 1923, the Commission of Intellectual Cooperation of the Society of Nations (created in 1922)\(^{39}\) addressed the RA, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the demand to present itself as mediator for the Romanian intellectuals\(^{40}\). That ministry offered financial support for the work of one of its representatives, the physician Gheorghe Marinescu (founder of the Romanian school of neurology). The lack of the necessary financial resources and of the support of the specific political institutions, led to the impossibility of the RA to participate in other artistic or scientist international societies\(^{41}\).

Academic institutions of France were the privileged interlocutors of the RA. Scientific relations were integrated in the bilateral relations of the two countries. Other interlocutors of the RA were the Royal Society of London and the ones coming from the United States. Invitations came from the West-European space and more precisely from North-European countries and Belgium. Only in 1926 did the invitations come from the Soviet space.

Financial difficulties prevented participation in several international congresses during the 1920s. The financial situation of the RA improved during the 1930s and particularly at the end of 1930s. Nevertheless, members of the RA could not participate in a certain number of events despite the fact that there were not many of them able to maintain relations with foreign scientific societies and to participate in events of international scientific world, even if the number of invitations increased. Financial demands were addressed to Ministry of Arts or the Ministry of Public Education, but also to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to which the RA requested in 1928 and 1929 the creation of a bureau for this purpose\(^{42}\). During the 1920s and the 1930s, the RA only hosted five international meetings\(^{43}\): the International Congress of Byzantine Studies, in 1924; the International Committee of Historical Sciences, in 1936 (the initiative belonged to Nicolae Iorga); the Balkan Congress of Mathematics in 1937. The International Congress of Sociology scheduled in 1939 at Bucharest, at the proposal of Dimitrie Gusti, did not take place because the War started\(^{44}\).


\(^{40}\) Dan Berindei, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2006), op. cit., pp. 211 and 229. Hârlușe Vacarescu [Elena Vacareșcu], French writer of Romanian descent, two times awarded by the French Academy, participated at this organism.

\(^{41}\) The RA did not participate to the different "unions" specialized in the empirical-theorized sciences domain. Invited by the Royal Academy of Belgium to participate at the project of an International Union of Art Academies, the RA sent once its representative to discuss on this project (Vasile Pârvan). The Ministry of Arts at which the RA asked a financial aid did not give its support (Ibid., p. 228-229).

\(^{42}\) Proposal which remained without results (Ibid., p. 235).

\(^{43}\) Two international congresses in medicine are organized in Romania at the end of the 1920s (Ibid., p. 271).

\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 244-245, 248-249.
Apart from the participation in the name of the RA, well-known intellectuals and members of the RA, mostly representatives of disciplines belonging to the three sections, participated individually to specific international institutions\(^\text{45}\). Except for the writers who participated in both political and cultural events, the representatives of the RA received the invitations individually\(^\text{46}\). In conclusion, one can talk about an elite, taking into account their limited number and their reputation. Moreover, they also succeeded in obtaining their fame abroad\(^\text{47}\). Despite the proclamation of the autonomy obtained in the interwar period, it was the government who has deciding who were the representatives of the RA for the international congresses\(^\text{48}\).

Between 1941 and 1942, the relations of the RA were deployed particularly within the space built by the Romania-Germany relations (first and foremost) during the World War II\(^\text{49}\). Starting from 1945, those who were invited by the RA came from Soviet Union, and so were invitations to which the RA responded. At the same time, the RA did not respond anymore, like in the past, to the invitations coming from its “traditional” interlocutors and from other West European countries. The Western space continued to be open to a limited number of scientists while the Soviet space was more and more open\(^\text{50}\). The expectations were that the RA played the role of mediator between those two spaces\(^\text{51}\). From

\(^{45}\) The international congresses in which representatives (mostly titular members) of the RA participated during the 1920s and the 1930s fell within the following disciplines: mathematics, astronomy, zoology, natural history, philosophy, history, archeology, art history, anthropology, social sciences and sociology.

\(^{46}\) Their relations abroad stem to date from a previous period, before their admission in the RA, since they were educated mainly in the Western Europe’s capitals.

\(^{47}\) The most well-known intellectuals circulating the most abroad during the 1920s and the 1930s are: Ion Petrovici, Lucian Blaga and Sextili Fugaru, two philosophers and a linguistic which are members of the literary section, and a writer (Mihail Sadoveanu); N. Iorga, Vasile Pârvan, Dimitrie Gusti, members of the historical section; a physician, a representative of the natural sciences, a mathematician and a physicist, members of the historical section.

\(^{48}\) One of the most well-known physicians expressed his wish concerning the participation of the RA in activities of international institutions of the scientific world with the support of the State. He also expressed his “wish” concerning “the appointment of delegates to the congresses [...] not by the governments [...] but by the Academy or similar scientific institutions”. He added to his wish the reproach that some appointments made by the politicians are not always appropriated (Analele Academiei, II, tome XLIX, p. 51, in Dan Berindei, Istitu Academiat Române (1866-2006), op. cit., p. 235).

\(^{49}\) Romania (the government under the rule of Ion Antonescu) adhURED to the Tripartite Pact (reuniting Germany, Italy and Japan) the 23th November 1940 and to the Anti-Comintern Pact (constituted in 1936 by Germany and Japan) the 25th November 1941.

\(^{50}\) The RA participated, through some of its members, to an international congress (of mechanics, organized in Paris in 1946). Difficulties caused by the international policy (difficulties about obtaining the visas) led to a proposal coming from the General Secretary of the RA in 1948: the RA should be represented at international level by its members from abroad (correspondent members or members of honour). Dimitrie Gusti was invited in June 1945 by the Academy of Moscow. Between 1946 and 1947, Dimitrie Gusti traveled in United States (especially) and France. He deployed an intense activity in order to make known his projects to the international institutions: his project regarding the creation of the a social and economic institute within the United Nations, his proposal to the International Union of the Academies for the cooperation in Historical Sciences concerning a “dictionary of distinctive social characteristic of the nations” (Dan Berindei, Istitu Academiat Române (1866-2006), op. cit., p. 251-253).

\(^{51}\) In 1948, the International Union of the Academies for the cooperation in Historical Sciences made a request to the RA for that to argue in front of the Soviet Union’s Academy of Sciences for its affiliation to that society (Ibid., p. 252).
the 1930s, the RA had to accommodate the competition within and outside the institution, coming from those who claimed for them the authority of science. Competition within and outside the RA tended to combine in favour of the power obtained by the science. The competition coming from similar projects was in liaison with the opening toward the extra-national space, which marked the academic and scientific world during the 1930s.

In 1935, the Academy of Science of Romania (ASR) was created as an association52, as the first sign of discontent with the place occupied by the scientific section within the RA53. The RA denounced the use of the term “academy”, for which the RA claimed the monopoly. The academicians protested and called for support from the King and the government but also from the large public54. Their wishes were resolved by a decree-law from 1938 which instituted that the monopoly of use of the term “academy” as denomination of an institution belonged to the RA, and so did the right to decide if another institution could use that term55. That is why the Ministry of Agriculture asked to the RA to authorize the use of this term when in 1941 the agricultural sciences created an academy, the Academy of Agriculture of Romania56.

Aside from the competition from outside with the creation of similar institutions or only contestant projects (a tendency of fragmentation which would continue under communist rule could be remarked then), the new relations between the human sciences and the empirical sciences threatened from inside the established order. As mentioned above, the most important initiatives for power, weakening RA, were primarily designed by members of the RA, mainly from the scientific section. Same initiatives came from some members of the historical section, who got themselves noticed through their discourses in favour of an empirical science57.

52 The term of “association” did not mean at that time “civic association” as we understand this term nowadays (after 1989).
53 The majority of those who initiate that academy were correspondent members of the RA, representatives of natural sciences, formal and technical sciences. The majority of the members of the ASR were also members of the RA. The structure of the ASR (ten sections) included history and philosophy of science (one section) and social sciences (another section). See Elvira Botez, “Academia de Științe din România. Istorieul ei” [The Academy of Sciences from Romania. Its History], Noema, VI, 2007.
54 Protests were expressed in March 1935 inside the institution on the occasion of the creation of the Academy of Sciences. Other protests were formulated in 1936 when the RA addressed memories to the King and to the government. The RA also launched a brochure on that matter. See Dan Bieruiță, Istoria Academiei Române (1866-2006), op. cit., p. 213.
55 After a process between the RA and the ASR, the Academy of Sciences took the name of Institute of Sciences of Romania, in October 1938. However, two years later, the concurrent institution took its initial name, due to a decree-law from October 1940 (Elvira Botez, “Academia de Științe din România. Istorieul ei”, art. cit. See infra).
56 The creation of that academy was preceded, as in the case of the RA, by the creation of a “society”, the National Society of Agriculture, in 1913. Before the creation of that society two specialized schools named by the term of “academy” were created.
57 We can mention at least Dimitrie Gusti (see infra) and P. P. Negulescu (P. P. Negulescu, Reforma școlară și educațională [The Reform of Education] [1922], cited by Elvira Botez, “Academia de Științe din România. Istorieul ei”, art. cit.) among the most well-known. The two of them were philosophers by their formation and members of the historical section of the RA (see supra).
With rare exceptions, members of the scientific section were claiming the reorganization of the Academy and the enlargement of its structure. Members of the literary section or of the historical section, but also members of the scientific section agreed at the end of the 1920s and in the 1930s to sustain a new division institutionalizing the differences which appeared between representatives of varied disciplines within the three traditional sections. Thus at the end of 1920s, a philologist (General Secretary of the RA and his future president) and a biologist (then president of the RA) sustained a rise in the number of sections which should appear, especially through the separation between the historical sciences and the science society, and between, on the one hand, philology and literature, and arts, on the other hand. But at the middle of 1930s and during the following decade, the power of the dominant culture (language, literature, and history) inside the RA was openly contested by the members of the scientific section. The importance obtained by positive sciences and technical sciences was then emphasized (in 1934) and the “absence of works of positive science” deplored (in 1946). Somebody sustained that the RA should give an orientation to the science (a representative of natural sciences, in 1934) and should be not only an institution for consecration but also one for scientific production (a philosopher converted to sociology, in 1941). The projects of reorganization marked the second half of the 1930s. A modification dated in 1935 increased the number of members – titular members and correspondent members of each section – and instituted the separation by disciplines, conserving the old division by sections (three) and their names. The division between disciplines was still difficult to see. Another project from 1939 had as an objective to achieve the modifications made in 1935. The project consisted in expanding the names of the three sections by including the names of the integrated disciplines.

Historians seemed to be subjected to the competition of those who were, like them, members of the historical section, but were representatives of the nascent social sciences who tended to approach the “positive science” of the representatives of natural sciences. The new situation seemed to affect especially the historians who were dominant in the previous periods (the writers had their one organization, the Romanian Writers’ Society, set up in 1909). The competition, particularly from representatives from the natural sciences, to which the representatives of the traditionally academic culture were exposed, was in connection with the opening toward the foreign space. Representatives from the new social sciences

59 Ibid., p. 292 and 302.
60 Ibid., pp. 301-302. Dimitrie Gusti also sustained the “organization of collective researches about the land and the Romanian people” (p. 302). During the interwar period and later, the second half of the 1940s, the prizes for works on subjects which were established by the RA attracted a limited number of authors (Ibid., pp. 299-301).
61 Ibid., p. 303.
joined those who were members of the scientific section, especially the representatives from natural sciences, in their attempt to organize the RA as an institution for science production and to develop the scientific methodology.

During the second half of the 1930s appeared the idea of creating a “National Council of the Scientific Research” under the ward ship of the RA. Those who pleaded for the creation of that institution, especially representatives of natural sciences, were invoking the existence of similar institutions abroad and “the laboratories’ misery”. Even if ideas and projects launched a number of times, that proposition remained without results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berescu-Drăghicescu (Adina), Bozgan (Ovidiu), O istorie a Universităţii din Bucureşti 1864–2004 [A history of the University of Bucharest…], Bucharest, University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2004;

Beriudei (Dan), Istoria Academiei Române (1856–2006) [The History of the Romanian Academy…], Bucharest, University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2006;

Botez (Elvira), “Academia de Științe din România. Istorieul ei” [Academy of Sciences from Romania. Its History], Noema, VI, 2007;

Botez (Elvira), “Scurt istoric al Asociaţiei române pentru înămintarea şi răspândirea Știinţelor” [A Brief History of the Romanian Association for the Progress and Diffusion of Sciences], Noema, IV, I, 2005;

Gheorghiu (Mihai Dinu), «La construction littéraire d’une identité nationale» [The literary construction of the national identity], Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, 98, 1993, p. 34-44;


Ionoşi (Ion), O istorie a filosofiei româneşti în relaţia ei cu literatura [A History of Romanian Philosophy in its Relationship with Literature], Cluj, Biblioteca Apostrof, 1996;

Rusu (Dorin), Istoria Academiei în date (1866–1996) [The Chronology of the Academy in Dates…], Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1997;


63 The idea of creating a national structure dedicated to research in applied sciences, having as objective to guide State’s policies, and the one of creating an “institute” for the support of the “laboratories”, to attract funds from private sector, were formulated earlier by one of the members of the RA but outside the institution: Ludovic Mraze, president of the Romanian Association for the Progress of Sciences [Asociaţia pentru înămintarea Știinţelor], at a congress of that association in 1934 (see Elvira Botez, “Scurt istoric al Asociaţiei române pentru înămintarea şi răspândirea Știinţelor” [Brief History of the Romanian Association for Progress and Diffusion of Sciences], Noema, IV, I, 2005, p. 149). The idea of creating a national structure dedicated to social science was also launched by Dimitrie Gusă (who had created in 1921 the Romanian Social Institute) in 1936.

64 A project dated in 1937 belonged to a representative of natural sciences, Emil Racoviţă, former president of the RA (Dan Berindei, Istoria Academiei Române (1866–2000), op. cit., p. 272). Those “laboratories” and an important number of institutes which defined their activities as research had functioned as integrated structures to the faculties (especially of the University of Bucharest).
INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND THE ROLES OF PEER-REVIEWED SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

HENRIETA ANIȘOARA ȘERBAN

Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations celebrates more than a decade of interdisciplinary and peer-reviewed presence among scientific communities. The diversity of articles published called upon aspects related to the heritage brought about by humanities, suggested new trends in political science, or international relations, or emphasized the pillars of fundamental research. Sometimes interdisciplinary research is the result of creativity, and other times it is the outcome of the effort to pursue a subject through all the interferences, or through the most interesting ones, through all the influences, or through the most significant, throughout consequences or through the most intriguing. The scientific enterprise requires specialization, foundations, relevance and creativity. Science is viewed in the history of ideas as the rational and objective enterprise built on the rules, principles and methods of a domain. But where do they lead us? For some specialists, science is still a sum of competing disciplinary theories. Interdisciplinary approaches to science affect both the visions of science and the visions in science. The criticism emphasizes the appurtenance of the scientists to disunity schools of science, bringing to the fore various arguments concerning the role and the importance of specialization. But where is this insulation in specialization leading scientific performance?

The Image of Science, the Unity of Science and Interdisciplinary Views

The interest for connections and correlations in science is both important and diverse. Thus, we can differentiate among interdisciplinary approach (meaning that the scientific collaboration creates a new discipline within which the initial disciplines are unchanged), multidisciplinary research (the same problem is discussed employing knowledge from a multitude of disciplines), crossdisciplinary
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investigation (when the resources from a discipline are borrowed to serve a project belonging to another discipline) and transdisciplinary research (a synthetic work including principles, theories, methods etc. from all the disciplines concerned with that topic of research). Since the metaphor is the fastest and shortest way to acquiring new meanings, in all these cases, the multidisciplinary, inter-, cross-, or trans-investigations are to revalue the role of the metaphor (cartographic, linguistic, socio-political, architectural etc.) in the research imagination.

**Political Science is Interdisciplinary:**

*Interdisciplinary Aspects in Sciences*

Political science and international relations are the result of interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, crossdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches. All the sub-domains of political science – political philosophy and political theory, comparative politics, public administration, public law and political methodology – are all the results of interdisciplinary researches. The main political theories come from philosophy. But history and the historical sense of ethics play an important role, too. We have a case of interdisciplinary research combined with all the above mentioned situations of inter-relationships between disciplines. Political philosophy is a branch of philosophy and all the philosophical methods apply to the study of legitimate government, laws, rights, freedom and politics in general, some of the information interpreted come from history, while other aspects, or data (not only these of political philosophy, but the aspects concerning political science in general) send to inter-relationships with humanities in general, with sociology, with law, and public administration.

Interdisciplinary endeavours are the reality in all the modern fields, but as a subject it belongs to the philosophy of science. When Thomas S. Kuhn interpreted, about half a century ago, the inter-relationships between the history of ideas, the history of science and the philosophy of science, he was studying interdisciplinary interferences, consequences and results. Although he noticed that the history and the philosophy of science have significantly different objectives, he was stating that within a process of investigating interdisciplinary relations between these fields. At Thomas S. Kuhn, the philosophy of science is founded in the comparative investigation of philosophy, physics and history, all disciplines producing knowledge, but as different as they are, as scientific disciplines, all have value and relevance. He understood that what has turned him from physics and philosophy to history, was the discovery that science, present in the historical sources, which seems a very different enterprise from the one implicitly present in the pedagogy of science, and explicitly, in the philosophical explanations of the scientific method

---

In other words, Thomas Kuhn found out that history can be relevant for the philosopher of science, as, we may add, it is relevant for the philosopher of politics, state, government, institutions, etc. As Kuhn saw the matter, we also can see that history is a resource, providing problems and intuitions. In a similar relation to that between history and the philosophy of science, the historical perspectives in the philosophy of politics, state, government, rights, etc. offer two types of advantages: the contextualization of achievements in the progress of knowledge and advantages following the identification of regularities and irregularities in the history of the processes of knowledge of politics, leading to the identification of rules, laws, etc. For Kuhn, becoming a philosopher means to acquire an intellectual training as to assess the relevant problems and the techniques for their solutions. To learn to be a historian is to attain a special training, too, but the results of the two types of training have diverse results. Indirectly stated as following in Kuhn’s study, the idea is that philosophers can conceive when confronted with the Gestalt diagram more than the alternating perception of the rabbit and of the duck – a “duck-rabbit”, both interdisciplinary (transdisciplinary, actually) and intriguing. This concept is interesting for modernity, interested in rigorous delimitations, but it is interesting for postmodernity, interested – as main characteristics relevant for this discussion – in the language and visionary games. The subtle analytical distinctions are central in the philosophical approach and uninteresting for historians. Yet, we must notice, some theories, methods, ideas and views are mutually relevant. To the same extent as there is the inter-disciplinary attraction between philosophy and history, there is an inter-disciplinary separation.

Thomas Kuhn understood the drama involved in preparing an article of philosophy: “They start from a problem and a key to solution, both often met in the critique of another philosopher. These are examined – on paper, mentally, or in discussions with peers – waiting for the moment when the author feels it is the high time to write. Most often, this feeling is incorrect and the author turns back to re-examining the subject, until, finally, it is written, almost as if all of a sudden.” For Kuhn, contemporary philosophy of science could be more relevant for the historian of science if the history of science had a more important role, if the evolution of ideas were taken more into consideration, along with the scientific methods and techniques. Interdisciplinary research can not only make a priority from investigating the evolution of ideas, but it can also stimulate this evolution, in political science, too. The changing patterns of the scientific education, of its institutionalization, of its moral aspect or of financing are dire obstacles to scientific evolution.

Philosophy is central to interdisciplinary research in many domains. Nevertheless, unlike other philosophical sub-domains, philosophy of science and philosophy

---

2 Ibidem, p. 5.
3 Ibidem, p. 7.
5 Ibidem, p. 12.
of law are the only ones addressing domains where the philosopher qua philosopher knows very little. And it is more probable for the philosophers of law than for the philosophers of science that they have been trained specifically and significantly in the field representing their object of study and to analyze the same data as the scientist about the domain of her or his interest. Kuhn notices that the magistrates and jurists read philosophy more than scientists read philosophy of science. Political scientists and the specialists of international relations turn to philosophy, sociology, history, law, psychology, etc. attempting to bring fundamental and more interdisciplinary theories closer to the realities of the states and of the world, and to resolving states’ and individuals’ problems.

Peer Review Process in Relation to the Interdisciplinary Roles of Journals

Although the value of the peer-review is different from journal to journal, “the value of peer review is not so much as a means of filtering poor manuscripts (though it is helpful to have the backing of several reviewers when faced with an irate author); instead, peer review is valuable as a means of enhancing the quality of what is published.” Peer-review can also set back highly creative or highly interdisciplinary studies, when it is prone to an extremely specialized approach and when the reviewers are neither diverse enough in their interests nor up to date enough in the particular sub-domain open by that interdisciplinary study. Assessing the quality of research should not be pursued to the detriment of another aim, which is communicating perspectives of the world, maintain the scientific dialogue, acknowledging new paradigms and not mere communication of information, or a mechanical application of theories to situations, etc. The role of the peer-reviewed journals is to offer a voice as well to the mainstream studies as to the more innovative ones, contributing to a lively scientific community and to the evolution of science.

Schaffner (1994) listed several roles of peer-reviewed academic journals: building a collective knowledge base, communicating information, validating the quality of research, distributing rewards and building scientific communities.

Most of these roles are overlapping, and most of them are self-explanatory. The first role, building a collective knowledge base, is considered the most important, while in our view the most important is the stimulating role of the studies published, which continue the dialogue in the field and lead to the evolution of science. The role of archive of knowledge is related to communicating information. Indeed, in this respect the peer-review process in very important in

---

6 Ibidem, p. 15.  
maintaining a good scientific level among the studies published, as well as the speed of the information, theories, paradigms, etc. dissemination and the interactivity of the scientists. The less suggestive role is “distributing rewards.” It refers to the contribution of peer-reviewed journals to the hierarchy appreciation, intellectual property and worth, and intellectual credit of the published specialists. The peer-reviewed “journals still fulfill the role of documenting the paternity of intellectual property.”

Interdisciplinary approaches to science affect both the visions of science and the visions in science, provided that they support the unity of science. Peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journals create scientific communities where the dream of the unity of science is seen in renewed meanings.
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