New Europe College
Ştefan Odobleja Program
Yearbook 2017-2018

HOREA AVRAM
ALEXANDRA BANEU
LORIN GHIMAN
MATEI IAGHER
DRAGOȘ JIPA
DUMITRU LĂCĂTUȘU
MIHAI OMETIȚĂ
DRAGOȘ SDROBIȘ
MARIAN ZĂLOAGĂ

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

This volume was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for the Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS/CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P1-1.1-BSO-2016-003

ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania
www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74

DRAGOȘ SDROBIȘ

Born in 1982, in Bacău

Ph.D. in History (2014), "George Barițiu" Institute of History, Romanian Academy – Cluj Branch
Thesis: *Elites and Education in Interwar Romania 1918-1940*

Conferences and workshops in Romania, Germany, France, and Switzerland

Published articles regarding history of higher education and student life in Greater Romania

Book:

Limitele meritocrației într-o societate agrară. Șomaj intelectual și radicalizare politică a tineretului în România interbelică [Limits of Meritocracy in an Agrarian Society. Intellectual Unemployment and Political Radicalization of Youth in Interwar Romania], Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 2015

BUILDING A PROFESSION: AN INSIGHT ON THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF ENGINEERS IN ROMANIA 1919-1940

Abstract

In the last three decades, Romanian historiography privileged the intellectual, cultural and political reevaluations of Romanian modernity. However, there is still little interest regarding the rise and formation of liberal and/or intellectual professions in modern Romania and the role these professions played in (re) shaping the social, economic and politic visions for a modern(izing) state. The aim of this study is to sketch the provisions for such a broader demarche, while taking engineers as a study case. From a theoretical point of view, the study relies on the "system of professions" theory of Andrew Abbott.

Keywords: professionalization, engineer, Greater Romania, Polytechnic School, technocracy

Introduction: The Instable Relationship between Intellectual Professionals and Politics

A report of the Romanian Intelligence Service (*Siguranța*) from January 1937 regarding the mood of the population revealed a fragile socio-economic landscape that could destabilize the state. From the economic point of view, the report signaled a general feeling of dissatisfaction due to the cost of living in the urban area. Among the most affected by the lack of necessary incomes one could find public servants or intellectual professionals. The social consequence of this precarious economic situation was a "somewhat alarming" situation across the country, "especially in cities". Because of this, "the measures against the right and the left movements have no effect", the author of the report warned. And, as a result, the economic dissatisfaction transposed also in the political field. That was the reason why "the vast majority of the population, which

is not yet registered in the organized political parties, is heading to the right. This current is not up to the people who propagate and patronize this movement; the orientation of public opinion to the right is provoked by the material shortcomings. If the law for the protection of national labor is honestly applied, then the Romanian intellectual and worker youth would find placement; therefore the movement in this direction would be very low",[1] the report concluded.

The aspect I would like to emphasize in this paper is the fate of the intellectual professionals in Greater Romania. Almost two decades earlier, in the aftermath of the 1st World War, an appeal of sociologist Dimitrie Gusti called for the instauration of a new system of leading and organizing society that was supposed to rely on professionals. In fact, his appeal was not a singular one. Many intellectual professionals, gathered into associations, expressed this need for a rebuilding of the Romanian society. However, to a certain degree these calls were neglected and Romania entered this new chapter of its history with the same old habits. And by this it seemed that Romania missed a chance of developing a social and economic system that could put things into motion.

Of course, one cannot ignore the fact that the entire Europe was trying to recover after a military conflict that took the entire continent to the edge of bankruptcy. Eric Hobsbawm called interwar period the "economic abyss", that brought to the fore the problem of unemployment.[2] To this respect, the fact that many young university graduates and liberal professionals were joining radical political movements because of their economic problems should not be a surprise at all. On the other hand, depressions and unemployment were basically something natural in the economic system of capitalism.[3] But when following a period of great expectations, unemployment was felt as degradation. "The despair brought by unemployment comes not only from the threat of destitution, but from the sudden view of a vast nothingness ahead. The unemployed are more likely to follow the peddlers of hope than the handers-out of relief".[4]

The question that arises is the following: were there any "handout" projects that could have transformed societies into more equitable ones? And, if so, what was the common ground for such a new social contract? And, in the case of Romania, was there any solution in order to escape this spiral of underdevelopment?

Although legitimate, these questions can constitute the premises for a counterfactual history. But this is not what I intend to do. My aim is to scrutinize the impact of the Western pattern in terms of developing

higher education system, a development creating the incentives that led to an increasing phenomenon of professionalization. Once in motion, professionalization developed into a system of reshaping reality – from educational, social, economic and political points of view – that was supposed to acknowledge and promote the power of expertise. In order to "historicize" this phenomenon, I chose to capture the way in which the profession of engineer was built; and I am doing so for several reasons.

In the first place, my study is about the impact of capitalism in the agrarian peripheries of Eastern Europe in the aftermath of the 1st World War. From a comparative point of view, it is quite striking to see that all successor states in Central and Eastern Europe – no matter that they were defeated or victorious in the 1st World War – followed sooner or later the same social, economic and political path. In fact, as Mária M. Kovács noticed for the Hungarian case, it was quite paradoxically that the group of liberal professionals "played a most controversial role in the rise and fall of liberalism in Central and Eastern Europe. In the 19th century, professional people – doctors, lawyers, and engineers – were exponents of cultural and political liberalism. But by the first half of the 20th century, they exhibited a pattern of growing illiberalism".[5]

Another aspect I will try to highlight is the (not just) symbolic power the intellectual professionals began to gain, making them capable of influencing the economics or politics. From such a stance, the approach represents an "archeology" of Romania's shift from the stage of annuitant's society towards a professional one. It should be pointed out that the pace of such a shift was quite slow because of the agrarian character of the Romanian economy, and of the lack of well-defined projects of social change for Romania. It was only in the 1930's that the state realized the impact education can play in the transfer of technology and of know-how. There's no coincidence that starting from here, the state got massively involved in redesigning the higher education system, or in adopting laws for protecting intellectual professions. The pressure came as well from the professional associations calling for the so-called "Romanianization" of the intellectual labor market and for building new social solidarities around professions. Politically, this phenomenon meant the abandonment of democratic play in favor of state interventionism.

Consequently, in the end I will sketch out some of the Romanian engineers' visions regarding the future development of the country. Convinced that science and technology can improve human condition and thus achieve progress, the engineers proposed an extreme technocratic

way of rebuilding society, as it was the corporatist system designed by Mihail Manoilescu. This new vision came along with an increased sense for planning education, economics or reshaping the way in which villages or cities should be framed. Therefore, engineers seemed to have succeeded in filling a strong social need for expertise. Or, maybe, was this just part of a strategy for increasing their social status and justifying their economic requests?

Theoretical Framework: Professionalization as Claim for "Jurisdiction" (Andrew Abbott)

In order to capture the growing importance of social expertise in governing the Western countries beginning with the late 19th century, the German historian Lutz Raphael coined the concept of "scientization of the social". The phrase encompassed the entire problematic of the new "governmentality" (Michel Foucault), interested in knowing and appropriating social reality. This is the way social sciences were called to identify, investigate, evaluate and propose remedies for the new revealed social realities. And this is what Lutz called the "embedding of human and social sciences" in the Western countries.[6] "Scientization of the social" means the professionalization of the social expert, by acquiring a field of authority.

In other words, building a profession is about (re)defining its social and economic place, the evolution in the logic of inclusiveness/ exclusiveness and gaining momentum for imposing its economic, social and even political aspirations. Functionalist sociologists (like Emile Durkheim or Talcott Parsons) preferred a positivist narrative on the evolution of professions. In doing so, they used the perspective of the subjects. Probably this is why the interpretation they reached was biased by the zeitgeist of those times. In the first decades of the 20th century, professionalization was envisaged as a natural stage in the development of capitalist system, therefore it was rather interpreted from a teleological perspective. Unavoidably, the only conclusion they could reach was that the phenomenon of professionalization (along with bureaucratization) was nothing else than the proof of a rationalizing capitalism. Despite the economic depression of 1929-1933, professionalization was envisaged as a glorious phenomenon, proving the flexible character of the entire

capitalist system. In brief, functionalism did nothing more than to spread this glowing image the professionals built about themselves.

Instead, the interactionist approach supposed that these bodies of professionals are not as homogeneous as they would like to be seen by others. Interactionists focused more on the interplay between market economy and the emerging professions. In other words, they were asking: is the market capable of regulating professions? Is there any way of minimizing the possibility of being cheated? This is the point where Magali Sarfatti Larson tackles the power of the professional associations and the pressure they created in order to make the state define and recognize the professions. To this respect, "modern reform movements [were] organized in response to *both* the expansion of market opportunities and the inability of the traditional warrants of moral probity to govern excessive competition".[7]

Andrew Abbott goes one step further, by stressing the importance of "inter-professional competition" for controlling "knowledge and its application". The result of such a competition will be "dominating outsiders who attack that control. Study of organizational forms can indeed show how certain occupations control their knowledge and its application". And, because of this, it follows a "jurisdictional conflict" for defining, enlarging and controlling an expertise field. "Thus an effective historical sociology of professions must begin with case studies of jurisdictions and jurisdiction disputes",[8] followed by placing these disputes in a larger context, in order to understand the influence of other "exogenous" factors like the social, political or economic ones.

There is another aspect showing why the theory of Andrew Abbott is helpful when tackling the subject of intellectual professionals, because "system of professions" he tried to define was supposed to acknowledge the supremacy of intellectual work: "Only a knowledge system governed by abstractions can redefine its problems and tasks, defend them from interlopers, and seize new problems […] Abstraction enables survival in the competitive system of professions".[9] It was this capacity of adapting and trying to face the challenges of a changing society that eventually separated professions from occupations. Moreover, it was this ability of continuous abstracting that empowered the professional actors to define, to delineate and to conquer jurisdiction.[10]

Last but not least, Andrew Abbott supposes that social processes are or should be organized as a story, in order to make it comprehensible. In other words, is quite important to have an intrigue, climax and outcome. But

the fundamental prerequisite is that no idea was supposed to be a winning one from the beginning. In fact, we should take a look at a cumulative series of factors and actions that can lead to the success of one of the options. This is the way by which the history of professionalization should not be conceived as a "story of the winners", but rather as a conquest for monopole of "the activity territory". Let's start our story by exhibiting the general framework.

A "Specter Haunting Europe": Technocracy

The end of the 1st World War brought for the first time to the fore the social side of Europe. As a matter of fact, the 13th chapter of the Peace Treaty of Versailles (1919) stated that in order to build a new Europe, its social organization should seek to develop ways of achieving social justice. That's why the entire chapter was dedicated to organization of labor, and the ground for such a decision was that universal peace cannot be established unless it is based upon social justice.

Nevertheless, Europe seemed more preoccupied with the national issues, haunted by a spirit of revenge. This was the reason why John Maynard Keynes, as a British economic delegate to the Peace Conference held in Paris was astonished by the blindness of the European leaders in building a peaceful climax. From his point of view, the Great War was the expression of an economic crisis of a too rapid and powerful growth. The rise of the new national states in Europe posed new and destructive challenges to the political elite. One of these challenges was the new national boundaries that crumbled the economic space that was previously shared by three continental powers. "An inefficient, unemployed, disorganized Europe faces us, torn by internal strife and international hate, fighting, starving, pillaging, and lying. What warrant is there for a picture of less somber colors?"[11] For Keynes it was quite obvious that the problems the defeated countries had to face in the aftermath of the Great War will – sooner or later – affect all European countries. His call that politics should rely on professional expertise was shared by many others. It was the case of the French artist Fernand Léger, who anticipated in 1916 the rise of a society ruled by professionals, capable of resolving the problems of the society: "The war will soon come to an end. The destroyed regions and countries will have to be rebuilt. I think the politicians will

be kicked out, they have gone bankrupt. In their place will be seated engineers, technicians and maybe workers too".[12]

The question that arises is if this kind of caesura influenced the "rise of the knowledge society". Was the 1st World War a cause or just an opportunity for the intellectual experts to define themselves as legitimate actors in the political field? Despite the answer, the new expert felt obliged to take a stance on the public issues, because they "were far more than just the products of professionalization. They were part and parcel of the process [...] of new forms of political control facilitated by technological progress".[13] This is what historian Charles S. Maier called to be "territoriality", as a concept defining the entire set of changes that occurred since the middle of the 19th century until late 20th century. In his opinion, the geographical sense of this notion began to decrease in favor of a new approach, by which "territoriality" "is a product of what is happening within the borders. The area within will no longer be constructed as a passive enclosure to be policed and kept orderly; it will be a source of resources, livelihood, output, and energy".[14]

Professional intellectuals, as carriers of this new sense of "territoriality", found a good opportunity to renew their claims for reshaping societies. Analyzing the way social sciences embedded in the social life and in decisions of the policy makers, Raphael Lutz noted that the 1st World War was "a catalyst for the spread of human sciences capable of implementation", calling interwar period the time of "social engineering".[15]

The engineers sought to gain the same social status in the 1920's, transforming technocratic temptation into a debate subject. Emphasizing the role of knowledge, technology and production the ideal of technocracy meant an alternative to the zero-sum paradigm of capitalism. Mostly inspired by the American scientific management of work, technocracy proposed making workers – manual or intellectual – fight for the same purpose: the welfare of the society. In USA, engineers stated that "There is no legitimate power but the power to deliver goods", therefore "The era of force must give way to the era of knowledge".[16] The technocratic conceptions spread all over Europe, even in the successor states. For instance, "Hungarian or Polish engineers claimed to be able to offer a neutral force around which effective government could be centred"[17] for the benefit of the nation. Therefore, an increased attention for the technical education was required.

Romania and the Quest for a "Democracy of Competence"

The technocratic spirit did not bypass Romania. In fact, in April 1918, when Romania was basically a defeated country, sociologist Dimitrie Gusti launched an appeal addressed to all intellectuals and professionals for reestablishing the foundation of the state. Acknowledging that "the capricious approximation and the chaotic improvisation of the so far politics must cease for all", Dimitrie Gusti called for a new "systematic division of labor, so that everyone can do what they are capable of".[18] One year later, he came with further explanations regarding his plan of embedding science as the background of any political decision. Romania needed urgent reforms, but Gusti's fear was that the old politicians would sacrifice this plan for the sake of winning the electoral competitions. In the era of the universal male vote, demagogy and populism were the main enemies of the professionals. And, in a time when Romania needed laws emerging from the knowledge of social reality, Gusti expected for the worst. This is how one should interpret his quest for co-opting the specialists as part of the legislative work; otherwise political parties would monopolize the entire public power. "In order not to degenerate into demagogy, social democracy needs this powerful corrective, i.e. jurisdictional competence. From a democratic point of view, there is nothing more important than jurisdictional competence of a nation to be at the base of its political organization".[19] And, in order to reach that, men of science were required, those endowed with a "disinterested competence, […] who are only considering the permanent and general interest of the nation". In fact, it is this "disinterested competence" that makes the man of science a truly professional, and therefore is the only one capable of conducting social reforms. By doing so, the professional really deserves the top spot in the new social hierarchy. This was the way Romanian engineers sought to follow.

What would be the Future for Technical Professions in an Agrarian Society?

A history of the intellectual professions should objectively begin with 1881, when the Romanian kingdom was proclaimed. Preoccupied with building an administrative system that should meet the needs of a modern state and inoculating a powerful sense of national identity, the Romanian

state privileged the formation of law specialists and funded writings of a patriotic historiography. The role played by other sciences or that of technical education was almost inexistent.

What followed was a bureaucratization phenomenon that created a quite vast "urban pseudo-bourgeoisie",[20] with the most activities run under the state control whilst the only requirement being the educational credentials. To some degree, this was a pattern shared by all countries that faced these national emancipation movements, with social and economic finalities. For instance, in the case of Hungary after 1867, the state began building an entire network of law higher education institutions, with the explicit purpose of creating an administrative body of civil servants, well-trained and loyal to the new political hierarchy. The legal career represented during the Austro-Hungarian dualist regime (1867-1918) a "rare form of public activity compatible with an elitist social status". As a consequence, legal studies represented a mechanism for the formation of legislative and administrative competences in state leadership, transforming the graduate into a true member of a "noble corporation".[21]

Along with the social uses of higher education in preserving the social status, there is also a complementary explanation for seeking a job in the service of the state. According to such an approach, the first contacts with the capitalistic economy caused a large phenomenon of pauperization, especially of the middle-class nobility and of some layers of the urban population. Because of that, the economic elite of the Romanian Principalities began to consider itself a sort of *declassée* in comparison with their western homologues, and starting from that they began looking for a new protector to reshape and to regain their social status. These representatives of the *proletariat of the penholder* (Mihai Eminescu) preferred to turn into a new intelligentsia, i.e. a state intelligentsia due to their educational capital they acquired. "Thus while the history of the modern Western state may well be described as one of the rising middle classes in quest of larger national markets, the history of the peripheral states is one of declining middle classes trying to escape the vagaries of the market and hoping to find safe haven in political, rather than economic, entrepreneurship".[22] For them, to serve the State was a financial necessity, while trying to westernize the society was an economic, cultural and political duty. So, the State was the only modernizing agent, but in the benefit of a small part of the entire society, while the largest part of the society – the peasantry – remained outside of this game, although it was the main social and economic class of the Romanian state.

But this kind of development could not continue indefinitely. Although there were voices condemning this disproportionate orientation of the youth toward the law studies, it seemed that a more practical career wasn't prestigious enough from a social point of view. It was simply because in this part of Europe, where the societies had a strong medieval social structure, technical expertise was associated with "the nongentlemanly, lesser social orders".[23] This was the main reason why the technical specialists came basically from the Western countries, where a technical career became a mechanism of social promotion. But when the bureaucratization reached its limits and technical education began to make a distinctive place among the higher education institutions, things began to change.

The Foundation of Engineer Studies in the Old Kingdom 1864-1918

A technical education institution was functioning in Bucharest since 1864. The School of Bridges, Roads, Mining and Architecture was called to prepare specialists for the technical functions in the bureaucratic apparatus of the Romanian state. Because of the financial shortages of the state, lack of know-how and a small number of students, the institution will have an irregular activity and an ambiguous status. For these reasons, starting with 1869 it was labeled as the School of Bridges and Roads, having the role of preparing *conductori* (head of public works) for the Minister of Public Works. Engineers who performed in Romania continued to be basically trained abroad, especially in France or in Germany.

Around 1881, there were about 130 engineers in the Old Kingdom, mostly foreigners. Yet, the development of the transportation system (railways and public roads) increased the necessity of a school entitled to deliver engineers, an outcome reached after gaining independence. Thus, the school is reformed in 1886, with the explicit mission of preparing engineers for the Minister of Public Works. Until 1890, the graduates of this school were enrolled in the Technical Body of the State as trainee engineers, while the graduates of the polytechnic schools from abroad were automatically enrolled as engineers. This situation terminated in 1890, when School of Bridges and Roads secured a key position in teaching and professional training of engineers, since the system was recognized by the state as one comparable with the ones of the schools from abroad.[24] However, the economic crisis that irrupted at the turn of

the 19th and 20th centuries affected the evolution of this branch of studies. The fact that the state began to dismiss engineers from its own services led to a decrease in enrollments. As a matter of fact, since 1878 and until 1900, only 231 engineers graduated this school, an average of 10 graduates per year. The insecurity of finding jobs as engineers reduced drastically the number of graduates: between 1906 and 1909 there were only 21 graduates. Until 1920, the total number of engineers prepared by the School of Bridges and Roads was of 575. The number was quite low for a country with a population of around 8 million inhabitants, while the need for specialists and specialized training was increasing. The time for reform had come.

Delimiting Educational Jurisdiction: The Polytechnic Schools of Greater Romania

Doubling its territory and population, Greater Romania had to face much greater challenges in the aftermath of the 1st World War. The most important one was the increasing surplus of agrarian population, with about 80% of the 18 million inhabitants living in the countryside, mostly occupied in rudimentary agricultural activities. Nevertheless, the traces of the 1907 peasant uprising were still visible, while the 1st World War caused a state of general discontent across Europe. Immediately after the war, an agrarian reform was implemented in order to pacify the villages. In the long run, however, the solution was rather a palliative. According to Leo Pavslovsky, an American analyst of the East and Central Europe during interwar period, there were two solutions for such a problem. The first one was emigration, especially in the USA. Since the Immigration Act of 1924 set quotas for immigrants coming from some parts of the world, including Eastern Europe, another solution had to be found. The second one was that of industrialization, but this solution was hard to implement, since the new successor states had budgetary shortages and promoted nationalistic economic policies. In the case of Romania, the per capita budget expenses decreased from 14.4 dollars in 1914/1915 to 9.5 dollars in 1925.[25] These problems were shared by the all 5 Danubian countries analyzed by Pavlovsky, who envisaged the danger of autarchy and growing nationalism as causal elements of a future conflict.

Turning back to the solution of industrialization, the first required step was a large body of professionals capable of conducting such a process.

At a time when economic activity was viewed as an element of a nation's power, professionals were called upon to ensure this social function of prestige and security.

The creation of Greater Romania had the appearance of a symbolic victory for the engineers' guild. On 24 October 1918, Anghel Saligny, the most famous Romanian engineer of that time, was named Minister of Public Works in Constantin Coandă's Government. He succeeded to retain this portfolio in the liberal cabinet led by Ion I.C. Brătianu. Eventually, his mandate was a short one, leaving the government on 14th of February 1919. A significant detail, however: during the period of its ministry, the *Asociația Generală a Inginerilor din România* [General Association of Engineers in Romania, hereafter AGIR] was founded, an association which was supposed to contribute to the "economic and social reconstruction work and to the establishment of the general activity of the country on scientific and national basis". As any professional association, active membership was granted to any engineer, regardless of his specialty, but who "possessed a title issued from a superior technical school in the country or abroad, a recognized institution in Romania".[26]

The "educational jurisdiction" was challenged by the universities, seeking to enlarge their academic offer. Already during the war, in 1917, a French-Romanian Commission was set up to study and propose solutions for the organization of technical higher education at the Romanian universities. On behalf of Romania, the members of this commission were Ermil Pangrati, Dragomir Hurmuzescu, D. Pompeiu, E. Neculcea, Traian Lalescu and Nicolae Dănăilă, university professors at the faculties of science in Bucharest and Iași. In his report, published in a prestigious French magazine, Dragomir Hurmuzescu mentioned that the Romanian university must represent the interests of the nation, and besides the propagation of science and truth, another role to be assumed is the prosperity of the country: "L'Université doit former l'élite pensante et travailleuse qui dirigera toute l'activité du pays".[27] Mentioning that Romania already had a National School of Bridges and Roads, which mainly prepared engineers for the Romanian company of railways and for various positions in the administrative apparatus, Hurmuzescu considered that the new technical higher education, organized according to the French model, should assume the role of training industrial engineers. By doing so, technical education was called to stimulate the development of local economies, whilst replacing the foreign specialists in the Romanian

economy, as long as most of them were Germans or Austrians, former enemies in the 1st World War.

Polytechnic engineers had another point of view. One of them was Constantin D. Bușilă, a supporter of polytechnic institutions. He graduated as an engineer from Bucharest in 1900, and then he became a close collaborator of Anghel Saligny, joining him at the works for modernizing Constanța harbor. Later on, Bușilă held the position of Secretary General in the Ministry of Public Works in 1918-1919, while Anghel Saligny held this portfolio. During this period, a project was formulated by which the National School of Bridges and Roads was to be transformed into a Polytechnic School. Within a broader commission called to propose solutions for reforming the education system, a subcommittee for technical higher education functioned, which included among others Constantin Bușilă (president), I. Atanasiu (rector of University of Bucharest), E. Balaban (director of National School of Bridges and Roads), Anghel Saligny or mathematician Grigore Țițeica. The challenge for this subcommittee was to decide whether the technical education should be embedded in the university, or was it desirable to develop autonomously, according to Romania's "tomorrow's economic needs". In the final meeting from 10th of May 1919, the subcommittee agreed on the second option, considering that universities still retain the ability to "do some general, applied science courses". Nevertheless, "it was stated that the faculties of the Universities do not have as a mission the training of specialists for the different branches of technical activity, since for such training a special technical knowledge was required".

The subcommittee succeeded to formulate the educational concept of polytechnics, implemented by the similar institutions across Europe. It was quite a new approach on education and training since that was supposed to rely mostly on the principle of practice courses. Therefore, the result should have been the split of higher education system into one of "pure sciences" (theoretical) and one of "applied sciences", characteristic for technical higher education. Such a separation was legitimate, the latter requiring the development of facilities necessary for practical works, different from laboratory experiments specific to the study of the sciences.[28] In 1920, this proposal turned into the law on the establishment of polytechnic schools, "similar to universities", with the explicit purpose of training engineers.[29] Thus Romania had two polytechnic schools, in Bucharest and in Timișoara, organized by Traian Lalescu, who used to be professor at the Faculty of Sciences in Bucharest.

Although the law stated that polytechnics were "similar to universities", still there were some details that reflected the inferior position in the higher education system. First of all, the person in charge of such an institution was called "director" (not rector, as in the case of universities), while the students were called, in fact, "pupils". On the other hand, the admission criteria were very selective and inversely in comparison with the admission requirements from universities. There was an annual quota which was set according to schooling capacities (laboratories, conference room etc.). Then, the candidate was supposed to be a graduate of secondary education (*baccalauréats*), exceptionally being accepted graduates from professional or vocation schools. After the secondary school reform of 1928, when the duration of these studies was reduced to 7 years, the polytechnics implemented the system of preparatory year in order to provide the future pupils enough knowledge inherent to engineering studies. The admission exam consisted of three evaluations on arithmetic, plane and space geometry, and trigonometry and algebra. This emphasis on mathematic sciences proved the French influence[30] on organizing polytechnic studies. The appeal to these sciences was supposed to develop the transition from theory to practice and to stimulate individual work and initiatives. The main assumption was that engineer studies were supposed to be a quest for innovation and experimentation.

Another French influence was the military training of the pupils. Starting with 1925, the pupils of the Polytechnics were making the military training in these schools, thus having the possibility of becoming second lieutenant in reserve. This kind of training was supposed to develop an *esprits du corps* sense and it also proved the strategic and security uses of engineers in case of a military conflict.

Coming back to the dissimilarities with universities, in the Romanian polytechnics the study branches were organized into sections. In 1920, there were 4 such sections in Bucharest, preparing pupils to become engineers in the following fields: public construction, electronic mechanics, mining and industry, while in Timișoara only the firsts two were functioning. Beginning with 1923, the Superior School of Forestry was merged into the Polytechnic School of Bucharest.

But the conflict for the "educational jurisdiction" between universities and polytechnics was just about to start. In September 1923, as a result of some changes to the Statute of the Faculty of Sciences in Bucharest, the Technical Institutes of the Universities were granted the right to award engineer and doctoral degrees in engineering recognized by the Ministry

of Public Instruction. The problem for the graduates of these schools was that, in order to become an engineer in the service of the state, the diploma was supposed to be recognized by the Minister of Public Works. Conversely, The Law of the Technical Body of the Ministry of Public Works stipulated that only graduates of polytechnic schools from the country or abroad may be employed in public positions. Because of this situation, the graduates of these Technical Institutes formulated numerous protests in order to achieve the right to become state employees. In 1929, there were several memorandum and protests sent to Nicolae Iorga, rector of University of Bucharest, who was asked to intervene in the favor of these students. Otherwise, considered the leaders of this protest, such a situation will contribute to the erosion of university prestige.[31]

On the other side, the students of polytechnics defined the specificity of this educational concept, totally opposed to the "bohemian" spirit of the universities. Unlike the university students running in struggle for obtaining a diploma, "the engineer is not just the outcome of passed exams". In fact, he was the result of a continuous and harsh work for years, and so he could take this spirit of order and discipline into his professional activity. Finally, although Polytechnic Schools were not entitled to provide doctoral studies, this was not enough to be hierarchically subordinated to universities.[32]

An indirect response offered by Nicolae Vasilescu-Karpen to the frustrations of the university students was the conference he held on 29 November 1929, entitled Polytechnic School. For Vasilescu-Karpen, the progress of European civilization in the 19th and early 20th centuries owes a great deal to engineering technique. On the contrary, the flowering periods of the arts and humanities have failed to improve the condition of the individual. Therefore, "the use of the mechanical forces, which nature gives us, increased the human powers, while suppressing the useless slavery. The characteristic of today's civilization over the past ones is the safety and dignity of human life, in all social classes, along with the individual freedom that is no more limited but to the needs of the community". Although it sounded as an anti-humanities speech, the conclusion reached by Vasilescu-Karpen was the opposite. In his opinion the only chance for a new flourishing age for humanities and arts was through an increasing public wealth, inconceivable outside of the progresses of science and technology. The faith in progress and technocracy shared by Vasilescu-Karpen meant also a promising non-zero-sum economic pattern of development. Technology was no more about taking the wealth from the masses for the benefit of small and

selfish elite. The power of technology was that it could provide anybody with what it needed.[33] For such a goal, a continuing development of the technic higher education system was required. In addition, the engineer must be prepared to assume leadership roles in economic life and must be aware of the major changes at the international level. This is why the Polytechnic students also attended economic and administrative courses, plus foreign language courses, without which the success of a career was almost impossible.[34]

The university law of 1932 came to complicate the things. Regarding "applied sciences",[35] article 70 of this law stipulated that "faculties of sciences that have organized applied sciences also grant diplomas of university engineer and doctor-university engineer". The one who signaled this strange situation was Constantin D. Bușilă, as a deputy in the Romanian parliament, who strongly opposed the introduction of the "applied education" to the University, since it was neither more, nor less, than "unfair" competition to the polytechnic schools. "It is not rational to have two similar institutions in the same city", Bușilă stated. "We need to train just in one place the engineers the public and private economic life of the country really needs". Instead, such a decision was supposed to contribute to the lowering of the educational requirements from both institutions, for the single purpose of attracting more and more students.[36]

The only achievement of Constantin D. Bușilă was passing an amendment by which the technical institutes pending of universities were supposed to be merged into the polytechnics by a future law for concentrating engineers training. Only that in the Senate, the influence exercised by the *de jure* senators of the universities led to the passing of a new "amendment". Article 96 stipulated that the provisions of article 85 were to be applied "only after the decisions of the Faculty Council, taken by the majority of the total number of titular professors and ratified by University Senate". Later on, Bușilă noted that the principle of university autonomy (as understood and practiced by the University) went beyond the interpretation given by the state to this notion, since article 96 "subordinated a state law to a so-called academic autonomy".[37] It was a proof of legal asymmetry since a law issued by the state could not produce effects without the prior ratification of the universities. Again, the fact that the polytechnic schools were inferior to the universities was more than obvious. While each university had a *de jure* senator in the Parliament, their power to influence political decisions into their own interest was considerable.[38]

Starting with 1935 the professional associations of engineers began to fight for concentration and rationalization of technical higher education. AGIR (headed by Mihail Manoilescu starting with 1935) and Societatea Politehnică din România [Polytechnic Society of Romania] (led by Constantin D. Bușilă) tried to come into notice and then get the support of public opinion in this regard. Considering that public support is essential in order to achieve the goal, these associations will exploit any public event or dissatisfaction to turn them into an argument for concentrating technical higher education and establish a meritorious place for the engineer in the hierarchy of intellectual professionals.

Such a demarche was framed also as a financial issue. From the budgetary point of view, the financing of the university technical institutes represented a waste of the public money: in 1935/36, the total expenses with the institutes in Bucharest amounted to 19 million lei, while the two polytechnic schools spent 34 million. In terms of labor market insertion, the university technical institutes contributed to an increasing unemployment among engineers: out of the 240 engineers of the Polytechnic School in Bucharest in 1934 and 1935, "only 20 % were placed in good conditions. Others have been placed, but I know cases when some of these graduates have just become teachers at a craft school in the countryside. As a matter of fact, many of them were hired and paid as workers because they could not be put into the budget. There is indeed great intellectual unemployment".[39]

Despite the public pressure for such a law, things seemed to be delayed on purpose. Although the student associations from the Polytechnic School and from Technical Institute of the Universities joined their forces, it seemed that the legislative procedure was obstructed by some professors who were senators.[40]

Sometimes a strong public emotion is required, so things can speed up. Such a pretext was the disaster at the feast of the restoration of June 8, 1936, when one of the tribunes arranged for the public at Cotroceni stadium (Bucharest) collapsed under the gaze of King Carol II. Media widely reported this unfortunate incident, which provoked a lot of casualties. A bizarre detail was also that the works were carried out with no professional advice. Although engineers tried to frame this incident as a reinforcement of their claims, the things were moving too slowly.

It was not until 19 February 1937 that the draft law on the concentration of technical higher education came into the debate of the Parliament. Mihail Manoilescu's arguments in the favor of such a law seemed

irrefutable. First of all, the university technical institutes would have functioned illegally, simply by the fact that they were empowered to grant the title of engineer by an internal statute, and not by an organic law. Then, although the 1932 university law revealed this abnormality, the decision taken by the Parliament was to simply perpetuate this state of affair. A decision of the Legislative Council of 1934, however, considered these institutes "virtually abolished" since "their origin was illegal". The law seemed simply incapable of replacing old habits. "The positive solution is to have a great totalitarian polytechnic for the whole country or a large technical university"[41] that was supposed to encompass all technical faculties in Romania. The difference between university and Polytechnic would rely on the degrees granted: universities were entitled for academic degrees (except for human medicine), while the latter granted professional titles.

On March 20, 1937, the law for the concentration of the training of engineers in the Polytechnic Schools was published in the Official Monitor, stipulating the settle down of a third polytechnic school in Iași, the capital city of Moldova. One year later, in November 1938, in order to "rationalize" higher education, the first law in the history of Romanian education was adopted which regulated the situation of all higher education institutions. Thus, the agronomic academies of Cluj and Bucharest were to be included in the Polytechnics of Timișoara and Bucharest; the technical institutes from Bucharest along with the Academy of Architecture were to be incorporated in the Polytechnics of Bucharest; finally, the Agronomic Faculty of Chișinău will become part of the newly established Polytechnic in Iași. The reasons behind the promulgation of this law were "a better recruitment of the teaching staff" and "a more serious training of the students". In the latter aspect, the law would set "a brake on endless inflation that did not serve either the proper development of science or the good training of students".[42]

The Fight for the Professional Jurisdiction

After 1918, Greater Romania enlarged considerably its body of professionals, if we take into consideration the specialists coming from the new provinces: Bessarabia, Bukovina and Transylvania. In fact, these provinces were totally different from social and economic point of view. Here came into action the professional associations who were

called to develop power strategies for dominating and monopolizing the labor market. In such a volatile medium in the aftermath of the 1st World War, it was almost naturally that, as it was the case in Germany, "many professional associations, when faced with higher competition and lowered incomes, actively sought to surrender some of their autonomy in return for state protection".[43] This pattern developed in many European countries, and many professional associations considered that only an international approach on such a problem would provide effective solutions.

In 1924, the International Labor Office (ILO) implemented an enquiry into the conditions of work of industrial workers possessing higher education qualifications, i.e. chemists and engineers. Almost all Central and Eastern European countries responded to this investigation, whose main purpose was to find out if there are special institutions that grant the titles mentioned above, if the professions were legally protected and if there were any signs of unemployment in these professions. From the Romanian side, the answer was provided by Ioan Protopopescu, professor at the Polytechnic School in Timişoara. If the engineer's title was an attribute of polytechnic schools only, the title of "licensed in chemistry" was awarded by all four universities of Romania, he noted in his answer. However, there was no law protecting the two academic titles, even though AGIR had put forward such a legislative proposal. Even so, unemployment among the two professions did not exist, due to the fact that many German and Austrian specialists who used to work in Romania preferred to emigrate. On the contrary, because of the industry's surge, the two polytechnic schools did not have the capacity to train a sufficient number of specialists. On the other hand, in terms of engineer payment, inflation contributed to a steep decline in purchasing power. Engineers in the state service earned between 4 and 9,000 lei, while in the private industry wages were three times higher.[44]

The situation began to change in the late 20's, according to Vasilescu-Karpen. Although the Polytechnic Schools imposed an annual quota of students in order to avoid an overcrowding in the profession, the effects of the economic depression played an important role, though. In April 1930, Vasilescu-Karpen initiated an inquiry in order to estimate if a future regulation of the flow the graduates of the two polytechnic schools was needed. The public and private institutions he addressed warned that "the number of positions in the various engineering specialties is very low and there was no estimate of vacancies in the near future". In addition, there was a large share of engineers trained abroad. The engineer body of the

Romanian Railway Company consisted of 612 engineers, of which 300 graduated abroad. According to Vasilescu-Karpen's estimates, the body of engineers of all specialties in the country could be rated at a "maximum of about 4000". "Admitting an average of 25 years in service, it would result that our country needs a flow of about 160 engineers per year; as not all graduates of engineering schools practice this profession, we can admit a maximum flow of 200 engineers per year. This is actually the flow of engineers of the two Polytechnics in the country, which can thus cope with the current needs of the country".[45] His statement can be considered as one of the first incentives for converting a liberal profession into a statefully-protected profession.

In 1931, another inquiry conducted by BIT revealed that in many European countries there was an important "endemic unemployment" because of an overcrowding in this profession. As for Romania, the report revealed that neither engineer nor architects (as academic title and as professions) were not protected by any law. The only positive aspect was that in the service of the state there were employed only holders of the academic titles of engineer or architect, granted by a polytechnic school from Romania or abroad. The report concluded that there was an "intellectual unemployment" among engineers, caused especially by the economic depression. In addition, the austerity policies adopted by the government led to salary cuts between 25% and 40% starting with January 1931.[46]

AGIR also tackled the problem of engineers' unemployment, proposing two distinct solutions. The first proposal was a nationalistic one, asking for the limitation of foreign specialists to work in Romania. It should be noted that Romania had already adopted two such measures: the Migration Law (1925) and the Indigenous Labor Protection Act (1930), which aimed at limiting the presence of foreign specialists on the intellectual professions market in Romania.

Four years later, through the law on the use of Romanian personnel in enterprises, the tendency towards Romanianizing the market of intellectual professions turns into state politics. Eugen Titeanu, rapporteur of the law in the Chamber of Deputies, explained the need for such a law through the amplitude of intellectual unemployment among young graduates: "The new generations of intellectuals coming from universities and renowned schools must find their place in the economic life of this state, so they won't become the trigger of social neurosis".[47] *De facto*, the law had a deep autarchic and nationalist character, since all economic, industrial,

and commercial enterprises (no matter if public or private) were obliged to have 80% Romanian citizens, with the exception of boards of directors where an equal ratio was still allowed. As for foreign employees, the law mentioned that those "who at the date of the promulgation of the law were married to Romanians and having children will preferably be hold in their positions".[48]

The law failed to calm the spirits, both in parliament and in public life. The nationalist derail asked for concrete measures of "national justice" for all Romanians, with the ethnic argument prevailing over the citizenship rights. The nationalization of economic life has become a widespread opinion in society.

The pressure exerted by professional associations played a great role to this respect. Since 1933, the most important intellectual professional associations from Romania decided to establish a national confederation. The new body, called *Confederația Asociațiilor de Profesioniști Intelectuali din România* [Confederation of Intellectual Professionals Associations of Romania, CAPIR], was one of the harsh promoters of a "nationalized" labor market. In May 16, 1937, CAPIR General Congress adopted the resolution called "Romanianization of Intellectual Professions", which aimed at promoting the "national ethnic element" in all professions, along with the Romanianization of the capital, and the revision of citizenships granted after 1918. In addition, the resolution asked for a severe revision of all diplomas of study obtained abroad and nostrified by the state after 1918. A last point was the creation of an intellectual work office with role in professional guidance and training. The extreme right press welcomed this initiative supposed to be just a materialization of the times' spirit. An article praised this "Resurrection of the Intellectuals", stating that "the members of this confederation will be victorious not as intellectuals, but as active patriots and soldiers for a sacred cause. The last question: can our intellectual professionals turn into such an army? Are they ready to fight; that is to say, are they full of abnegation and willing to totally give up the bourgeois prejudices and commodities?"[49]

Towards an "Enlightened Minority's Dictatorship"

The royal dictatorship regime installed by King Carol II had all the ingredients of an intellectual professionals' victory. In 1936, in a statement in Parliament, Mihail Manoilescu pointed out the necessity

of an "enlightened minority's dictatorship", i.e. a dictatorship in which intellectual professionals were supposed to be in charge of everything. The idea of a corporatist organization of the state was in strong relation with the idea of a planned economy,[50] considered to be the only system capable of a truly development of the state. Economic underdevelopment, stated Manoilescu, was caused by the free-trade system, which disadvantaged the agrarian economies, unable to produce added value due to the low labor efficiency. The solution was industrialization at the expense of investment in agriculture, and a protectionist system for the entire economy, including the intellectual professionals. Economic nationalism "first means the external struggle of the entire internal economy against the economic interests of foreigners and, secondly, the internal struggle to conquer the decisive economic positions on the part of the Romanians".[51]

In 1938, Mihail Manoilescu proposed a scheme for the organization and representation of intellectual professions in Parliament, as well as in the new society. The aim was therefore a corporate organization of intellectual professionals, "a massive grouping of intellectuals as intellectuals, according to their specialty and competence, a group that has in its various sectors a right to intervene legally in all matters of the State".[52] The first step was an organization in distinct colleges of intellectual professionals according to their specialties, while enrollment was supposed to be mandatory in order to practice any profession.

The result was the Law on exercising the profession of engineer and the establishment of the Engineers College, published in the Official Monitor on the 10th of August, 1938. Thus, the exercise of the engineer profession became the exclusive attribute of the Engineers'College members, open only to Romanian citizens who enjoyed all civil and political rights and who were holders of a diploma issued by higher technical schools in Romania or abroad (in the latter case an equivalence was required). AGIR proposed that all members of this association automatically be recognized by the state as members of the College of Engineers and thus to be the only experts that public authorities should call for jobs. In the AGIR Yearbook of 1938-1939, a list of experts comprising 3172 engineers was published. The distribution by specialties was as follows: 738 were construction engineers, 896 mechanical and electromechanical engineers, 342 mining and metallurgy engineers, 295 engineers for the chemical industry, 461 forest engineers, and 420 agronomic engineers (for 20 engineers there was no specialty mentioned). In terms of work, over 60% were in state service (2039 engineers), almost 20% were working in the private sector

(629), 136 were entrepreneurs and 368 were freelancers. The vast majority of this body was active in the Muntenia-Bucharest area (1900), and the area with the lowest number of AGIR members was Oradea, with only 20 engineers.

Political Authoritarianism as a Culmination of Professionalization? (Conclusions)

GrigoreTrancu-Iași wrote on 1 December 1916 that "This country was a great victim of loquacity: loquacity from the Parliament tribune and loquacity in the papers. We have chosen the ruling people not according to their skill, but after the perception of their discourse. Who has made more swirling phrases has come closer to the ministerial portfolio". And under this mask of erudite peroration, room was made to incompetence, corruption and servility: "When you look like an obedient servant and you succeed to become a minister, well, then there's no wonder that in such a government the prime minister has the entire power, and the others do not dare to oppose. Therefore, the country gets to the point it reached today",[53] referring to the disaster of the military campaign of the autumn of 1916, resulting in the refugee in Moldova.

The new state, Greater Romania, was supposed to trigger a new system of reshaping society, with professionalization as the core phenomenon in building a modern labor market and a new bureaucracy, since it relied on a meritocratic system of promotion. Instead, bureaucracy became a politicized area, while professionalization was hardly penetrating economic and social structure. And, as I presented above, these professions were supposed to manage into a free-market system with no legal protection. This was the reason why the political parties system meant for many professionals a high degree of uncertainty and precariousness. Since political parties were the exponents of a democratic electoral regime, these shortcomings have turned into a fierce criticism of the idea of democracy itself, increasingly manifested among intellectual professionals in the 1930s. That was why the discourse of professionalism supported the need for state interventionism in society and in the economy, with the risk of canceling democracy. In fact, democratic practice had not even managed to legally protect their professions.

The regime of royal dictatorship of King Carol II intended to reshape the state system in favor of professionals. The administrative reform initiated by

Radu Portocală aimed to reduce the number of civil servants, amounting to 408.619 in 1940, i.e. 2.15% of the total population of the country, well above the state's financial capacities. His aim was to create a slim and modern bureaucratic apparatus. According to the new law, by specialist it was understood a "graduated from a specialized school, directly related to the position he wants to fulfill and who also has academic titles or activities in the same specialty". Radu Portocală hoped that his approach will be the first step in the "intellectualization of cadres", and the entrance exam among civil servants will be able to become a selection of the most valuable university graduates, in order to establish a new "administrative nobility, a second magistracy": "To this new connection of social and national life we call the titrated youth. For him and for a higher state, we have created this new social value, the cultured public function".[54]

Finally, I would like to emphasize the necessity of a historical sociology of labor and, in particular, of intellectual professions in modern Romania. Although historiography has highlighted the successes of the higher education system in the training of professionals, few studies have focused on the fate of the graduates in the labor market. Another issue less approached is the shift from an occupational agrarian society towards one of employed people. In 1930, Romania had an "active population" of 10 million, a rather fake statistic, considering that over 8 million were peasants exploiting their own farms. In fact, the paid work represented only 13.9% of the active population, with the state as the largest employer. The underdevelopment of the Romanian society can be envisaged as the incapacity of creating, protecting and promoting a more complex socio-economic structure. To this respect, the case of engineers is illustrative. Born as an intellectual profession in order to serve the interests of the state, it developed an entire social, economic and political system in order to make the state support the interests of this profession.

NOTES

* The author would like to thank Petru Negură (NEC alumnus) for his helpful comments and feedback.

1 ANIC, *Fund Direcția Generală a Poliției 1903-1936*, folder no. 1/1926, ff. 201, 213, 218.

2 The British Leftist historian will conclude that the interwar period was nothing more than an interstitial between the time of laissez-faire capitalism and the birth of the welfare state after 1945. An excerpt from the Times January 23rd, 1943, was illustrative: "Next to [first world] war, unemployment has been the most widespread, the most insidious, and the most corroding malady of our generation; it is the specific social disease of Western civilization in our time". Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes. The Short 20th Century 1914-1991*, London, Abacus, 1995, p. 85.

3 For Europe, it was not the first time it had to face problems like intellectual proletariat or intellectual unemployment. As Lenore O'Boyle put it, an "excess of educated men" was faced by France, Germany or England in the first half of the 19th century. Soon after that, along with the spread of the Industrial revolution and the economic system it created – the capitalist one – this phenomenon was faced by many other countries, especially during the interwar years. "In the 20th century this kind of intellectual proletariat was important in the growth of Fascism and Right Radicalism, and has been crucial in the history of underdeveloped countries". Lenore O'Boyle, "The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe 1800-1850", in *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 42, no. 4, December 1970, p. 494.

4 Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer. Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*, New York, Harper&Row, 1951, p. 15.

5 Mária M. Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics. Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*, Washington DC, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, p. xvii.

6 Lutz Raphael, "Embedding the Human and Social Sciences in Western Societies, 1880-1980: Reflections on Trends and Methods of Current Research", in Kerstin Brückweh, Dirk Schumann, Richard F. Wetzell, Benjamin Ziemann (eds.), *Engineering Society. The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies 1880-1980*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 41-56.

7 Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism. Monopolies of Competence and Sheltered Markets*, 2nd edition, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, 2013, p. xxiv.

8 Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions. An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*, Chicago&London, The University of Chicago Press, 1988, p. 2.

9 *Ibidem*, p. 9.

10 "The central phenomenon of professional life is the link between a profession and its work, a link I shall call jurisdiction". *Ibidem*, p. 20.

11 John Maynard Keynes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920, p. 249.

12 Cited in Maria M. Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics*, p. 38.

13 Martin Kohlrausch, *The Hour of the Experts? Reflections on the Rise of Experts in Interbellum Europe*, in JorisVandendriessche, Evert Peeters and Kaat Wils (eds.), *Scientists' Expertise as Performance: between State and Society 1860-1960*, London&New York, Routledge, 2015, p. 70.

14 Charles S. Maier, "Consigning the 20th Century to History. Alternative Narrative for the Modern Era", in *The American Historical Review*, vol. 105, no. 3, June 2000, p. 818.

15 Lutz Raphael, "Embedding the Human and Social Sciences in Western Societies, 1880-1980", p. 51.

16 Charles Ferguson and Henry Gantt cited in Charles S. Maier, "Between Taylorism and Technocracy. European ideologies and the vision of industrial productivity in the 1920's", in *Journal of Contemporary History*, volume 5, issue 2, april 1970, p. 33.

17 Martin Kohlrausch, *The Hour of the Experts?*, p. 73.

18 Dimitrie Gusti, "Apel cu prilejul întemeierii Asociației pentru studiul și reforma socială", in *Arhiva pentru Știință și Reformă Socială*, year I, no. 1, April 1919, p. 91.

19 Idem, "Realitate, știință și reformă socială. Câteva indicații asupra metodei", in *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială*, year I, no. 1, april 1919, p. XXIV.

20 Historian Ioan C. Filitti envisaged *pseudoburghezia orășenească* as the original error from the inception of the Romanian state. In fact, this strategy turned to be a way of preserving its own privileges in the new regime, while the state of the peasantry lagged behind. Citing a phrase of Take Ionescu as a deputy in the Parliament of Romania in 1887, it seemed that "the boyars were gone, so the *cumulards* can come!".See Ioan C. Filitti, *Rătăcirile unei pseudo-burghezii (și reforme ce nu se fac)*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice Torouțiu, [1935], p. 6.

21 Viktor Karády, "Une *nation de juristes*. Des usages sociaux de la formation juridique dans la Hongrie d'Ancien Régime", in *Acte de la recherche en sciences sociales, vol. 86-87: Education et société*, mars 1991, p. 109.

22 Andrew C. Janos, *East Central Europe in the Modern World. The Politics of the Borderlands from pre- to Postcommunism*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2000, p. 66.

23 Maria M. Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics*, p. 12.

24 Ion Ionescu, *Istoricul învățământului ingineriei în România*, in *Aniversarea a 75 de ani de învățământ tehnic în România*, București, Cartea românească Publishing House, 1930, p. 183-191.

25 Leo Pavslovsky, *Economic Nationalism of the Danubian States*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928, p. 401.

26 See *Monitorul Oficial al României* no. 223 from 30th of December 1918, articles 4 and 7.

27 D. Hurmuzesco, "L'Organisation de l'Enseignement Technique Supérieur auprès des Universités de Roumanie", in *Revue génerale des Sciences pures et appliquées*, year 29, no. 21, 15th of November 1918, p. 615.

28 Constantin D. Bușilă, *Învățământul tehnic superior*, București [f.e.] 1939, p. 17.

29 *Monitorul Oficial al României* no. 61 from 10th of June 1920.

30 On the origins and evolution of the Ecole Politechniques in Paris, see Ulrich Pfammatter, *The Making of the Modern Architect and Engineer. The Origins and Developments of a Scientific and Industrially Oriented Education*, Basel-Boston-Berlin, Birkhäuser, 2000, p. 17-99.

31 ANIC, Fund Direcția Generală a Poliției 1906-1936, folder no. 42/1929, f. 3-4.

32 ANIC, Fund Direcția Generală a Poliției 1906-1936, folder no. 28/1928, f. 7-8.

33 Nicolae Vasilescu-Karpen, *Școala politehnică. Conferință susținută în data de 29 noiembrie 1929*, in *Școala Politehnică din București. Anuarul pentru anul 1927-1928*, București, Cartea Românească Publishing House, [1930], p. IV.

34 *Ibidem*, p. VIII.

35 Nicolae Iorga noted in his memoirs that during the discussions on the university education law, he had to face the adversity of the polytechnic students, a "disrespectful demonstration because the law did not respect the monopoly of engineers". The note is dated March 16, 1932, when Iorga also visited King Carol II, who had a similar point to the representatives of the Romanian polytechnics: "He [King Carol 2nd believes politehnicians are right. The university should only grant the title of graduates in applied science". Nicolae Iorga, *Memorii. Încercarea guvernării peste partide 1931-1932*, vol. VI, București, [f.e.], 1939, p. 349.

36 See the meeting of the Deputies Assembly from 28th of March 1932, in *Monitorul Oficial al României. Partea a treia: Dezbateri parlamentare. Adunarea Deputaților*, no. 71 of 15th of April 1932.

37 Constantin D. Bușilă, *Învățământul tehnic superior*, p. 54.

38 The Deputy Chambers after the elections of December 1933 had a total of 384 positions, and was by far dominated by lawyers (174 deputies listed this profession); 21 came from the university milieu and 14 listed engineer as their professional identity. See *Listă nominală cu arătarea grupării politice, profesiunii, stării civile și domiciliului domnilor deputați aleși în alegerile din 20 decembrie 1933* ACNSAS, Fund Documentar, file no. 10809, f. 2-22.

39 ȘtefanMihăescu, "Organizarea rațională a învățământului tehnic superior", in *Buletinul AGIR*, year XVIII, no. 5, May 1936, p. 164.

40 *Buletinul AGIR*, year XVIII, no. 4, April 1936, pp. 134-135.

41 Mihail Manoilescu, "Problema concentrării învățământului tehnic superior (interpelare în ședința Senatului din 19 februarie 1937)", in*Buletinul AGIR*, year XIX, no. 2, February 1937, pp. 34-45.

42 *Legea pentru modificarea și completarea legilor privitoare la învățământul superior și special în vederea raționalizării*, in *Monitorul Oficial al României* no. 257 of 4th of November 1938.

43 Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization. Modern Learned Professions and their organizations from the early 19th century to the Hitler era*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 22.

44 ILOA, Series L, folder no. 25/10/52/1

45 Nicolae Vasilescu-Karpen, *Dare de seamă asupra învățământului în Școala Politehnică din București*, in *Aniversarea a 75 de ani de învățământ tehnic în România*, București, Publishing House Cartea românească, 1931, pp. 9-10.

46 ILOA, Series N, folder no.N/207.

47 Hans-Christian Manner, *Parlamentarismul în România 1930-1940*, București, Enciclopedică Publishing House, 2004, p. 311.

48 The law was published in *Monitorul Oficial* no. 161 of 16th of July 1934. The excerpts used in this study are taken from Gheorghe Iacob (editor), *Modernizarea României 1859-1939. Legislație și strategie economică*, Iași, Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza Publishing House, 2012, p. 103.

49 ANIC, Fond DGP 1937-1948, folder 175/1937, f. 23-29.

50 For a detailed analysis of the parliamentary debates on "planned economy" and the Superior Economic Council, see Hans-Christian Manner, *Parlamentarismul în România 1930-1940*, p. 276-288.

51 Mihail Manoilescu apud Bogdan Murgescu, *România și Europa. Acumularea decalajelor economice 1500-2010,* Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 2010, p. 251.

52 *Asociația Generală a Inginerilor din România. Anteproiect de memoriu asupra organizării și reprezentării în Parlament a profesiunilor intelectuale*, București, Imprimeria Națională, 1939, p. 7.

53 Grigore Trancu-Iași, *Țara mea. Memorii 1916-1920*, edited by Fabian Anton, București, Ararat Publishing House, 1998, p. 13.

54 *Cuvântarea rostită de d-l ministru Radu Portocală înaintea Comisiunilor reunite de legislație civilă, comercială și penală, ale Senatului și Camerei Deputaților (5 iunie 1940)*, București, Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, 1940, 18p.

References

Archives

National Council for the Study of the Securitate Archive [ACNSAS], Fund Documentar

Historical National Archives of Romania [ANIC], Fund Direcția Generală a Poliției 1903-1936

International Labor Office Archive [ILOA], Series L and N

Periodicals

Arhiva pentru Știință și Reformă Socială, year I, no. 1, April 1919

Buletinul AGIR [Asociația Generală a Inginerilor din România], 1919-1940

Monitorul Oficial al României. Part 1: Laws and Decrees

Monitorul Oficial al României. 3rd Part Parliamentary Debates. Chamber of Deputies

Școala Politehnică din București. Anuarul pentru anul 1927-1928, București, Cartea Românească Publishing House, [1930]

Articles

O'Boyle, Lenore, "The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe 1800-1850", in *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 42, no. 4, December 1970, pp. 471-495.

Viktor Karády, "Une "nation de juristes". Des usages sociaux de la formation juridique dans la Hongrie d'Ancien Régime", in *Acte de la recherche en sciences sociales, vol. 86-87: Education et société*, mars 1991, pp. 106-124.

Maier, Charles S., "Consigning the 20th Century to History. Alternative Narrative for the Modern Era", in *The American Historical Review*, vol. 105, no. 3, June 2000, pp. 807-831.

Idem, "Between Taylorism and Technocracy. European ideologies and the vision of industrial productivity in the 1920's", in *Journal of Contemporary History*, volume 5, issue 2, april 1970, pp. 27-61.

Books

*** *Aniversarea a 75 de ani de învățământ tehnic în România*, București, Cartea românească Publishing House, 1930

Abbott, Andrew, *The System of Professions. An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*, Chicago&London, The University of Chicago Press, 1988

Brückweh, Kerstin; Schumann, Dirk; Wetzell, Richard F.; Ziemann, Benjamin (eds.), *Engineering Society. The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies 1880-1980*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012

Bușilă, Constantin D., *Învățământul tehnic superior*, București [f.e.] 1939

Filitti, Ioan C., *Rătăcirile unei pseudo-burghezii (și reforme ce nu se fac)*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice Torouțiu, [1935]

Hobsbawm, Eric, *Age of Extremes. The Short 20th Century 1914-1991*, London, Abacus, 1995

Hoffer, Eric, *The True Believer. Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*, New York, Harper&Row, 1951

Iorga, Nicolae, *Memorii. Încercarea guvernării peste partide 1931-1932*, vol. VI, București, [f.e.], 1939

Janos, Andrew C., *East Central Europe in the Modern World. The Politics of the Borderlands from pre- to Postcommunism*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2000

Keynes, John Maynard, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920

Kovács, Mária M., *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics. Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*, Washington DC, Woodrow Wilson Center Press

Larson, Magali Sarfatti, *The Rise of Professionalism. Monopolies of Competence and Sheltered Markets*, 2nd edition, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, 2013

Manner, Hans-Christian, *Parlamentarismul în România 1930-1940*, București, Enciclopedică Publishing House, 2004

McClelland, Charles E., *The German Experience of Professionalization. Modern Learned Professions and their organizations from the early 19th century to the Hitler era*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Murgescu, Bogdan, *România și Europa. Acumularea decalajelor economice 1500-2010,* Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 2010

Pavslovsky, Leo, *Economic Nationalism of the Danubian States*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928

Pfammatter, Ulrich, *The Making of the Modern Architect and Engineer. The Origins and Developments of a Scientific and Industrially Oriented Education*, Basel-Boston-Berlin, Birkhäuser, 2000

Trancu-Iași, Grigore, *Țara mea. Memorii 1916-1920*, edited by Fabian Anton, București, Publishing House Ararat, 1998

Vandendriessche, Joris; Peeters, Evert; Wils, Kaat (eds.), *Scientists' Expertise as Performance: between State and Society 1860-1960*, London&New York, Routledge, 2015