



UNIVERSITATEA DIN BUCUREȘTI

DANIEL CHIROT

Doctor Honoris Causa

DANIEL CHIROT
DOCTOR HONORIS CAUSA





What can we do as academics, as teachers, as writers? Few of us ever get the kind of political power that would make a direct difference. But for those in the humanities and social sciences, we can look back and try to understand why some intellectuals resisted, why others did not, and what we can do to give more support to those who are fighting for the liberal Enlightenment. Then we can teach what we have learned, and prepare the young to take a stronger stand in that direction. That is not what everyone can or should do, but at least those of us engaged in the social sciences and humanities who study the modern world should.

Daniel Chirot



Laudatio | Daniel Chirot

Domnule Profesor Daniel Chirot,
Domnule Rector,
Domnule Președinte al Senatului,
Distinși membri ai comunității academice,
Stimați colegi,

Îmi revine onoarea, dar și plăcerea, de a vorbi astăzi despre o personalitate din domeniul științelor sociale, pe care, la propunerea Facultății de Științe Politice, Universitatea din București o onorează prin acordarea înaltului titlu de Doctor Honoris Causa. Daniel Chirot, profesor la Școala de Studii Internaționale „Henry M. Jackson” din cadrul Universității Statului Washington, cu sediul la Seattle, Statele Unite ale Americii, este o personalitate de prim rang în mediul academic din S.U.A. și se bucură de o largă recunoaștere internațională. În lunga sa carieră academică, profesorul Chirot a publicat un număr impresionant de lucrări care au contribuit în mod hotărâtor la dezvoltarea unor teme importante din diverse domenii ale cunoașterii, precum: sociologia istorică – cu accent pe studiul schimbărilor sociale, economice și politice, conflictul etnic și religios, violența politică, tiraniile moderne sau revoluțiile și consecințele acestora. Dincolo de impactul operei profesorului Chirot la nivel internațional, trebuie amintit faptul că domnia sa a contribuit și contribuie la diseminarea cunoștințelor de specialitate despre România. Studiile și articolele sale pe teme românești, sau care plasează evoluții din spațiul românesc în context sud-est sau central european, au contribuit și contribuie în mod semnificativ la creșterea interesului specialiștilor din întreaga lume pentru teme românești.

Daniel Chirot a absolvit Universitatea Harvard (Cambridge, Massachusetts) în anul 1964, specializarea studii sociale (Social Studies), și a susținut doctoratul în sociologie la Universitatea Columbia (New York) în anul 1973. Cariera profesională și-a început-o ca lector universitar în sociologie la Universitatea din Statul Carolina de Nord cu sediul la Chapel Hill (1971–74). Și-a continuat cariera la Universitatea din Statul Washington cu sediul la Seattle, unde, începând cu anul 1975, a urcat treptele academice de la lector universitar la profesor universitar în sociologie (1980). Din anul 1980 este profesor universitar (studii internaționale și sociologie) la aceeași universitate. A predat, ca profesor invitat, la universități din S.U.A. și din străinătate, dintre care amintim:

National Taiwan University (1989), Northwestern University, Chicago (1993), University of California at San Diego (1996), Bogazici University, Istanbul (1997) sau University of Texas at Austin (2007).

Decizia Senatului Universității din București de a aproba propunerea înaintată de Facultatea de Științe Politice privind acordarea titlului onorific de Doctor Honoris Causa profesorului Daniel Chirot este motivată de îndeplinirea cerințelor impuse de *Regulamentul de acordare a titlurilor onorifice*. Prin urmare, este vorba despre o personalitate din afara sistemului Universității, care nu este alumnus al acesteia și care a contribuit semnificativ la dezvoltarea cunoașterii, culturii și civilizației. În același timp, este vorba despre o personalitate care a contribuit în mod hotărâtor la inițierea sau strângerea legăturilor științifice și culturale, la nivel instituțional, dintre țara sa și România și este public recunoscută pe plan internațional.

În cele ce urmează voi prezenta, pe scurt, din păcate, având în vedere timpul pe care îl avem la dispoziție, argumentele menite să susțină propunerea de acordare a acestui înalt titlu profesorului Daniel Chirot. Astfel, profesorul Chirot este o personalitate care a contribuit semnificativ la dezvoltarea cunoașterii, culturii și civilizației. În susținerea acestei afirmații, amintim că lucrările sale privind schimbările sociale, economice și politice, conflictele etnice și religioase, violența politică, tiraniile moderne, sau revoluțiile moderne și consecințele acestora se bucură de o largă circulație internațională. După cum se poate observa și din lista de lucrări inclusă în broșura tipărită special pentru acest eveniment, operele profesorului Chirot au fost publicate de către edituri de mare prestigiu, precum: Princeton University Press, Cambridge University Press, University of California Press (Berkeley), University of Washington Press (Seattle), Oxford University Press, Cornell University Press, New York University Press, Central European University Press, Routledge, Sage/Pine Forge Press, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Westview (Boulder, Colorado) etc. În afara lucrărilor publicate în volum (cărți și capitole de carte), trebuie menționate și numeroasele studii, articole și recenzii publicate în reviste academice de mare circulație din S.U.A. și din întreaga lume, dintre care amintim: *Social Forces*, *Southeastern Europe*, *International Interactions*, *London Times Literary Supplement*, *Sociology: Reviews of New Books*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Contemporary Sociology*, *Sociology and Social Research*, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, *American Historical Review*, *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, *Journal of Social History*,

Canadian-American Slavic Studies, Journal of Asian Studies, Slavic Review, Journal of World History, American Political Science Review, Journal of Modern History, Revue Canadienne des Etudes sur le Nationalisme, German Politics and Society, Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism, Journal of Political Psychology, Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Slavonica, Journal of Cold War Studies, Comparative Political Studies, Contemporary Sociology, Perspectives on Politics etc.

Lucrările profesorului Chirot se regăsesc în numeroase bibliografii ale cursurilor predate în universități din întreaga lume. Unul dintre volumele pe care le-a coordonat, *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economic and Political Change from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989; ediția a II-a, 1991), tradus în limba română în anul 2004, este prezent în majoritatea bibliografiilor cursurilor care tratează schimbările politice și economice, precum și procesele de modernizare din Europa Centrală și de Sud-Est predate în principalele universități din regiune. Cartea sa, *How Societies Change* (Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1994), a devenit o lucrare canonică în studiul schimbărilor sociale. În anul 2012 a fost publicată o a doua ediție, complet revăzută, a acestei lucrări, care a fost tradusă în limbile română (1996), italiană (2010) și albaneză (2013). Volumul *The Shape of the New: Four Big Ideas That Made the Modern World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), semnat de Scott L. Montgomery și Daniel Chirot este unul dintre volumele considerate de prestigioasa publicație *The New York Times* a fi printre cele 100 de cărți notabile ale anului 2015 și se află pe lista celor mai bune cărți din 2015 a *Bloomberg Businessweek*. O nouă ediție, în tiraj de masă, a acestui volum a fost publicată de Princeton University Press în anul 2016. Volumul a fost tradus în limba coreeană (Seoul: Chaek-se-sang, 2018) și, recent, în limba chineză (2019). De asemenea, Daniel Chirot a fondat prestigioasa revistă de specialitate *East European Politics and Societies* (1985), fiind și primul redactor șef al acestei reviste (1986–89). Revista a fost fondată prin intermediul unui grant acordat pe o perioadă de trei ani (1985–88) de American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) din fonduri ale Departamentului de Stat al Statelor Unite și administrat de către ACLS și profesorul Chirot.

În continuare, vom arăta că, pe lângă faptul că a contribuit în mod hotărâtor la inițierea sau strângerea legăturilor științifice, culturale

sau politice, la nivel instituțional, dintre țara sa și România, Daniel Chirot este o personalitate public recunoscută pe plan internațional. În acest sens, trebuie spus că, în calitatea sa oficială de cadru didactic la Universitatea din Statul Carolina de Nord cu sediul la Chapel Hill și apoi la Universitatea din Statul Washington cu sediul la Seattle – unde predă neîntrerupt începând cu anul 1975, profesorul Chirot a contribuit și contribuie activ la diseminarea cunoștințelor de specialitate despre România. Numeroasele sale studii și articole pe teme românești – sociologie, politică, economie – sau care plasează schimbări sociale, politice sau economice din spațiul românesc în context central sau sud-est european au contribuit în mod semnificativ la creșterea interesului specialiștilor de peste hotare pentru teme românești și, mai ales, la inițierea sau strângerea legăturilor științifice dintre cercetători din S.U.A. și din întreaga lume și România. Având în vedere prestigiul internațional și circulația largă a operei profesorului Chirot, putem afirma că scrierile sale pe teme românești au contribuit în mod semnificativ la creșterea vizibilității României ca obiect de studiu în S.U.A. și la nivel internațional. Cartea sa, *Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony* (New York: Academic Press, 1976), traducere în limba română, București: Corint, 2002, este un exemplu grăitor pentru cadrul teoretic și metodologic inovativ aplicat pentru cercetarea schimbării sociale și culturale în spațiul românesc.

Dintre celelalte scrieri ale sale pe teme românești, amintim: “A review of Romanian peasant studies”, *Peasant Studies Newsletter* 1:1 (1972), pp. 3–8; “Sociology in Romania”, *Social Forces* 51:1 (1972), pp. 99–102; “The market, tradition and peasant rebellion: the case of Romania in 1907”, *American Sociological Review* 40:4 (1975), pp. 428–444 (în colaborare cu Charles Ragin); “The Romanian communal village: an alternative to the Zadruga”, in *The Zadruga: The Extended Family of the Balkans. Essays by Philip E. Mosely and Essays in His Honor*, R. F. Byrnes, coord., (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1975), pp. 139–159; “Neoliberal and social democratic theories of development: the Zeletin-Voinea debate concerning Romania’s prospects in the 1920s and its contemporary importance”, in *Social Change in Romania, 1860–1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation*, Kenneth Jowitt, coord. (Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1978), pp. 31–52; “A Romanian prelude to contemporary debates about development”, *Review* 2:1 (1978), pp. 115–123; “Social change in Communist Romania”, *Social Forces*

57:2 (1978), pp. 457–499; “Corporatism, socialism, and development in Romania”, *Amsterdam Sociologisch tijdschrift* 5:3 (1978), pp. 389–409; “Henri H. Stahl”, in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*; Biographical Supplement (New York: The Free Press, 1979), pp. 436–437; “The corporatist model and socialism: notes on Romanian development”, *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), pp. 363–381.

La sfârșitul anilor 1980, la lucrările citate mai sus se adaugă un articol critic privind situația dezastruoasă din România lui Nicolae Ceaușescu: “Romania: Ceaușescu’s Last Folly”, *Dissent* (Summer 1988), pp. 271–275. Urmează numeroase scrieri privind schimbările politice și economice din România și din Europa Centrală și de Est declanșate de schimbările de regim din anul 1989: “What Happened in Eastern Europe in 1989?”, în Daniel Chirot, coord., *The Crisis of Leninism and the Decline of the Left: The Revolutions of 1989* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), pp. 3–32; republicat în: Kyu-taik Kim, coord., *The Future of Socialism* (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1990), pp. 9–36; J. A. Goldstone, coord., *Revolutions* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1994), pp. 165–180; Vladimir Tismăneanu, coord., *The Revolutions of 1989* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 19–50; “Romania”, în Joel Krieger, coord., *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 797–798, ed. a II-a (2001), pp. 739–740; “Who Influenced Whom? Xenophobic Nationalism in Germany and Romania”, în Roland Schönfeld, coord., *Deutschland und Südosteuropa – Aspekte de Beziehungen im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Südosteuropa-Studie* 58 (Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1997), pp. 37–57; “Is Civil Society Enough? Comparing Romania and the American South”, in Robert Hefner, coord., *Democratic Civility: The History and Cross-Cultural Possibility of a Modern Political Ideal* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, 1998), pp. 175–202; “How Much Does the Past Count? Interpreting the Romanian Transition’s Political Successes and Economic Failures”, în Werner Baer și Joseph Love, coord., *Liberalization and Its Consequences* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2000), pp. 103–124.

Trebuie subliniat încă o dată efortul constant făcut de profesorul Chirot în vederea difuzării operei sociologice românești la nivel internațional. În acest efort se înscrie și traducerea în limba engleză (în colaborare cu Holley Coulter Chirot) a unei lucrări fundamentale a sociologului Henri H. Stahl, publicată sub titlul *Traditional Romanian Village Communities: The Transition from the Communal to the Capitalist Mode of Production*

in the Danube Region (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980; ed. a II-a, 2008).

În ce primește faptul că profesorul Chirot este o personalitate public recunoscută pe plan internațional, credem că prezentarea succintă a carierei sale academice de excepție și larga difuziune a operei sale la nivel global dovedesc cu prisosință acest lucru. Considerăm însă că o serie de date privind bursele, granturile, prezența în asociații profesionale și colective de redacție, precum și consultanța de specialitate oferită în cadrul unor proiecte internaționale de anvergură susțin afirmația noastră. Astfel, pe parcursul îndelungatei sale cariere a obținut granturi din partea unor instituții sau fundații prestigioase, precum: American Council of Learned Societies (grant pe trei ani, 1985–88, pentru înființarea revistei *East European Politics and Societies*); John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, una dintre cele mai prestigioase burse la nivel mondial, oferită pentru finalizarea cercetărilor privind tirania, 1991–92; Rockefeller Foundation Center, Bellagio, Italia, 1992, profesor invitat; United States Information Agency, grant pentru studierea situației științelor sociale în Balcani, 1993; Solomon Asch Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, grant pentru studierea conflictelor etnice, 2000; Mellon Foundation, grant pentru un seminar despre conflict etnic și soluționarea conflictelor (în colaborare cu Resat Kasaba), 2001–2004; United States Institute of Peace, grant pentru studiere guvernării și conflictelor în Africa și Orientul Mijlociu, 2004–2005.

Cu privire la calitatea de membru în diferite asociații profesionale sau prezența în diverse comitete de redacție, amintim: membru, Joint Committee on Eastern Europe al American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) și al Social Science Research Council (SSRC), 1982–88; fondator și redactor al *East European Politics and Societies*, 1986–1989; președinte al comitetului de redacție, 1989–94 și membru al acestuia, 1994–până în prezent; consultant redacțional, *American Journal of Sociology*, 1986–88; membru, Selection Committee pentru Slavic and East European Section al Fulbright Exchange Program, 1990–92 și președinte, 1992; membru, International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), Selection Committee, proiecte speciale pentru Europa Centrală și de Est, 1993–95; consultant pentru United States Information Agency (USIA) în Balcani, 1993; consultant pentru National Endowment for Democracy

(NED) în România, 1995; membru, comitetul de redacție, *Problems of Post-Communism*, 1996–2002; consultant pentru Ford Foundation în Europa Centrală, 1999; consultant pentru CARE în Niger, 2000–2001 (planificarea programelor pentru societatea civilă); fondator și co-director (împreună cu Resat Kasaba) al Center for the Study of Ethnic Conflict and Conflict Resolution, University of Washington, 2000–2004; consultant pentru United Nations High Commission for Refugees, 2005 (autor al raportului privind situația politică în zona de conflict din Africa de Vest, între Guineea și Benin); consultant, Open Society Foundation, Senegal (proiectul privind învățământul superior), 2016.

Timpul, din păcate, nu ne permite o prezentare amănunțită a prestigioasei cariere profesionale a lui Daniel Chirot. Cele de mai sus vorbesc însă convingător despre contribuția importantă a profesorului Chirot la dezvoltarea cunoașterii, precum și despre contribuția sa hotărâtoare la inițierea sau strângerea legăturilor științifice și culturale dintre S.U.A. și România și pentru intensificarea circulației la nivel internațional a cercetărilor românești în domeniul științelor sociale. Ne aflăm în fața unei personalități recunoscute public pe plan internațional și am adus argumente solide în vederea susținerii acestei afirmații.

În încheiere, vreau să mulțumesc Senatului Universității din București pentru decizia luată prin consens colegial de a-i acorda înaltul titlu de Doctor Honoris Causa profesorului Daniel Chirot și, în același timp, să îl felicit călduros pe profesorul Chirot cu această fericită ocazie!

Prof. univ. dr. Dragoș PETRESCU
Facultatea de Științe Politice
Universitatea din București

*Dear Professor Daniel Chirot,
Esteemed Rector,
Esteemed President of the University Senate,
Distinguished members of the academic community,
Dear colleagues,*

It is my honor and my pleasure to talk today about an outstanding scholar in the field of social science, who is awarded by the University of Bucharest at the proposal of the Faculty of Political Science a honorary doctoral degree, the greatest honor a University can confer to a person. Daniel Chirot, Professor of International Studies and of Sociology at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington (Seattle), is an academic of high repute in the United States and has earned widespread international recognition for his scholarly work. During his long career, he has published an impressive number of works, which have contributed greatly to the development of important topics in various fields, such as: historical sociology – with an emphasis on social, economic and political change; ethnic and religious conflict; political violence; modern tyrannies or revolutions and their consequences. Apart from the international impact of his work, one should mention that Professsor Chirot has contributed significantly to the dissemination of knowledge of Romania at a world scale. The numerous studies and articles he authored on Romanian topics, or which analyze developments in Romanian territories in a Southeast-European or a Central-European context, have played an important role in stirring the interest of foreign scholars in Romanian society, politics and culture.

Daniel Chirot graduated from Harvard University (Cambridge, Massachusetts) in 1964 – Magna Cum Laude in Social Studies, and received his PhD in Sociology from Columbia University (New York) in 1973. He began his professional career as Instructor and subsequently as Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1971–74); he pursued his career going to the University of Washington (Seattle), where he climbed the career ladder from Assistant Professor to full Professor of Sociology (1975–80). From 1980 to the present, he is Professor of International Studies and of Sociology at the University of Washington (Seattle). He has held many appointments as Visiting Professor, among

others at the National Taiwan University (1989); Northwestern University, Chicago (1993); University of California at San Diego (1996); Bogazici University, Istanbul (1997); and University of Texas at Austin (2007).

The Senate of the University of Bucharest has decided to endorse the proposal of the Faculty of Political Science to award a honorary doctoral degree – Doctor Honoris Causa – to Professor Daniel Chirot based on the fulfilment of strict criteria imposed by the University's Regulations for Granting Honorary Academic Titles. Thus, a honorary doctoral degree recognizes persons of outstanding accomplishment who have contributed greatly to the advancement of knowledge, culture and civilization and are not University current staff members, students or alumni. At the same time, the title is conferred to a personality who contributed decisively to the initiation and strengthening of scientific and cultural contacts between their country and Romania and has earned widespread international recognition.

In the following, I will present briefly, alas only briefly because of the time limits, the main arguments put forward in the proposal to confer a honorary doctoral degree to Professor Daniel Chirot. Professor Chirot contributed greatly to the advancement of knowledge, culture and civilization. His works on social, economic and political change, ethnic and religious conflict, political violence, modern tyrannies or revolutions and their consequences have gained widespread international recognition. As one can easily grasp from the list of publications included in the official brochure published on this occasion, his scholarship has been published by prestigious publishing houses such as: Princeton University Press, Cambridge University Press, University of California Press (Berkeley), University of Washington Press (Seattle), Oxford University Press, Cornell University Press, New York University Press, Central European University Press, Routledge, Sage/Pine Forge Press, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Westview (Boulder, Colorado) etc. Apart from the many books and book chapters, one should mention the numerous studies, articles and book reviews published in high quality academic journals, of which one can mention: Social Forces, Southeastern Europe, International Interactions, London Times Literary Supplement, Sociology: Reviews of New Books, American Journal of Sociology, Contemporary Sociology, Sociology and Social Research, Journal of Interdisciplinary History, American Historical Review, Journal of

Political and Military Sociology, Journal of Social History, Canadian-American Slavic Studies, Journal of Asian Studies, Slavic Review, Journal of World History, American Political Science Review, Journal of Modern History, Revue Canadienne des Etudes sur le Nationalisme, German Politics and Society, Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism, Journal of Political Psychology, Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Slavonica, Journal of Cold War Studies, Comparative Political Studies, Contemporary Sociology, Perspectives on Politics *etc.*

Many of Professor Chirot's works have been included in the lists of mandatory readings for courses taught in universities around the world. One of the volumes he edited, namely, The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economic and Political Change from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989; 2nd edition, 1991), translated into Romanian in 2004, features in the lists of required readings of many courses focusing on economic and political change and on modernization processes in Southeast and East-Central Europe taught at the main universities in these regions. His book, How Societies Change (Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1994), has become a mandatory reading for students of social change. A second and completely revised edition of this book was published in 2012; the book was translated into Romanian (1996), Italian (2010) and Albanian (2013). One should emphasize that the book The Shape of the New: Four Big Ideas That Made the Modern World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), authored by Scott L. Montgomery and Daniel Chirot, was one of The New York Times' 100 Notable Books of 2015 as well as one of Bloomberg Businessweek's Best Books of 2015. A new, paperback edition of the book was published by Princeton University Press in 2016. The book was is important to mention that Daniel Chirot is the founder of the prestigious academic journal East European Politics and Societies (1985). He was also the Editor of the said journal (1986–89), then Chair of the editorial committee (1989–94) and member of the editorial committee (1994 to the present). The journal was established through a three-year grant (1985–88) awarded to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) from U.S. State Department funds and administered jointly by Professor Chirot and the ACLS.

Furthermore, Professor Chirot is a personality who contributed decisively to the initiation and strengthening of scientific and cultural contacts between

their country and Romania and has earned widespread international recognition. In his professional capacity as professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and subsequently at the University of Washington (Seattle) – where he teaches uninterruptedly since 1975, Professor Chirot contributed greatly to the dissemination of knowledge on Romania. His numerous articles and studies on Romanian sociology, politics and economy, or which discuss social, political and economic change in Romania in a Southeast- or Central-European context have been published in high quality academic journals and have fostered the interest of foreign scholars for Romanian topics. Equally important, through his constant interest for Romanian topics Professor Chirot contributed significantly to the initiation and strengthening of scientific contacts between U.S. and foreign scholars and Romania. Considering his international prestige, one can affirm that Professor Chirot's writings on Romanian topics have played an important role in increasing the visibility of Romania as a subject of study and an object of research in the U.S. and internationally. His book, Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony (New York: Academic Press, 1976), Romanian translation (Bucharest: Corint, 2002), is an example of innovative conceptual and methodological frameworks employed for researching social and cultural change in a Romanian territory.

From among his other writings on Romanian topics, one should mention: "A review of Romanian peasant studies", Peasant Studies Newsletter 1:1 (1972), 3–8; "Sociology in Romania", Social Forces 51:1 (1972), 99–102; "The market, tradition and peasant rebellion: the case of Romania in 1907", American Sociological Review 40:4 (1975), 428–444 (with Charles Ragin); "The Romanian communal village: an alternative to the Zadruga", in The Zadruga: The Extended Family of the Balkans. Essays by Philip E. Mosely and Essays in His Honor, R. F. Byrnes, ed., (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1975), 139–159; "Neoliberal and social democratic theories of development: the Zeletin-Voinea debate concerning Romania's prospects in the 1920s and its contemporary importance", in Social Change in Romania, 1860–1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation, Kenneth Jowitt, ed. (Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, 1978), 31–52; "A Romanian prelude to contemporary debates about development", Review (Fernand Braudel Center) 2:1 (1978), 115–123; "Social change in Communist Romania", Social Forces 57:2 (1978), 457–499; "Corporatism, socialism, and development in Romania", Amsterdam Sociologisch

tijdschrift 5:3 (1978), 389–409; “Henri H. Stahl”, in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences; Biographical Supplement* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 436–437; “The corporatist model and socialism: notes on Romanian development”, *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 363–381.

In the late 1980s, Daniel Chirot wrote an article in which he criticized the dire situation in Romania under the rule of Nicolae Ceaușescu: “Romania: Ceaușescu’s Last Folly”, Dissent (Summer 1988), 271–275. This article was followed by numerous writings on the political and economic changes in Romania and in East-Central Europe triggered by the 1989 regime changes: “What Happened in Eastern Europe in 1989?” in Daniel Chirot, ed., The Crisis of Leninism and the Decline of the Left: The Revolutions of 1989 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), 3–32; republished in: Kyutai Kim, ed., The Future of Socialism (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1990), 9–36; J. A. Goldstone, ed., Revolutions (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1994), 165–180; and Vladimir Tismăneanu, ed., The Revolutions of 1989 (London: Routledge, 1999), 19–50; “Romania”, in Joel Krieger, ed., The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 797–798, 2nd edition (2001), 739–740; “Who Influenced Whom? Xenophobic Nationalism in Germany and Romania”, in Roland Schönfeld, ed., Deutschland und Südosteuropa – Aspekte de Beziehungen im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Südosteuropa-Studie 58 (Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1997), 37–57; “Is Civil Society Enough? Comparing Romania and the American South”, in Robert Hefner, ed., Democratic Civility: The History and Cross-Cultural Possibility of a Modern Political Ideal (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, 1998), 175–202; “How Much Does the Past Count? Interpreting the Romanian Transition’s Political Successes and Economic Failures”, in Werner Baer and Joseph Love, eds., Liberalization and Its Consequences (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2000), 103–124.

One should emphasize once again the constant effort by Professor Chirot to make essential Romanian works in sociology known to a wider public. In this respect, one should mention the translation into English (with Holley Coulter Chirot) of a fundamental work by Romanian sociologist Henri H. Stahl, published as Traditional Romanian Village Communities: The Transition from the Communal to the Capitalist Mode of Production in the Danube Region (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980; 2nd paperback edition, 2008).

This presentation of the outstanding career of Professor Chirot and the global diffusion of his work illustrate that he has earned a widespread international recognition. Nevertheless, a brief overview on the grants, awards and fellowships received, as well as on professional and consulting activities performed, will complete the profile of the personality we honor today. Thus, during his long career, he was awarded prestigious grants, awards and fellowships such as: American Council of Learned Societies (three-year grant, 1985–88, for starting the journal East European Politics and Societies); John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, one of the most prestigious grants in the world, awarded for finalizing research on tyranny 1991–92; Rockefeller Foundation Center, Bellagio, Italy, 1992, guest scholar; United States Information Agency, grant for the study of the condition of social sciences in the Balkans, 1993; Solomon Asch Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, grant for the study of ethnic conflict, 2000; Mellon Foundation, grant for a seminar on ethnic conflict and conflict resolution (with Resat Kasaba), 2001–2004; United States Institute of Peace, grant for research on governance and conflict in Africa and the Arab Middle East, 2004–2005.

Time limits do not allow a thorough presentation of the outstanding career of Professor Daniel Chirot and therefore this account of a long and successful career is inevitably incomplete. Nevertheless, our presentation illustrates that we honor today an academic of high repute, who has earned widespread international recognition for his scholarship. Moreover, we honor today an exceptional scholar who, during his long career, has constantly disseminated knowledge of, and fostered interest in, Romanian society, politics and culture.

Finally, I would like to thank the Senate of the University of Bucharest for endorsing the proposal of the Faculty of Political Science to confer the title of Doctor Honoris Causa to Professor Daniel Chirot and, at the same time, to congratulate Professor Chirot wholeheartedly on this special occasion!

*PhD Prof. Dragoș PETRESCU
Faculty of Political Science
University of Bucharest*



Discurs | Daniel Chirot

WHY 20TH CENTURY ROMANIAN SOCIOLOGY AND HISTORY ARE RELEVANT TODAY

Daniel Chirot
10 October 2019

When I arrived in Romania in January 1970 from Columbia University in New York to start research for my doctoral dissertation, I knew very little about this country except for the basic facts about its history. I had studied Romanian for a semester, and was greatly helped by the fact that I was fluent in French, but I really had no idea of what life would be like in Bucharest.

I did have one important advantage. I had gotten to know Philip Mosely who was a Professor at Columbia. Mosely was hardly an ordinary professor. In 1940 he was one of the few American scholars who not only knew Russian well, but also had done extraordinary ethnographic research in Southeastern Europe and had connections with scholars throughout this region. He had traveled to Romania and gotten to know Dimitrie Gusti and Henri Stahl. In 1940 at the time of the partition of Transylvania in which Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy had forced Romania to cede the northern half of Transylvania to Hungary, Mosely had written an influential article in *Foreign Affairs* showing that in fact the ethnic makeup of the ceded region showed it should have remained Romanian. During World War II he became a top advisor to the American State Department and to America's intelligence services. In 1946 Mosely was one of the American delegates to the post-war Paris Peace Conference that resulted in a 1947 treaty settling boundaries and claims in Southeastern Europe, including Hungary. Mosely's view that northern Transylvania should be returned to Romania helped make that the American position, and Mosely was considered a friend of Romania, even by its communist regime.

Mosely told me that in 1946 Dimitrie Gusti had come to Paris as a minor part of the Romanian delegation that included as its most important members Gheorghiu-Dej, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, and others. The sociologist Anton Golopenția, who would die in a communist prison in 1951 after being tortured during the purges of Pătrășcanu allies, was also

at the Paris conference. Gusti was allowed to bring a significant number of scholarly Romanian works, including much of the product of his school of sociology. He gave those to Mosely. As a result, Columbia University's library turned out to have what is probably the best collection of Romanian material of any American university, something that, needless to say, helped me a lot. Mosely eventually returned to academic life and was one of the founders and most influential members of Russian and East European studies in American universities. It was Philip Mosely who arranged for me to be housed in Romania at the *Centrul de Cercetări pentru Problemele Tineretului*, which was the research arm for the youth wing of the Communist Party, and therefore connected to the Central Committee under the protection of Miron Constantinescu. In 1969, just before I left for Romania, Mosely introduced me to Corneliu Bogdan, the Romanian Ambassador to the United States. Bogdan was a prominent member of the Communist Party and a longtime leading diplomat until, in the 1980s he finally broke with Ceaușescu and became an outcast, only to join in the anti-regime resistance in 1989. But in 1969 he was still an important Romanian diplomat and he kindly told me that if I ever had any problems I should contact him.

When I got to Romania I met the Director of the Institute, Ovidiu Bădina, who as it happens was the editor of a multi-volume collection of Dimitrie Gusti's work. It was Bădina who, at my request, and on Philip Mosely's advice, introduced me to Henri Stahl. Stahl became my closest academic advisor, and a good friend despite our great age difference of 41 years. And this connection opened up for me a window into the history and accomplishments of Romanian social science. The more I learned, the more complicated, and tragic the story seemed to be.

There were of course notable historians and social analysts in Romania well before World War I. Issues of nationality and ethnicity, of the peasant problem, and of the historical legacies of a very diverse cultural heritage were at the heart of Romanian intellectual life. What was lacking was a more solid ethnographic grounding. About 80% of Romania's population was rural after World War I, and that proportion was higher still if one only took into account the ethnic Romanians as opposed to the more urbanized minorities. Yet, much about rural life was still not well studied. The period between World Wars I and II changed that. It was Dimitrie Gusti who established and nurtured a distinctive School of Romanian Sociology. Gusti's contributions are well known and much has been written about him and his work. Combined

with the increasingly sophisticated ability to collect good statistics that culminated in the wonderful census of 1930, the result was that Romanian social science was quite advanced by 1940, more so than one would have expected of a country that was still one of the poorest in Europe. It would have become more prominent if the World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology had had its planned meeting in Bucharest in 1939. But the war intervened and it was cancelled.

What made Gusti distinctive was that he was tolerant of a variety of political views at a time, in the 1930s, when politics was increasingly bitter and deeply divided. He accepted having a young Communist working with his group, Miron Constantinescu. He accepted an Iron Guard ideologue named Traian Herseni who wrote praises of the Legion. Herseni went from doing interesting rural research to writing increasingly anti-Semitic, ultra-nationalist propaganda. Stahl, on the other hand, was a moderate Marxist social democrat who had a far more benign political outlook and was also the most original and skilled rural sociologist in the Gusti group.

Gusti's work, his access to financial support, and his ability to protect various students, at least until everything got worse after 1939, depended in part on his academic prestige. But it did not hurt that his wife was the cousin of the notorious Magda Lupescu, mistress, and eventually in exile wife of King Carol the Second. Carol made sure that Gusti received ample funding, and Gusti reciprocated by being loyal to Carol's autocratic rule. This did not prevent Gusti from promoting a rigorously objective, non-ideological kind of field research that produced a large number of publications that remain essential today for anyone who wants to study inter-war Romanian rural society. Gusti himself died in 1955, but in 1970 Henri Stahl and his wife introduced me to Gusti's widow, a dignified old lady who was in a sense, as were many other people I met then, a kind of living window into the elite of a very different past.

As a passing note I might add that I also got to know Traian Herseni, who, after a fairly short period in prison was taken out to help ghost write, and then write under his own name some interesting sociology but also propagandistic work in favor of communism. In an unguarded moment he once told me that in the past he used to write praises of "Căpitanul," that is, Codreanu. Now, in 1970, he told me he still wrote some similar praises, but of Ceaușescu. It's not that different after all, he said. Then he was obviously

sorry he had said that because he was cautious about revealing his political feelings. But Herseni clearly approved of the growing ethno-nationalism and anti-Russian pronouncements of the communist regime, as did many right-wing intellectuals from the past. I need not go into any details about Herseni's views about eugenics and race. They were awful. Though Gusti helped protect him during the period in which leading Iron Guardists were in danger in 1938, he never agreed with that aspect of Herseni's thinking.

I must say that one of my great regrets is that even though I got to know quite a number of distinguished intellectuals from that pre-war period, including, not long before he died, Petru Comarnescu, one of the few noted older Romanian intellectuals who spoke excellent English. I did not fully appreciate in 1970 how much these people represented a golden period in Romanian cultural life before a great darkness fell upon Romania and much of Europe during the late 1930s and afterward. Nor did I quite grasp how closely interrelated they all were, how well they knew each other, nor how convoluted their relationships were as they split into competing, scheming political factions. The results in their personal lives were far more dramatic than anything we American scholars have ever experienced. Imprisonment, for some torture and death, for others great success followed by disaster, and sometimes eventual rehabilitation. It is no wonder that in general they did not speak about the past, and even Stahl never told me many details. I should have done more to question these people, to write about them, and to make their work more accessible outside Romania. At least I feel I did some of that for Henri Stahl, but not nearly enough.

I am not going to try to say anything new about Henri Stahl. The excellent work of Zoltán Rostás covers that very well, and I would recommend Rostás's book, *Monografia ca utopie, Interviu cu Henri H. Stahl* (1985-1987), and also much of Rostás's other work. All I want to emphasize is what I found most inspiring, and what has guided me ever since even when I began to do research and write about topics outside Romania. To understand a society, whether a particular mountain village like Nerej in Vrancea, or a much larger society, or many, requires history, comparison, and a sense of the larger world. That was also the perspective of my American mentor Immanuel Wallerstein, so he and Stahl were intellectually quite compatible. Eventually Wallerstein published a good article by Stahl in the journal Wallerstein's center put out, and he arranged to publish my translation of one of Stahl's best books with Cambridge University Press.

This was what Stahl had written in French, *Les anciennes communautés villageoises roumaines; asservissement et pénétration capitaliste*, or in the English translation, *Traditional Romanian Village Communities: The Transition from the Communal to the Capitalist Mode of Production in the Danube Region*. This book was Stahl's summary of his great three volume work published from 1958 to 1965, *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești*. I'm happy to note that this was reprinted in a new edition with funding from the Soros Foundation in 1998.

Stahl was eventually more influenced by the French historical school of Annales and particularly by the work of its founder, Marc Bloch, than by the German philosophical tradition that was so current in the 1930s. Detailed knowledge of agrarian history, some of it taken from contemporary observation of villages and farmland, could greatly contribute to an understanding of how a whole social system evolved and shaped the present, even if there had been much change. He used to tell me that what he needed was aerial pictures to recapture the landscapes of the past, but of course that was not available in communist times when he did so much of his writing on agrarian history. Now it could be, and I wonder if there are any young Romanian historians and anthropologists interested in doing such studies. Combined with the work of the Gusti group of scholars from the 1930s that could yield some new, important insights into Romanian social history. If I were starting out as a young scholar now I think that is what I would want to do.

My main point today, however, is not to go over in any detail the history of the Gusti group, or to summarize the work of Henri Stahl, or to explain how that influenced me. Rather, having introduced these topics, I want to discuss the reasons for the ultimate, deeply sad failure of that endeavor by Dimitrie Gusti and his followers to produce an empirical, objective, non-ideological kind of research in order to solve Romania's social problems. The chief of these social and economic problems in the 1920s and 1930s was the agrarian situation. After the land reform that followed World War I, too many Romanian peasants lived on small, inefficient plots of land. This did not generate enough of a surplus to invest sufficiently in industry. It created a vast reservoir of discontent ripe for exploitation by politicians. The fact that so much commerce and industry was in the hands of those not considered genuine Romanians – Jews, Greeks, Germans, Hungarians – fed xenophobia and discontent in the cities. All that led to a growth of what today we call nationalist populism, at least some of which if not all was more properly called fascism.

One need only look at the old newsreels of Iron Guard demonstrations and parades to note how much they tried to project the image of themselves as representatives of an idealized authentic peasantry. To be sure it was not only the fascists who did this as there was also the generally far more liberal National Peasant Party that also appealed to rural populism. Without knowing much about Romanian peasants Dobrogeanu-Gherea's Marxist analysis of Romanian society in 1910 had identified the agrarian situation as the most important aspect of Romanian society.

Idealization of this peasantry was a major part of Romanian nationalism, but when Gusti decided to tackle Romania's problems, he realized that glorifying a mythical peasant essence and talking about his racial excellence was not going to solve anything. The point was never to do rural sociology just for the sake of expanding knowledge, but rather to produce studies that would guide social reform and to create social action institutions that would educate rural society and help it improve itself. Putting the peasantry at the heart of this endeavor was as much a nationalist project as that of the more idealized writings of someone like, for example, Lucian Blaga, but it was meant to be more practical by being more objective, more scientific, and more directly useful. Stahl, it is useful to remember, did not have much regard for Blaga because he thought that mystifying the nature of Romania's peasants ignored reality.

Gusti's history of combining sociological research with social action is well known, at least here in Romania. It was a noble goal, but of course it failed. Failure was preordained for reasons that are in retrospect obvious.

Romania was politically and socially too polarized in the 1930s to be able to solve its problems. Though there were elections and a sort of parliamentary democracy, the growing strength of the far right pushed King Carol into trying to create a kind of royal fascism. It was anti-democratic and autocratic, and also corrupt, certainly, but it was a kind of fake fascism, not the real thing. Preoccupied with an increasingly hazardous international situation, Carol could hardly spare any time or effort into continuing interesting social experiments. And finally, with Hitler's military victories in 1940, the royal dictatorship collapsed, and with it any serious prospects for social reform as the country was fully militarized and eventually, in 1941, entered the World War as Hitler's ally.

After the war, there was no chance that the Gusti school could be revived, much less its social experiments. In 1948 sociology was outlawed as a

“bourgeois science” not worthy of state support. Henri Stahl and most of the others lost their university positions. Stahl survived with some help from Miron Constantinescu, but lived much more poorly than before. It took a long time before he was allowed to publish again, and only in the 1960s did he gradually regain his former stature. Again, he was helped by Miron Constantinescu who, after being purged by Gheorghiu-Dej was fully rehabilitated by Ceaușescu. It is a long and tortuous history that ended well for Stahl, so that by the time I met him, even though he was old, he was regularly publishing new work and had devoted students. By then sociology had been revived, and there was a growing amount of good social research.

Unfortunately, it did not last. Along with the reaction against reform initiated by Ceaușescu in the early 1970s that culminated in the degeneration of the Romanian economy in the 1980s, social research became just another political casualty. It has only been since 1990 that it has once again been revived, not only in sociology and political science but in history and all other social sciences.

The fact is that scholarship in the humanities and social sciences is always dependent on being supported by a favorable political environment. Dictatorships, whether on the right or the left, cannot allow social and historical research to be unbiased because that might undermine their ideological legitimacy. Only a very limited, technocratic kind of social research can be permitted, and even that is subject to rigorous control in any undemocratic regime.

What happened to the Gusti school was a perfect example. It could thrive in the 1920s and early 1930s in a relatively democratic environment. It could continue for a time under Carol's dictatorship because of special circumstances, but not indefinitely. It was perverted and finally eliminated after 1940, first by the far right, then more totally by the communists. It was revived at a time of gradual liberalization of communism that reached its peak just when I arrived in Romania in 1970. Then it was gradually crushed again until the overthrow of communism.

So why is this relevant today, other than as a matter of historical curiosity? For two reasons.

One is that it is a reminder of the vulnerability of what has always been a fundamental part of the Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth

century, an Enlightenment that gained strength in the nineteenth century to create our modern world. The Enlightenment was not just a move to separate religion from science in order to gain a better understanding of the natural world. Yes, that produced the scientific revolution from which came the technologies and ever more rapid advances that have characterized the world since the late eighteenth century. But the Enlightenment also promoted the idea that science should help humanity, and that the old social systems based on hereditary privilege, on fossilized religious orthodoxy, and on the denial of individual human rights should be replaced. It was from Enlightenment social philosophy that ideas emerged to power the American as well as the French Revolution. The spread of those ideas, first throughout Europe, and then throughout the world has ever since been a fundamental part of creating fairer, more democratic societies. But that is precisely the part of the Enlightenment that has always been vulnerable to attack by political forces and ideologies that reject individual rights in favor of hereditary group rights, that reject democracy in favor of autocracy, that reject truth in favor of supposedly higher forms of dogmatism, and that ultimately seek to crush free thought.

In the crisis of the 1930s throughout the world anti, or as the liberal British philosopher Isaiah Berlin put it, counter-Enlightenment forces gained ground. Partly it was the disillusion produced by the rejection of supposedly corrupt bourgeois ways that had begun even before World War I. Even more it was a reaction to the catastrophe of that war, and then the Great Depression of the 1930s. Romania was no exception. I was struck reading some articles in Romanian journals of the 1920s how influential the pessimism of Oswald Spengler was. There was also the growing antagonism toward ethnic minorities. And finally, of course, the rise of European fascism that reached its height in 1933 when Hitler took power contributed to the strengthening of Romania's far right. And that far right was resolutely hostile to Enlightenment liberalism.

What is astonishing is how many of Romania's most distinguished intellectuals fell for this, and promoted not just the far right but specifically Codreanu's Legionary movement. It wasn't just Nichifor Crainic (who like Herseni reconciled his religious ethno-nationalism with communist nationalism after his time in prison), Nae Ionescu, or Constantin Noica whose association with the Iron Guard was more or less temporary, but also the young Mircea Eliade who later would become internationally very famous. All of these, and many

other well-educated intellectuals were seduced by what many historians have characterized as the most violent fascist movement in Europe after Nazism.

What was so appealing? Shouldn't they have known better? If anything united them it was this mystical ethno-nationalism that believed that there was something particularly noble and unique about Romanian blood. That blood carried its own culture. Therefore, foreign cultural influence, but even more mixture with impure and un-Romanian blood weakened national strength. As Katherine Verdery somewhat gently pointed out in her book *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania*, a very similar kind of nationalism came to be at the heart of late communism's attempt to legitimize itself. That narrowed the difference between fascism and communism, though to say this before 1989, or even today arouses quite a bit of angry rejection.

Believing that national culture and strength are tied to blood is not necessarily the same thing as wanting to commit genocide against the polluting elements in the nation, but it is a good first step in that direction. Gusti, Stahl, and at least a few other prominent intellectuals, including Comarnescu, were not fooled and steered clear of supporting the mystical, religious, racist, and violent elements gaining ground in Romania by the late 1930s and early 1940s. Most Romanian intellectuals did not resist and many sympathized with the far right.

During the academic year 1975–1976, when I was just starting at the University of Washington, Mircea Eliade came to give a lecture. It was a continuation of his life-long aim to diminish and ultimately discredit the Enlightenment. He talked about Isaac Newton, describing him as more of a religious mystic who considered his alchemy and religious obsessions as more important than his scientific breakthroughs. Eliade was a careful scholar, and what he had to say was not entirely wrong. But as with many other aspects of his career, including his most famous writings about religion, and the distortions of his experiences in India, the aim was to undermine faith in the liberal, scientific, modernizing Enlightenment. After his lecture I went up to him and told him that I was a friend of Henri Stahl. He looked embarrassed, asked how Stahl was, and turned away to talk to someone else. He understood immediately that I knew things about his past that he had carefully concealed at the University of Chicago. The point was that unlike some others, most notably Emil Cioran, Eliade never repented.

This leads to my second and concluding thought. It is not just that Enlightenment liberalism proved to be very vulnerable in Europe, and much of the world in the 1930s. The fact is that today the same thing is happening right here in this region of East-Central Europe, and in Europe as a whole, and elsewhere in the world, including in the United States which, in the 1940s, was the country that saved democracy and the humanistic side of the Enlightenment. If in America, in England, and in Western Europe the Enlightenment's belief in free thought, in democracy, and in the defense of individual human rights is under threat, where is rescue going to come from? What if this time America is no longer available? It isn't China that is going to take over that role.

Why has this happened? Part of the reason has been the unrelenting attack against liberalism from both the left and the right, and therefore the failure of educational systems in the West to teach the history of that struggle over many centuries. It was, after all, the Enlightenment that emancipated humanity from its oppressive past.

To go back to the 1920s and 1930s it was not that young intellectuals in Romania, or elsewhere created fascist tyranny on their own, but that they were prepared to legitimize it, to spread its ideas, and to teach a new generation of intellectuals to do the same in large part because they had abandoned faith in the Enlightenment.

It was the same with communist intellectuals, though throughout most of Europe there were far fewer of these before World War II than afterward when the far right was temporarily discredited, and in the West, particularly in France and Italy, a whole new generation of anti-Enlightenment intellectuals turned to communism.

By understanding better how the Enlightenment was largely rejected here in Romania, and elsewhere in Europe can help us get a clearer understanding of why it could happen again.

I am not suggesting that the world geo-political or economic conditions are the same as in the 1930s. Rather, I am saying that some of the same distrust of liberal humanism is at work. In the coming political and economic crises that will occur, in the face of continuing rapid disruptive social change, the spread of anti-Enlightenment, anti-Western, anti-liberal, and anti-

democratic ideologies is certain to generate new neo-fascist movements and perhaps even regenerate an equally illiberal far left.

This should not be. We know what happened as a result of such developments in the twentieth century. We cannot predict future political events, but we can be sure if we do not pay attention to the consequences of the spread of counter-Enlightenment sentiments we will experience another set of terrible disasters.

What can we do as academics, as teachers, as writers? Few of us ever get the kind of political power that would make a direct difference. But for those in the humanities and social sciences, we can look back and try to understand why some intellectuals resisted, why others did not, and what we can do to give more support to those who are fighting for the liberal Enlightenment. Then we can teach what we have learned, and prepare the young to take a stronger stand in that direction. That is not what everyone can or should do, but at least those of us engaged in the social sciences and humanities who study the modern world should.

It is now a platitude, but nevertheless true that the famous quote from George Santayana is apt: “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”

About 20 years ago I began to understand this, rather late in my career. Since then I have tried to explore the meaning of the Enlightenment, the reasons for its fragility, and the consequences of abandoning it. My most recent books have been about that, most obviously, the book called *The Shape of the New: Four Big Ideas and How They Made the Modern World* that I co-authored with a colleague. My newest book coming out soon, *You Say You Want a Revolution? Radical Idealism and Its Tragic Consequences* takes up some of the same thoughts about how to interpret history. There is something but not very much in each book about Romania. But now I recognize that it was from years of thinking and reading about Romania, and from the people I had known when I first came that I got many of my most general ideas. Much of that, it turns out, is applicable to the rest of the world too. It took me a long time to fully appreciate this, but now I do. For this I am very grateful to Romania.



• Curriculum vitae | Daniel Chirot

EDUCATION

PhD: Columbia University (New York, NY 10027), Sociology, **1973**;
BA: Harvard University (Cambridge, MA 02138), Magna Cum Laude in Social Studies, **1964**.

EMPLOYMENT

1980 – present: Professor of International Studies and of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle;
1975–1980: Assistant Professor to Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle;
1971–1974: Instructor to Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514;
1969: Lecturer in Sociology, Columbia University New York, NY 10027;
1964–1966: Peace Corps Volunteer, Republic of Niger.

VISITING APPOINTMENTS

2007: Professor of Government, University of Texas at Austin;
2004–2005: Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow, United States Institute of Peace, Washington DC;
1997: Professor of Sociology, Bogazici University, Istanbul;
1996: Professor of Sociology, University of California at San Diego;
1993: Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University, Chicago;
1992: Visiting Fellow, Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen, Vienna;
1989: Professor of Sociology, National Taiwan University.

GRANTS, AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS (SINCE 1987)

Three-year grant **1985–1988** given to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and administered jointly by me and the ACLS to start the journal *East European Politics and Societies* – from Title VIII U.S. State Department funds;
Guest Scholar, Woodrow Wilson Center of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. for research on social and political change in Eastern Europe, **1987**;
Henry M. Jackson Foundation Conference Grant, "Revolutions of 1989," Seattle, **1990**;

John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, work on tyranny, **1991–1992**;
 Guest Scholar, Rockefeller Foundation Center, Bellagio, Italy, **1992**;
 University of Washington, Dean's Recognition Award, "For contributing to a high level of excellence in the College of Arts and Sciences," **1992**
 United States Information Agency grant for study of the condition of social sciences in the Balkans, **1993**;
 SSRC/ACLS Conference Grant (with Anthony Reid of Australian National University) for "Minority Entrepreneurs and Modern Nationalism: East-Central Europe and Southeast Asia," San Diego, **1994**;
 With INCORE (Initiative on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity) in Northern Ireland, Conference Grant for "Causes of Ethnopolitical Warfare throughout the world," Derry, Northern Ireland, **1998**;
 Grant from the Solomon Asch Institute at the University of Pennsylvania for the study of ethnic conflict, **2000**;
 Mellon Foundation Grant for a Sawyer Seminar on Ethnic Conflict and Conflict Resolution (with Resat Kasaba), **2001–2004**;
 United States Institute of Peace grant for research on governance and conflict in Africa and the Arab Middle East, **2004–2005**;
 Visiting Senior Fellow, Foundation for Research in Economics and the Environment, **summer 2006**.

COURSES TAUGHT

Undergraduate: States and capitalism: introduction to political economy; Introductory sociology; Political sociology; Comparative sociology; Social theory; Economic and social development; Balkan societies; Eastern Europe since 1948; War; Guerrilla war; American policy and the New International Economic Order; Social change; Introduction to the history of Eastern Europe; Conflict and politics; Genocide; Ethnic conflict and democracy, Terrorism; American foreign policy dilemmas: how to deal with tyrants; Ethnic, religious, and nationalist conflicts; Deeply divided societies; Collective violence: genocides; The Making of the 21st Century; Critical Contemporary Issues in International Politics. Deeply Divided Societies. Revolutions.

Graduate: Social stratification; Classical social theory; Historical methods for sociologists; Worker and peasant movements of the twentieth century; Social change and the world system; Methods of

comparative research in international studies; Political sociology; Contemporary change in Eastern Europe; Introduction to Russian and Eastern European studies; Comparative politics; The political economy of industrial societies; Nationalism; Ethnic conflict; Analysis of information in the formulation of American foreign policy; Peace, Violence, and Security. How the Modern World Came to Be.

PROFESSIONAL AND CONSULTING ACTIVITIES (SINCE 1987)

Member, Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), **1982–1988**;

Member of the editorial board of the Rose Monograph Series of the American Sociological Association, **1983–1988**;

Founder and Editor, *East European Politics and Societies*, **1986–1989**; then Chair, editorial committee, **1989–1994**; Member, **1994 to the present**;

Consulting Editor, *American Journal of Sociology*, **1986–1988**;

Reviewer, National Humanities Center applications, **1988–1993**;

Chair, Russian and East European Studies Program and Director of the Russian and East European National Resource Center (U.S. Department of Education), University of Washington, **1988–1991**;

Member, Joint Committee of the ACLS and the SSRC for Scholarly Cooperation with Taiwan, **1990**;

Member, Academic Advisory Council of the East European Program at the Woodrow Wilson Center, Smithsonian Institution, **1990–1995**;

Member, Selection Committee for the Slavic and East European Section of the Fulbright Exchange Program, **1990–1992**; Chair, **1992**;

Lecturer, U.S. Defense Department Overseas Schools (Germany), **1991**;

Chair, External Program Review Committee, Department of Sociology, University of California at San Diego, **1991**;

Reviewer, SSRC pre-dissertation training grant proposals, **1992–1994**;

Member, Program Committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), **1993**;

Member, International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), Selection Committee, Special Projects on Central and Eastern Europe, **1993–1995**;

Member, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) panel for reviewing conference proposals, **1993**;

Consultant for United States Information Agency (USIA) in the Balkans, **1993**;
 Member, Council for European Studies Committee on Research Planning Groups, **1993–1994**;
 Chair, External Program Review Committee, Austrian Studies Center, University of Minnesota, **1994**;
 Consultant for the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) in Romania, **1995**;
 Member, Editorial Board of *Problems of Post-Communism*, **1996–2002**;
 Member, Editorial Board, *The Encyclopedia of Political Revolutions* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly), **1996–1998**;
 Member, National Science Foundation (NSF) Panel for Graduate Research Fellowship Program, **1997, 1999, 2000**;
 Member, Program Committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), **1997**;
 Consultant for BBC documentary on modern tyranny, **1997**;
 Co-chair, Presidential Task Force of the American Psychological Association (APA) for the Study of the Causes and Ways of Resolving Ethnic Conflict, **1997–1998**;
 Chair, External Program Review Committee, Center for European and Russian Studies, UCLA, **1998**;
 Acting Chair, International Studies Program, University of Washington, **1999**;
 Consultant for the Ford Foundation in Central Europe, **1999**;
 Consultant for CARE in Niger, **2000–2001** (planning civil society programs);
 Founder and co-director with Resat Kasaba, Center for the Study of Ethnic Conflict and Conflict Resolution, University of Washington, **2000–2004**;
 Member of the Library of Congress Fellowship Selection Committee, American Council of Learned Societies, **2001–2003**;
 Chair, International Studies Program and Director of the International Studies National Resource Center (U.S. Department of Education), University of Washington, **2001–2004**;
 Program Reviewer, Center for Western European Studies, Kalamazoo College, **2002**;
 Member CIES (Fulbright) grant committee for research on ethnic conflict, **2002**;
 Member Fulbright Senior Specialists Selection Committee, **2003–2007**;

Evaluator of Senegal exchange program for CIEE, **2003**;
 Consultant for CARE in Côte d'Ivoire, **2003–2004, 2006** (political analysis, planning conflict mitigation programs);
 Member, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) panel for reviewing proposals in religion, philosophy, and science, **2005**;
 Member, Mellon Foundation panel for reviewing Sawyer Seminar grant proposals, **2005–2010**;
 Consultant for the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, **2005** (author of report on political situation in the West Africa conflict zone from Guinea to Benin);
 Member, United States Institute of Peace panel for reviewing senior fellow grant proposals, **2005**;
 Chair, External Program Review Committee, Sociology Department, University of California at San Diego, **2006**;
 Member, External Program Review Committee, International Studies, University of Utah, **2008**;
 Member, Advisory Editorial Board, *Society*, **since 2008**;
 Member, External Program Review Committee, European Studies Program, UCLA, **2010**;
 Advisory Board, Legatum Institute (London), **2011–2013**;
 Consultant, Open Society Foundation, Senegal (higher education project), **2016**;
 Member, NEH Public Scholar Program panel reviewing grant applications, **2017**;
 Member, Advisory Board, Fulbright University in Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City), **2018**.



Lista publicațiilor | Daniel Chirot

BOOKS

Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony (New York: Academic Press, 1976). [Romanian translation, Bucharest: Corint, 2002.]

Social Change in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977). [Italian translation, Naples: Liguori Editore, 1985; Korean translation, Seoul, 1984.]

Social Change in the Modern Era (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986). [Korean translation, Seoul, 1987; Chinese translation, Taipei: Chu Liu Books, 1991.]

Modern Tyrants: The Power and Prevalence of Evil in Our Age (New York: The Free Press, 1994; 2nd, paperback edition, Princeton University Press, 1996). [Polish translation, Warsaw: Michal Urbanski, 1997.]

How Societies Change (Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1994). [Romanian translation, Bucharest: Athena, 1996; Italian translation, Bologna, il Mulino, 2010.]

Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley, *Why Not Kill Them All? The Logic and Prevention of Mass Political Murder* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Chinese translation, complex characters (Hong Kong: New Century Publishing, 2007); new Chinese translation, simplified characters (Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2012); Swedish translation (Goteborg: Daidalos, 2008); Finnish translation (Helsinki: Like, 2008); paperback 2nd edition (Princeton University Press, 2010).

Contentious Identities: Ethnic, Religious and Nationalist Conflicts in Today's World (New York: Routledge, 2011).

How Societies Change [completely new and revised 2nd edition] (Los Angeles: Sage/Pine Forge Press, 2012); Albanian translation, 2013.

Scott Montgomery and Daniel Chirot, *The Shape of the New: Four Big Ideas That Made the Modern World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015); one of *The New York Times*' 100 Notable Books of 2015, and one of *Bloomberg Businessweek*'s Best Books of 2015; paperback 2nd edition (Princeton University Press, 2016); Korean translation (Seoul: Chaek-se-sang, 2018); Chinese translation, 2019.

You Say You Want A Revolution? From Idealistic Radicalism to Tragedy (in production with Princeton University Press, to be published in late 2019).

EDITED VOLUMES

Editor, *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economic and Political Change from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989; 2nd, paperback edition, 1991); Romanian translation (Bucharest: Corint, 2004).

Editor (with Anthony Reid), *Essential Outsiders: Chinese and Jews in the Modern Transformation of Southeast Asia and Central Europe* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997).

Editor, *The Crisis of Leninism and the Decline of the Left: The Revolutions of 1989* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991).

Editor (with Martin Seligman), *Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes, Consequences, and Possible Solutions* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press, 2001).

Editor (with Gi-Wook Shin and Daniel Sneider), *Confronting Memories of World War II: Recriminations and Reconciliations in Europe and Asia* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2014).

TRANSLATIONS

Translator (with Holley Coulter Chirot) of Henri H. Stahl, *Traditional Romanian Village Communities: The Transition from the Communal to the Capitalist Mode of Production in the Danube Region* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980; 2nd, paperback edition, 2008).

ARTICLES, STUDIES AND BOOK CHAPTERS

“Urban and rural economies in the Western Sudan; Birni N’Konni and its hinterland”, *Cahiers d’études africaines* 8:4 (1968), 549–565.

“The social order”, in *Harper Encyclopedia of the Modern World*, R. Morris and G. Irwin, eds., (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 849–883.

“A review of Romanian peasant studies”, *Peasant Studies Newsletter* 1:1 (1972), 3–8.

“Sociology in Romania”, *Social Forces* 51:1 (1972), 99–102.

“The growth of the market and servile labor systems in agriculture”, *Journal of Social History* 8 (Winter, 1975), 67–80.

(With Charles Ragin) “The market, tradition and peasant rebellion: the case of Romania in 1907”, *American Sociological Review* 40:4 (1975), 428–444.

"The Romanian communal village: an alternative to the Zadruga", in *The Zadruga: The Extended Family of the Balkans. Essays by Philip E. Mosely and Essays in His Honor*, R. F. Byrnes, ed. (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1975), 139–159.

"Neoliberal and social democratic theories of development: the Zeletin-Voinea debate concerning Romania's prospects in the 1920s and its contemporary importance", in *Social Change in Romania, 1860–1940. A Debate on Development in a European Nation*, K. Jowitt, ed. (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1978), 31–52.

"A Romanian prelude to contemporary debates about development", *Review* 2:1 (1978), 115–123.

"Social change in Communist Romania", *Social Forces* 57:2 (1978), 457–499.

"Corporatism, socialism, and development in Romania", *Amsterdam Sociologisch tijdschrift* 5:3 (1978), 389–409.

"Henri H. Stahl", in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences: Biographical Supplement* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 436–437.

"The corporatist model and socialism: notes on Romanian development", *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 363–381.

"Changing fashions in the study of social causes of economic and political change", in *The State of Sociology*, J. S. Short, ed. (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981), 259–282.

"Historical sociology", *Historical Methods* 16:3 (1983), 121–123.

"Ideology and Legitimacy in Eastern Europe", *States and Social Structures Newsletter of the SSRC* 4 (1987), 1–4.

"Romania: Ceausescu's Last Folly", *Dissent* (Summer, 1988), 271–275.

"Ideology, Reality, and Competing Models of Development in Eastern Europe Between the Two World Wars", *East European Politics and Societies* 3:3 (1989), 378–411.

"What Happened in Eastern Europe in 1989?" in D. Chirot, ed., *The Crisis of Leninism and the Decline of the Left: The Revolutions of 1989* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1991), 3–32; republished in: Kyu-taik Kim, ed., *The Future of Socialism* (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1990), 9–36; J. Wasserstrom and E. Perry, eds., *Popular Protest and Political Culture in Modern China* (Boulder: Westview, 1992 and 1994, 2nd edition), 215–243 and 218–245; J. A. Goldstone, ed., *Revolutions* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1994), 165–180; V. Tismăneanu, ed., *The Revolutions of 1989* (London: Routledge, 1999), 19–50; Romanian translation: V. Tismăneanu, *Revoluțiile din 1989* (Iași: Polirom, 1999), 27–61.

“Romania”, in Joel Krieger, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 797–798, 2nd edition (2001), 739–740.

Liah Greenfeld and Daniel Chirot, “Nationalism and Aggression”, *Theory and Society* 9 (1994), 79–130.

“Liberty or Prelude to New Disasters? The Prospects for Post-Revolutionary Central and Eastern Europe”, in John Moore, ed., *Legacies of the Collapse of Marxism* (Fairfax, VA: George Mason University Press, 1994), 199–227.

“Outsiders and Insiders: Entrepreneurial minorities and conflicting ethnic identities in the modern transformation of Southeast Asia and Central Europe”, *Items* (S.S.R.C.) 48:4 (December 1994), 90–94.

“Introduction”, in Stephen Hanson and Willfried Spohn, eds., *Can Europe Work: Germany and the Reconstruction of Post-Communist Europe* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1995), 3–12.

“Herder’s Multicultural Theory of Nationalism and its Consequences”, *East European Politics and Societies* 10:1 (Winter, 1996), 1–15.

“Why East Central Europe is Not Quite Ready for Peron, but May Be One Day”, *East European Politics and Societies* 10:3 (Fall 1996), 536–540.

“Who Influenced Whom? Xenophobic Nationalism in Germany and Romania”, in Roland Schönfeld, ed., *Deutschland und Südosteuropa – Aspekte de Beziehungen im Zwanzigsten Jahrhundert*, Südosteuropa-Studie 58 (Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1997), 37–57.

“Is Civil Society Enough? Comparing Romania and the American South”, in Robert Hefner, ed., *Democratic Civility: The History and Cross-Cultural Possibility of a Modern Political Ideal* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, 1998), 175–202.

“The Lessons of 1989: Comments on Janos Kis”, *East European Politics and Societies* 12:2 (Spring 1998), 384–389.

“Who is Western, Who is Not, and Who Cares?” *East European Politics and Societies* 13:2 (Spring 1999), 244–248.

“How Much Does the Past Count? Interpreting the Romanian Transition’s Political Successes and Economic Failures”, in Werner Baer and Joseph Love, eds., *Liberalization and Its Consequences* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2000), 103–124.

“A Clash of Civilizations or of Paradigms? Theorizing Progress and Social Change”, *International Sociology* 16:3 (September 2001), 343–362.

“Ethnopolitical Warfare and Massacres: Is There Progress?” in C. Leigh Anderson and Janet W. Looney, *Making Progress: Essays in Progress and*

Public Policy (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002), 219–238.

(With Jennifer Edwards) “Making Sense of the Senseless: Understanding Genocide”, *Contexts* 2:2 (Spring, 2003), 12–19.

“What Provokes Violent Ethnic Conflict? One African and Two Balkan Cases”, in Zoltan Barany and Robert Moser, eds., *Ethnic Conflict in Post-Communist Societies* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 140–165.

“Postcolonial African and Middle Eastern Tyrannies: Combining the Worst of the Classical and Modern Traditions”, in Toivo Koivukoski and David E. Tabachnick, eds., *Confronting Tyranny* (Lanham, MD and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 81–102.

“The Power of Imaginative Analogy: Communism, Faith, and Leadership”, in V. Tismaneanu, M. M. Howard and R. Sil, eds., *World Order After Communism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006), 269–274.

“That Enlightenment Question Again”, *Society* 45:3 (May/June, 2008), 257–259.

“The Retribalization of the Modern World: How the Revival of Ancient Sentiments Leads to Persisting Nationalist and Ethnic Conflicts”, *Ab Imperio* 3/2008, 23–46.

“Does Democracy Work in Deeply Divided Societies?” in Zoltan Barany and Robert Moser, eds., *Is Democracy Exportable?* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 85–109.

“Theories and Realities: What are the Causes of Backwardness?” in Peter Hanns Reill and Balazs Szelenyi, eds., *Cores, Peripheries, and Globalization* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011), 63–72.

“Dogmatism and Genocide”, in Don Ambrose and Robert Sternberg, eds., *How Dogmatic Beliefs Harm Creativity and Higher-Level Thinking* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 33–36.

Daniel Chirot and Daniel Karell, “Identity Construction and the Causes of Genocidal Mass Murder”, *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 14:3 (December 2014), 484–499.

“The Long Struggle: Enlightenment, Counter-Enlightenment, and the Importance of Ideas in Democratization”, *Journal of Asian Studies* 74:4 (November 2015), 863–874.

BOOK REVIEWS

Before 1997, a number of 51 book reviews published in: *Social Forces*, *Southeastern Europe*, *International Interactions*, *London Times Literary*

Supplement, Sociology: Reviews of New Books, American Journal of Sociology, Contemporary Sociology, Sociology and Social Research, Journal of Interdisciplinary History, American Historical Review, Journal of Political and Military Sociology, Journal of Social History, Canadian-American Slavic Studies, MAN, Journal of Asian Studies, Slavic Review, Journal of World History, American Political Science Review, Journal of Modern History, Revue Canadienne des Etudes sur le Nationalisme, German Politics and Society.

Since 1997:

“The Agony of Revolutionary Historical Sociology”, a review of *Social Revolutions in the Modern World* de Theda Skocpol, *Social Forces* 75:3 (1997), 1121–1126.

Stalinism and Nazism, by I. Kershaw and M. Lewin, eds., *American Journal of Sociology* 104:3 (1999), 923–925.

The Wealth and Poverty of Nations, by D. Landes, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 564 (1999) 229–230.

Anatomy of Mistrust: U.S.-Soviet Relations during the Cold War, by D. W. Larson, *Journal of Political Psychology* 20:2 (1999), 405–408.

The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia and the World, by B. Anderson, *American Historical Review* December (1999), 1651–1652.

Uncertain Transitions: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World, M. Burawoy and K. Verdery, eds., *Slavic Review* 59:2 Summer (2000), 432–433.

Culture: The Anthropologists’ Account, by A. Kuper, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31:2 (2000), 248–250.

“What was Communism All About?” a review of *The Black Book of Communism* by Stéphane Courtois et al., *East European Politics and Societies* 14:3 (2000), 665–675.

The Holocaust in Romania, by R. Ioanid, *American Historical Review* June (2001), 1086–1087.

East Central Europe in the Modern World, by A. Janos, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies Review* (2002), 241–242.

Curriculum and the Holocaust, by M. Morris, *Contemporary Psychology* 48:6 December (2003), 728–730.

Dreamworld and Catastrophe, by S. Buck-Morss, *Journal of Cold War Studies* 6:2 Spring (2004), 84–86.

The Struggle for the Soul of a Nation, by B. Abrams, *East European Politics*

and Societies 19:2 (Spring 2005), 322–326.

Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century, by B. Valentino, *Comparative Political Studies* 38 June (2005), 578–580.

“Can Grand Evolutionary Theory Be Revised?”, a review of *Human Institutions: A Theory of Societal Evolution*, by J. H. Turner, *Contemporary Sociology* 34:5 (2005), 470–472.

Les fondements du nationalisme roumain, by A. Roger, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 12:2 (2006) 293–296.

“Revisiting the Rise of the West”, a review of I. Wallerstein, *The Modern World System II* (new edition), *Contemporary Sociology* 41:1 (2012), 12–15.

“Looking into the Abyss”, a review of T. Snyder, *Bloodlands, Perspectives on Politics* 10:2 (2012), 397–402.

“Communism’s Efforts to Legitimate Itself and the Aftermath: A Review of Two Books”, review of: M. Shore, *A Taste of Ashes: The Afterlife of Totalitarianism in Eastern Europe* and M. Mevius, ed., *The Communist Quest for National Legitimacy in Europe, 1918–1989*, *Journal of Cold War Studies* 16: 1 (Winter 2014), 245–249.

“Legacies. Memories, and Consequences of European Communism’s Collapse”, review of the book *Historical Legacies of Communism*, M. Beissinger and S. Kotkin, eds.

Postcommunism from Within, J. Kubik and A. Linch, eds., and *Twenty Years After Communism*, M. Bernhard and J. Kubik, eds., *Perspectives on Politics* 13: 2 (2015), 431–436.

Elections in Hard Times: Building Stronger Democracies in the 21st Century, by T.E. Flores and I. Nooruddin, *American Journal of Sociology*, 123: 5 (2018), 1056–1058.

Modernity and the Jews in Western Social Thought, by Chad Alan Goldberg, *Contemporary Sociology*, 47:6 (2018), 712–713.

© Direcția Comunicare, Relații Publice și Marketing
Universitatea din București
Tipărit la Editura Universității din București

2019
Universitatea din București
Virtute et Sapientia

Bulevardul Mihail Kogălniceanu, nr. 36-46, București, România
Tel: +4021 307 73 00
Fax: +4021 313 17 60