

DEBATES ON DEVELOPMENT IN AN EUROPEAN SUBURB: EUGEN LOVINESCU'S THEORY OF "INTEGRAL IMITATION"

Dragoş Petrescu

Interwar Romania was characterized by a diverse and highly sophisticated intellectual life. In this respect, Keith Hitchins stated that "in the period between World Wars I and II there was an intensity and variety of intellectual expression in Romania perhaps never before equaled."¹ In a similar vein, Daniel Chirot wrote: "For a contemporary American sociologist steeped in the debates currently at the fore of macrosociological theory, it is startling and sobering to discover that in the 1920s some Romanian intellectuals were engaged in essentially the same controversies, and their polemic was conducted on a level at least as sophisticated as that of today."²

The majority of the scholars interested in the Romanian cultural phenomenon agree that, in the interwar period, the great intellectual debates concentrated with even more intensity than before on the nature of Romanian ethnicity and culture. Hence, the search for "national values," the strive to define Romanians' "essential character," and the emphasis on the "idea of Romanianness." Although it is difficult to classify the large variety of viewpoints generated by such debates, one can still identify the two currents that polarized the intellectual life of the period, and label those from one side as "Europeans" or "Westernizers," and those from the other as "traditionalists" or "indigenists." A detailed analysis of the debates and the arguments provided by each of the two rival groups is beyond the scope of the present paper. However, it is worth remembering that, by the end of the interwar period, the indigenist camp proved to be the most influential.

This study concentrates on the major ideas put forward by the literary critic Eugen Lovinescu (1881-1943), one of the prominent "Westernizers" of the period.³ As Virgil Nemoianu observed, "for about twenty years, Eugen Lovinescu was the most seminal and forceful spokesman for classical liberalism in Romania, and the only one to respond in a creative way to the challenges of a rapidly changing historical environment."⁴ Unfortunately, Lovinescu did not have many followers during his lifetime, and, in this respect, Katherine Verdery aptly puts it: "That he was spitting into the wind of his time is evident in the defeat of his nominations for membership in the Romanian Academy and for a university post."⁵

The present paper discusses at length only Lovinescu's ideas concerning Romania's development and "catching up" with the West. Consequently, the analysis focuses on *History of Modern Romanian Civilization*, his major oeuvre, the three-volume work published between 1924 and 1926, in which he developed his theory of *synchronism* or "integral imitation." The discussion on Lovinescu's work within the context of the Romanian interwar debates on development and modernization goes beyond the limits of this study. Instead, this author limits himself to trace his sources of inspiration and to emphasize how similar ideas emerged in a later period and in a different context. Therefore, since Lovinescu was deeply influenced by the works of the French sociologist Jean-Gabriel Tarde (1843-1904), the first part of the present paper addresses Tarde's ideas, especially his *lois de l'imitation* (laws of imitation). The second part discusses Lovinescu's concepts of *synchronism* or "integral imitation," by which he attempted to explain the process of modernization that started in Romania beginning in the 19th century. The third part compares Lovinescu's approach to economic development and modernization with some of the ideas that emerged from the early modernization theory, developed in the United States during the 1950s and based on the theory of *cognitive dissonance* coined by the psychologist Leon Festinger. More specifically, this part analyzes, in a comparative perspective, Albert O. Hirschman's concept of *inverted sequences* and Lovinescu's concept of *synchronism*. In terms of "catching up," "development" or "modernization," this study concludes, the ideas of the two authors conspicuously resemble. To Lovinescu, who referred to the case of Romania, *synchronism* with the West can be achieved through massive import – wholesale in the beginning, critical afterwards – of Western "forms" that would be filled gradually with "substance." Three decades later, reflecting on another geographical zone that had to "catch up" – Latin America – Hirschman proposed a strategy of overcoming economic backwardness and stirring development based on *inverted sequences*. He advanced the idea that carefully planned ventures, with a complicated technology, are more likely to succeed due to the compulsion to maintain them, which makes such investments less exposed to the inevitable gradual deterioration in a non-Western environment. In other words, the import of thoroughly chosen Western "forms" promotes economic development.

JEAN-GABRIEL TARDE'S "LAWS OF IMITATION"

In 1890, Tarde published his book, *Les lois de l'imitation* (The Laws of Imitation), which was considered by some authors to be his most famous sociological work.⁶ As already mentioned, in elaborating his theory of "integral

imitation,” Lovinescu drew on Tarde’s laws of imitation but he interpreted differently the orientation of the imitation process. Therefore, this part is concerned mainly with Tarde’s laws of imitation.

In order to explain these laws, Tarde used three concepts: *invention*, *imitation* and *opposition*.⁷ For him, invention is the source of human progress. He defined *progress* as a “kind of collective thinking, which lacks a brain of its own, but which is made possible, *thanks to imitation*, by the solidarity of the brains of numerous scholars and inventors who interchange their successive discoveries [emphasis added].”⁸ As shown by the fragment quoted above, the concept of imitation is central to Tarde’s sociological work. However, as some authors have observed, he does not offer an explicit definition of the term. Nevertheless, in the preface of the second edition of his *The Laws of Imitation*, he defines imitation as a “quasi-photographic reproduction of a cerebral image.”⁹ For Tarde, the crucial question was why some inventions and discoveries diffuse successfully while others are forgotten. It was the need to answer such an essential question that incited him to elaborate the laws of imitation.

According to Tarde, the “supreme law of imitation” can be defined as imitation’s tendency toward “indefinite progression.”¹⁰ Known as the “law of progressive enlargement” this law epitomizes Tarde’s conception of the relationships between the three basic concepts: *invention*, *imitation* and *opposition*.¹¹ In this respect, Terry N. Clark offers an insightful summary of Tarde’s ideas:

Inventions, the creations of talented individuals, are disseminated throughout social systems by the process of imitation. These imitations spread – to use one of Tarde’s favorite analogies – like the ripples on the surface of a pond, regularly progressing toward the limits of the system until they come into contact with some obstacle. The obstacle, however, is likely to be the imitation of some earlier invention, and when the two collide, from their opposition is likely to emerge a new product – that is, a new invention – which in turn is imitated until it too meets further obstacles, and so on, ad infinitum.¹²

Tarde argued that “social progress is accomplished through a series of substitutions and accumulations.”¹³ Therefore, in his view, inventions and discoveries might compete and replace each other or might combine and augment each other. In Tarde’s words, it is about “alternative” inventions and discoveries in the first case, and of “accumulable” inventions and discoveries in the second.¹⁴

Tarde’s second law of imitation can be formulated as follows: “The more similar are inventions to those already imitated and hence institutionalized in a particular social system, the more likely they are to be imitated.”¹⁵ By refining this law, Tarde further elaborated two sets of laws: the *logical* and the *extra-*

logical laws of imitation. The “logical” law of imitation states that: “The closer a particular invention is to the most advanced technological aspects of a society, the more likely it is to be imitated.” The “extra-logical” law of imitation reads as follows: “The more an invention meets the predominant cultural emphasis, the more likely it is to be imitated.”¹⁶

The “logical” laws of imitation are related to the logical aspect of inventions and discoveries. As shown above, Tarde distinguishes between “alternative” and “accumulable” inventions. The struggle between alternative (substitutable) inventions conveys to a “logical duel,” whereas the encounter of accumulable (complementary) inventions results in a “logical union.”¹⁷ Nevertheless, the society witnesses simultaneously a continuous, two-faceted process of struggle between substitutable inventions and, respectively, of aggregation of complementary inventions. Such a process conveys to what Tarde called a “logical strain.” In his view, there are two basic sources of “logical strain.” In the first case, “logical strain” is produced by the simultaneous presence of relatively incompatible inventions in a society, at least for some time. Obviously, the society would decide eventually which inventions are more appropriate. In the second case, “logical strain” is generated by the general and irreversible advancement of knowledge, which would lead to an increasing number of inventions and would make difficult to maintain a sort of consistency of thought. Hence, Tarde’s idea that the 19th century was a century of inventions, while the 20th century would have to be dedicated to the rationalization of the inventions of the previous century.¹⁸

Tarde formulated two basic “extra-logical” laws of imitation. First, he asserted that extra-logical imitation proceeds “from the inner to the outer man” or from “inside” to “outside:”

Imitation, then, contrary to what we might infer from certain appearances *proceeds from the inner to the outer man*. It seems at first sight as if people or a class began to imitate another by copying its luxury and its fine arts before it became possessed of its tastes and literature, of its aims and ideas, in a word, of its spirit. Precisely the contrary, however, occurs.... This progress from *within* to *without*, if we try to express it more precisely, means two things: (1) That imitation of ideas precedes the imitation of their expression. (2) That imitation of ends precedes imitation of means. Ends or ideas are the *inner things*, means or expressions, the outer [original emphasis].¹⁹

As the above cited paragraph shows, the first “extra-logical” law of imitation states that the imitation process takes place from *within* towards *without* or, in other words, that ideas are adopted before their material expression.

The second “extra-logical” law of imitation is related to the way in which imitation is channeled in a given society. In this respect, Tarde argued:

Nevertheless, on the whole it is the generous radiation of the warm body towards the cold, not the insignificant radiation of the cold body towards the warm, that is the main fact in physics and the one which explains the final tendency of the universe towards an everlasting equilibrium of temperature. Similarly, in sociology, *the radiation of examples from above to below is the only fact worth consideration* because of the general leveling which it tends to produce in the human world [emphasis added].²⁰

Therefore, Tarde considered that imitation is channeled from the elites to the masses or from the highest social stratum to the lowest. Hence, his emphasis on the importance of elites in diffusing new inventions. The presentation of Tarde's main ideas regarding progress, invention and imitation aims to provide the necessary elements for understanding Lovinescu's theory of "integral imitation." Moreover, the discussion on the concept of "logical strain" intends to present an intellectual background for understanding modern concepts such as "cognitive dissonance."

EUGEN LOVINESCU'S IDEA OF SYNCHRONISM

The debate on Romania's developmental path started in the second half of the 19th century. It is generally accepted nowadays that the philosopher and literary critic Titu Maiorescu (1840-1917) was the first outstanding intellectual who articulated a radical critique of the modernization program based on the implementation of Western-type institutions in Romania. It is in his seminal article "În contra direcției de astăzi în cultura română" (Against the current trend in Romanian culture), published in 1868, that Maiorescu developed his theory of "forms without substance" (*forme fără fond*). In his conception, the program of rapid and uncritical import of Western institutions – which was imposed upon the Romanian society – hampered its gradual, organic development.²¹ Nevertheless, Maiorescu acknowledged that the "forms" could precede the "substance," but only for a short time span. Otherwise, the wider the gap between forms and substance and the longer the period of exposure to such forms, the more falsified the pattern of the Romanian modern civilization would become.

Lovinescu, however, had a totally different opinion. In his view, the Romanian cultural "substance" was not able to develop properly without borrowing Western forms. Such forms would determine the emergence of a modern and original Romanian culture, in synchronism with the more advanced cultures in the world. Lovinescu argued that, until the 19th century, Romania, being isolated from the Western civilization, developed inferior cultural forms and genres:

Isolated from the rhythm of Western civilization by its surroundings and its religion, the Romanian people was unable to develop in its own manner and was derouted from the potentialities of its race; *for entire centuries it expressed its Latin thought in cumbersome cyrillic letters; descended of those whose unbeaten will and energy conquered the world, our soul was dislocated by infiltrations of oriental fatalism* [emphasis added].²²

Furthermore, Lovinescu approached the debate “culture” vs. “civilization,” stressing his preference for “civilization.” As Nemoianu notes, Lovinescu understood the concept of “culture” as “the organic unity of creative and spiritual endeavors,” which included philosophy, art, and religious beliefs, while “civilization,” in his view, referred to “the sum of repetitive technical or organizational activities,” such as economy, politics and technology. However, as Nemoianu further asserts, “Lovinescu clearly rejected an antagonistic use of culture and civilization, often spoke of the solidarity between the two, and developed a sophisticated theory of their interaction.”²³

In his *History of Modern Romanian Civilization*,²⁴ Lovinescu discussed Romania’s prior developmental pattern and argued that only the notion of *synchronism* would permit Romania to progress. In his view, modern societies were interdependent; the discoveries and inventions in the more advanced societies influenced also the less advanced ones, because the latter imitated the former. As Nemoianu aptly observes, Lovinescu “turns the implications of Maiorescu’s postulate of ‘forms without substance’ upside down.”²⁵ Therefore, Lovinescu was very much in favor of the introduction of new forms, and argued that the imitation of forms and values from the more advanced societies would stimulate the creativity of the Romanian people. In developing his theory, Lovinescu made use of Tarde’s laws of imitation. Like Tarde, Lovinescu stressed the importance of communication in the modern world, but, in order to address the particularities of the Romanian case, he adapted and refined some of Tarde’s ideas, as is further shown.

Lovinescu concluded his analysis of Romanian modern civilization by drawing seven conclusions,²⁶ which can be summarized as follows:

1. Romanians have Latin origins and are characterized by the same “habits of the heart” as the rest of the Latin peoples. However, due to their geographical location, historical conditions and religion, the Romanians, until the 19th century, forcibly belonged to an Eastern cultural space. Therefore, the history of the Romanian modern civilization begins in the 19th century, and the 1848 revolution represents the symbolic moment of the “integral contact” with the West.

2. Like in the case of other “backward” peoples (Russian, Japanese), the formation of the Romanian modern civilization took the form of a revolutionary

process, characterized by a radical, wholesale and uncritical import of Western forms.

3. The Romanian modern civilization was formed in accordance with the laws of imitation, and the process of its formation had three major characteristics: (a) the new forms spread from “above” to “below,” Western ideas being adopted first by the upper strata of the Romanian society; (b) the process was a revolutionary, integral one, characterized by a wholesale, uncritical import of the new forms, and (c) the wholesale import of the new forms was specific to the first phase of the process, while the second phase was dominated by a “critical spirit,” or, in other words, by a critical imitation process.

4. The process of imitation is a stimulative one; over time, imitations take a specific character. Therefore, the originality of the Romanian civilization rests on adaptation and refinement and not on elaboration of “original ideas.”

5. Contrary to Tarde’s argument, the process of imitation takes place from “outside” to “inside,” and not the other way around. Therefore, the imitation process is oriented from “form” to “substance.”

6. The imitation process may be oriented toward the past. In such a case, it gives birth to “traditionalism” or “indigenism.”

7. The lack of strong and unitary traditions made possible the revolutionary transformation of the Romanian civilization beginning in the 19th century.

To sum up the crucial points related to this discussion, Lovinescu regarded the birth of the Romanian modern civilization as a revolutionary process, based on the principle of imitation of Western forms. This process, which started in the 19th century, had a first phase of “integral” (wholesale and uncritical) imitation of Western forms, and a second phase, in which Romania entered around 1900, characterized by selective and critical imitation. With regard to the influence of Tarde’s ideas on Lovinescu’s theory, one should note two important aspects, related to Tarde’s “extra-logical” laws of imitation. As discussed above, Tarde formulated two basic “extra-logical” laws of imitation. First, Tarde asserted that extra-logical imitation proceeds from “inside” to “outside,” which means that ideas are adopted before their material expression. The second “extra-logical” law of imitation was related to the way in which imitation is channeled in a given society. In this respect, Tarde argued that imitation is channeled from the elites to the masses, and emphasized the importance of elites in diffusing new inventions.

Lovinescu agreed with Tarde’s second “extra-logical” law of imitation, and asserted that the new forms spread from “above” to “below.” However, contrary to Tarde’s first “extra-logical” law of imitation, for Lovinescu, the process of imitation takes place from “outside” to “inside,” from “form” to “substance,” and not the other way around. Nonetheless, Lovinescu does not provide a detailed discussion on the issue regarding the orientation of the imitation process.²⁷ As shown below, Lovinescu’s ideas concerning the way that

should be followed by the Romanian society in order to develop and modernize itself were quite similar to ideas that emerged three decades later, in a different context: beginning in the 1950s, in the United States, authors interested in the developmental paths of the less advanced countries, asked themselves once again in what ways imitation could stimulate progress, or, in other words, how the import of “forms” influences the evolution of “substance.”

FROM “COGNITIVE DISSONANCE” TO “INVERTED SEQUENCES”

After World War II, the so-called “Third World countries” became an object of sustained academic inquiry, and numerous scholars undertook research projects in the “underdeveloped” societies of Africa, Asia or Latin America. Such research projects and the whole discussion on development and economic growth led, in the 1950s, to the emergence of modernization theory. Simply put, modernization theory states that – on their route to modernity – all developing societies go through a uniform, evolutionary process characterized by a defined set of stages of development. Once they start their modernization process, societies go through similar stages of development, although some may advance more rapidly from one stage to another.²⁸

It is important, however, to stress that, at the time, there were other original thinkers, such as Albert O. Hirschman, who perceived that the processes of economic development in the “underdeveloped” world differed from the experience of the advanced Western countries. In this respect, Hirschman affirmed: “I saw originality and creativity in deviating from the path followed by the older industrial countries, in skipping stages, and in inventing sequences that had a ‘wrong way around’ look.”²⁹ At the same time, one should note that the whole debate on “modernization” is far more complicated, and that ambiguities and conflicting theories – which often neutralize each other – abound. A thorough analysis of the debates on modernization has to address also the proposals to adjust the theoretical model based on stages of development. More importantly, it has to analyze critically the alternative, world-system theory developed by Immanuel Wallerstein in the early 1970s and the huge debate that it aroused.³⁰ However, considering the limits of the present paper, the scope of this part is to focus on some ideas that emerged in the early formulations of modernization theory.

According to David Harrison, “in early modernization theory it was invariably implied that the ideas, practices, technology or capital that were to be diffused in any Third World society originated outside.”³¹ Early modernization theory also stressed that values were embodied in culture, and culture was an important barrier to development.³² Therefore, scholars were concerned with the strategy of removing the barriers to development, which was seen mainly in the sense of economic growth. Moreover, such a perspective imposed the identifi-

cation of the “change agents,” which, in the majority of the cases, were considered to be the “modernizing elites.” From this derived the idea that development has to be directed from above.

In his analysis of obstacles to development, Albert O. Hirschman provides an original discussion on “inverted” or “cart-before-the-horse” sequences in the process of economic and social development.³³ In Hirschman’s view, it is important to study “the role of attitudes, beliefs, and basic personality characteristics favorable to the emergence of innovation, entrepreneurship, and the like.”³⁴ In order to analyze the possibilities of changing the attitudes detrimental to development in a given society, Hirschman employs Leon Festinger’s “theory of cognitive dissonance.”³⁵ In his understanding, the theory of cognitive dissonance can be summarized as follows:

A person who, for some reason, commits himself to act in a manner contrary to his beliefs, or to what he believes to be his beliefs, is in a state of dissonance. Such a state is unpleasant, and the person will attempt to reduce dissonance. Since the “discrepant behavior” has already taken place and cannot be undone, while the belief can be changed, reduction of dissonance can be achieved principally by changing one’s beliefs in the direction of greater harmony with the action.³⁶

Drawing on the concept of “cognitive dissonance,” Hirschman observes that development can be promoted by the means of the dissonance created by a modern type of behavior. Consequently, Hirschman introduces his concept of “inverted sequences” arguing that cognitive dissonance permits a replacement of the “orderly” sequence (attitude change precedes behavioral change) by a “disorderly” one (modern attitudes are acquired as a consequence of modern behavior). Such a mechanism, Hirschman states, can be utilized in the underdeveloped countries to promote economic growth.

Nevertheless, in order to understand the functioning of such a mechanism, one has to answer a crucial question: “What are the kinds of jobs underdeveloped countries are likely to be particularly good (or bad) at?”³⁷ The answer to this question reveals a paramount problem the underdeveloped countries face: the lack of maintenance habit. As Hirschman puts it, “eroding soils, stalled trucks, leaking roofs, prematurely run-down machines, unsafe bridges, clogged-up irrigation ditches – all testify to the same pervasive and paradoxical trait: the inadequate care for existing capital in capital-poor countries.”³⁸ To overcome such a deeply undermining habit, one has to think to invest in ventures that require a high level of maintenance work. The same author argues that the best example of such a venture is the introduction of an airline service.³⁹

Considering the special requirements in terms of maintenance of airplanes, imposed by the handling of high-technology equipment, the establishment of an airline service implicitly creates the basis of a modern behavior. Such a behavior is not a part of the culture of the country where the airline is based. However, the dangers associated with a poor maintenance of airplanes impose a

continuous and thorough maintenance service, under the penalty of death and disaster, different from other existing maintenance services (for roads, bridges or even railways, for instance).⁴⁰ Furthermore, the habit of maintenance – which is essential in avoiding the slow deterioration of the venture – becomes a “second nature,” and could be transmitted to other sectors. Simply put, the strategy of economic development through “inverted sequences” resides in “multiplying the opportunities to engage in these dissonance-arousing actions and in inducing an initial commitment to them.”⁴¹ To sum up, one can argue that a thoroughly planned investment, such as an airline service, represents a kind of Western “form” that can be rapidly filled in with domestic “substance.”

CONCLUSIONS

The first thing that comes to one’s mind after reading these authors is that the way in which Lovinescu approached the problem of Romania’s modernization and development deserves a closer look. He agreed with Tarde’s second “extra-logical” law of imitation, and asserted that the new forms spread from “above” to “below.” Similarly, as discussed above, in their search for “agents of change” in the Third World, able to diffuse new ideas, practices and technology, early modernization theorists have stressed the importance of “modernizing elites.” At the same time, contrary to Tarde’s first “extra-logical” law of imitation, Lovinescu argued that the process of imitation takes place from “outside” to “inside,” or, in other words, that the imitation process is oriented from “form” to “substance.” In the 1950s, Hirschman has taken a similar stance when he stressed the importance of the cognitive dissonance theory in establishing a strategy of development for the Third World countries. To his part, Hirschman has argued that development can be promoted by the means of the dissonance created by a modern type of behavior. Consequently, he has introduced the concept of “inverted sequences” arguing that cognitive dissonance permits a replacement of the “orderly” sequence (attitude change precedes behavioral change) by a “disorderly” one (modern attitudes are acquired as a consequence of modern behavior).

The similarity between the two approaches resides in the mechanism of change. To Lovinescu, the introduction of new “forms” by the modernizing elites induces a change in “substance.” To Hirschman, the imposition of modern behavior (by local elites, foreign companies, international organizations, etc.) leads to modern attitudes and, consequently, to development. Obviously, this paper aimed at discussing Lovinescu’s ideas from a fresh perspective, i.e., by comparing his idea of catching up with the West to theories developed three decades after and emphasizing their striking convergence. It is another question to what extent these theories are still relevant. This is, nevertheless, a question that deserves a comprehensive answer and will be addressed with another occasion. Yet, it is worth mentioning that the modernization theory, abandoned

in the 1970s, was revived after the fall of communism, when the problem of “returning to Europe” was raised throughout East-Central Europe. Turning back to Chirot’s phrase, quoted at the beginning of this paper, it is indeed sobering to discover that, in the 1920s, some Romanian intellectuals debated over the issue of modernization in a way that was very much alike the way some theorists debate nowadays, and that their approaches were at least as sophisticated as those of today.

-
- 1 Keith Hitchins, “Gîndirea: Nationalism in a Spiritual Guise,” in Kenneth Jowitt, ed., *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1978), 140.
 - 2 Daniel Chirot, “Neoliberal and Social Democratic Theories of Development: The Zeletin-Voinea Debate Concerning Romania’s prospects in the 1920s and its Contemporary Importance,” in Kenneth Jowitt, ed., *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1978), 31.
 - 3 The sociologist Ștefan Zeletin (1882-1934) was another remarkable “Westernizer” of the period. His book, *Burghezia română* (The Romanian bourgeoisie), first published in 1925, is still one of the best analyses on the development of modern Romania. See Ștefan Zeletin, *Burghezia română: Originea și rolul ei istoric* (The Romanian bourgeoisie: Its origins and its historical role) (Bucharest: Nemira, 1997). His second sociological-economical analysis was published in 1927. See Ștefan Zeletin, *Neoliberalismul: Studii asupra istoriei și politicii burgheziei române* (Neoliberalism: Studies on the history and politics of Romanian bourgeoisie) (Bucharest: Nemira, 1997). Nevertheless, Zeletin’s work needs a separate discussion due to its originality and complexity, and especially with regard to his two creative periods: the “traditionalist” and the “modern” or “classical.” For a recent, insightful approach to the “first,” the “traditionalist” Zeletin, see Victor Rizescu, “Un critic al Partidului Liberal: ‘Primul’ Ștefan Zeletin” (A critic of the Liberal Party: The “first” Ștefan Zeletin), in *Studia Politica* (Bucharest) Vol. 1, No. 3 (2001), 841-72.
 - 4 Virgil Nemoianu, “Variable Sociopolitical Functions of Aesthetic Doctrine: Lovinescu vs. Western Aestheticism,” in Kenneth Jowitt, ed., *Social Change in Romania, 1860-1940: A Debate on Development in a European Nation* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1978), 194.
 - 5 Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu’s Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 53.
 - 6 See Terry N. Clark, *Introduction* to Gabriel Tarde, *On Communication and Social Influence: Selected Papers*, edited and with an introduction by Terry N. Clark (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), 5. Hereafter quoted as *On Communication*.
 - 7 *Ibid.*, 21.
 - 8 Tarde, *On Communication*, 179.
 - 9 Clark, 27.
 - 10 *Ibid.*, 189.
 - 11 Clark does not consider Tarde’s “law of progressive enlargement” as a “law of imitation.” See Clark, 22. However, Tarde stated clearly that “the supreme law of imitation seems to be its tendency towards indefinite progression.” See Tarde, 189.
 - 12 Clark, 21.
 - 13 Tarde, 184.

- 14 *Ibid.*, 182-83.
- 15 Clark provides an extensive analysis of Tarde's laws of imitation. Regarding the second law of imitation, the present study utilizes Clark's formulations of Tarde's laws. See Clark, 27.
- 16 Clark, 27-28.
- 17 Clark, 28.
- 18 See the discussion in Clark, 29.
- 19 Tarde, 185-86.
- 20 Tarde, 188.
- 21 See Titu Maiorescu, "În contra direcției de astăzi în cultura română" (Against the current trend in Romanian culture), in Titu Maiorescu, *Critice* (Critiques) (Bucharest: Editura pentru Literatura Română, 1966), 75-84. Maiorescu argued, for instance, that Romania established an Academic Society before having any sort of original scientific activity throughout the country. Hence, the very idea of an Academic Society became deprecated and falsified. See Maiorescu, 81.
- 22 Quoted in Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceaușescu's Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 51.
- 23 See Nemoianu, 198-99.
- 24 Eugen Lovinescu, *Istoria civilizației române moderne* (History of Romanian modern civilization) 3 vols. (Bucharest: Minerva, 1992). The book was first published between 1924 and 1926.
- 25 Nemoianu, 200.
- 26 Lovinescu, vol. 3, 159-62.
- 27 See Lovinescu, vol. 3, 161-62.
- 28 In this respect, Rostow's dynamic theory of production based on five distinct stages of economic growth is perhaps the most famous. See Walt W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). First published in 1960.
- 29 See Albert O. Hirschman, *The Strategy of Economic Development* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988), 223. First published in 1958.
- 30 See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974 – vols. 1 and 2, and San Diego: Academic Press: 1989 – vol. 3). See also his *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). On Wallerstein's own perspective on the challenges to the world-system analysis, see his *The End of the World as We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), especially "The Rise and Future Demise of World-Systems Analysis," 192-201.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 31.
- 32 David Harrison, *The Sociology of Modernization and Development* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 30.
- 33 Albert O. Hirschman, *A Bias for Hope: Essays on Development and Latin America* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1971), 322. Hereafter cited as *A Bias for Hope*.
- 34 Hirschman, 323.
- 35 See Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957).
- 36 *Ibid.*, 324.
- 37 Hirschman, *The Strategy of Economic Development*, 140.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 141.
- 39 See Albert O. Hirschman, *A Propensity to Self-Subversion* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), 135.
- 40 *Ibid.*
- 41 Hirschman, *A Bias for Hope*, 325.