

PETRE ANDREI – THE MODEL ROMANIAN SOCIOLOGIST OF THE INTERWAR PERIOD

*Dumitru STAN**

Abstract

About Petre Andrei has been written, in laudatory terms, that he represents the first Romanian sociologist brought up at a university from Romania, that he was the adept of sociological integralism through which he overcame the boundaries of the deterministic conceptions dominant during the time when he created, that he wrote considerably and at a level comparable with what was being written in the Western sociology at the time, that he was a model as an university professor and man of culture etc. In the present study we present arguments that enforce the truthfulness of the above praises and confirm the high reputation gained by Petre Andrei. Also, we summarize some aspects of its sociological writings which indicate that, now, at almost eight decades since its death, the ideas promoted by him are clearly still actual.

Keywords: access to culture, University, cultural capital, sociological integral, cultural space, social order, cultural model

Résumé

A propos de Petre Andrei on a écrit toujours laudatif, comme étant le premier grand sociologue roumain formé dans une université roumaine, comme adepte de l'intégralisme sociologique qui a dépassé les limites de conceptions déterministes dominantes à l'époque dans laquelle il a créé, ainsi parce qu'il a écrit beaucoup et à un niveau comparable à ce qu'il était écrit alors-là dans la sociologie occidentale, enfin, qu'il a été un modèle de professeur et grand érudit. Dans cette étude, nous présentons des arguments qui renforcent la véracité de ces panégyriques et confirment la grande réputation de Petre Andrei. Cependant, nous faisons l'inventaire de certaines dimensions de son oeuvre sociologique qui montrent que, huit décennies après sa mort, ses idées s'inscrivent dans une actualité évidente.

Mots-clés: accès à la culture, université, capital culturel, intégralisme sociologique, espace culturel, ordre social, modèle culturel

Rezumat

Despre Petre Andrei s-a scris la modul elogios că reprezintă primul mare sociolog român format la o universitate din România, că a fost adeptul integralismului sociologic prin care a depășit limitele concepțiilor deterministe dominante în perioada în care a creat, că a scris mult și la un nivel comparabil cu ceea ce se scria pe atunci în sociologia occidentală, că a fost un model de profesor universitar și de om de cultură etc. În studiul de față prezentăm argumente care să întărească veridicitatea acestor elogii și să confirme înaltul renume pe care Petre Andrei l-a căpătat. Totodată, inventariem unele dimensiuni ale

* Professor PhD, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iași, Carol I 11, 700506, Iași, Romania; e-mail: dtrustan@yahoo.com

operei lui sociologice din care rezultă că, acum, la aproape opt decenii de la moartea sa, ideile pe care le-a susținut se înscriu într-o evidentă actualitate.

Cuvinte cheie: acces la cultură, Universitate, capital cultural, integralism sociologic, spațiu cultural, ordine socială, model cultural

1. Introduction

With only a few exceptions, the Romanian sociologists between the two wars – especially D. Gusti, P. Andrei, T. Herseni, H. H. Stahl – were given prominence by their exceptional moral and professional attitudes and behaviours, as well as by their scientific achievements, also in the superlative. To state it differently, due to their personal performance indicators, they represented real *intellectual models within sociology, and due to their life as a whole they represented even more than that: genuine cultural models.*

Among these four Romanian authors, the university professor of Iasi was the earliest to die (1940). The others had much more time to their disposal to complete their “work” and finish up their image: until 1955 – D. Gusti, 1980 – T. Herseni, 1990 – H. H. Stahl. Technically, P. Andrei’s teaching, cultural and scientific performance detached him from it in only two and a half decades while enforcing him as a *model or standard of the Romanian education, culture and sociology.* While being familiar with his achievements within this period of time, some rhetoric questions would go without saying: *how much could he have helped the intellectual environment in our country if he only had lived some more decades longer? What cultural and scientific outcomes would he have come to, if he had not been teased and politically aggressed and forced to consume his energy in ideological disputes? How much prestige would he have kept on lending to the University of Iasi through completion of his already begun projects?*

Sociological imagination fills the cognitive gap having been created by such questions, the American sociologist W. Mills (1980) would claim. The purpose of obtaining satisfying information in given rhetoric interrogative circumstances correlates much diversified information. Therefore the increased comprehension that we are all striving for in relation to P. Andrei’s reputation becomes a contextual consequence of available information sources: newspaper pages, official documents, parliament discourse, printed books, eulogies, evocations, etc. A synthesizing image, a sort of personal identity code very difficult to hide, modify or forge has resulted from it.

2. Bio-bibliographic Identity

The brilliant Nicolae Iorga would encourage everyone to write history and he would suggest those who were to take his advice what it is worth being recorded for posterity: “if you have seen historical facts, you have the obligation to keep

them in the form they have been revealed to you. To write history is humankind duty, to supplement it with what you have found about it is everyone's duty while it remains that those who can write should gather all they have found out from those who can no longer talk about it. But still there is another thing which, to a certain type of man, may, should come out. And this is the way he has mysteriously made his moral being after having seen and read all and processed him thoroughly. Especially if he has made trenches in and let traces behind, even if they would be sooner or later covered as the waves do over the face of the sea". (Iorga 1981, pp. 4-5)

To write about a name like that of P. Andrei, so imposing to the Romanian sociology and culture, means to identify the cultural "traces" he had left behind. Yet, before all this, we should, as N. Iorga suggested it, reveal the "mysterious" sources having given birth to it and its creative capacity. Essentially, such an approach should be focussed on biographic and bibliographic aspects, even if they are separable only from a methodological point of view. Intention to follow them within the dynamics of their evolution has forced us to outline some (biographic and bibliographic) chronologies. While correlated, these may represent a great part of the references required by a chronological table. Not such a table about the life and work of Petre Andrei has been written so far.¹ Information to follow cannot be omitted from the content of a synthesis of this kind.

- 1891 (29 June): Petru C. Andrei was born in the city of Brăila, in a family of unimportant civil servants.
- 1902-1910: Attended pre higher education at the "Nicolae Bălcescu" Secondary School in his native town.
- 1910: He was admitted at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Iasi. He entered a competition and obtained the only scholarship awarded by the university for the academic year 1910/1911, and he was therefore remarked as an exceptional student by his professors D. Gusti and I. Petrovici. (Petrovici 1966) While applying for the scholarship he attached certificate of poverty to his application to the Dean and this explained that his family was not able to invest in his professional training.
- 1912: He is offered a meritorious position as a teaching assistant and is in charge with the management of the Library of the Philosophy Seminary, although he was only a second-year student.

¹ Especially in the last two decades, new findings have been revealed about the life and work of the sociologist of Iasi. The "Petre Andrei" Academic Foundation of Iasi, coordinated by Professor Doru Tompea, keeps on publishing books in the „Petre Andrei. Man and his Work" series, while bringing unprecedented elements to it. Only after the issues on the disappearance of some of P. Andrei's manuscripts and the nature of his relations to politicians of that time will be elucidated, a relevant chronological table and a new monograph will be written.

- 1913: He took the Bachelor's degree examination and he obtained the diploma with the distinction *Magna cum Laude*. He is appointed as a substitute professor to teach: *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*² and *History of Philosophy*. (P.P. Andrei 2001, pp. 5-7) It was also that year when he became a doctoral student of Professor Dimitrie Gusti, and he would write a thesis on the “Sociology of Value”.
- 1914-1915: He attended courses to universities of Berlin and Leipzig with a view to prepare his doctoral thesis.
- 1916-1918: He joined the Romanian reunification war and he was decorated for his merits with the “Order of the Star of Romania”, “Order of the Crown” and “Order of the War Cross”.
- 1918: He presented his thesis for debate to the commission made up of Al. Philippide (chairman), D. Gusti (coordinator) and I. Petrovici (reviewer).
- 1919-1922: He worked as a teacher in the secondary education system of Iasi (National Secondary School, Military School, Orthodox School for Girls, the Moritz Wachtel Secondary School). He concomitantly substitutes courses of philosophy for I. Petrovici, and sociology for D. Gusti.
- 1922: He became director of the Central University Library of Iasi and he would keep this position until 1927.
- 1922 (31 October): At the age of only 33 he obtained the tenure as a professor at the Sociology and Ethics Department once this position became vacant after D. Gusti's transfer to Bucharest.
- 1924: He unreservedly expressed himself, within the University Senate, against the fascist ideology and especially against penetration of policy inside university.
- 1928: He joined the National Peasant's Party and he became a deputy in the month of December of that year.
- 1929-1933: He had a rich parliamentary activity reflected by his numerous interventions aiming at modernisation of the Romanian law. (Andrei 1996)
- 1930: He was appointed state secretary at the Ministry of Agriculture.
- 1931-1932: He was state secretary at the Ministry of Public Instruction and Religions.
- 1932: Only for a few months he was the dean of the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of Iasi.
- 1938-1940: He was the minister of National Education and he produced several laws while occupying this position, including the *Law of the organisation of the higher education system*. On the 3rd of July 1940 he was discharged from office and the ministership was offered to another university professor of sociology Traian Braileanu from the University of Chernovtsy.

² That is the former name of the course currently entitled *Introduction to Philosophy*.

- 1940 (October): The search warrant was issued for the search of P. Andrei's location, dismissal from higher education and his arrest, the concerned document being signed by I. Antonescu, Tr. Braileanu and Tr. Arseni. On the 4th of October he regrettably resorted to commit suicide since he could no longer bear humiliations he had submitted and injustices they had done to him.

To all this suggestive information on the origin and socio-professional evolution of P. Andrei we would attach other significant findings on his cultural and sociological advancement. We will not be able to comply as strictly as we can with the above mentioned chronology since some of his works are not known precisely to have appeared for the first time *whereas others are not known to have been published during his life*. There is also a more unrewarding attestation of Andrei's works: some manuscripts were confiscated during the arrest of the sociologist and they were further either destroyed or hidden or stored in places where they should be taken out from. Even news on how much P. Andrei wrote is sensibly discordantly. The Encyclopaedia of the Romanian sociologists mentions that he wrote "6 author volumes, 37 studies and articles in volumes and specialised magazines, 25 reviews and notes, 36 conferences to universities, scientific clubs, radio, 73 discourses and interventions in Parliament". (Costea 2001, p. 22) However, in a volume, in the series "P. Andrei, Man and His Works" it is mentioned that the sociologist of Iasi wrote "15 works, 5 lithography courses, over 40 studies and articles, 25 reviews, 35 conferences and speeches, 3 reports to laws and over 75 discourses and intervention in the parliament". (Andrei 1993, p. 36) The same source mentioned that, in time, besides his duties as a professor, Petre Andrei also occupied positions as director of magazine, dean, member of the parliament and three ministerships.

According to bibliographical researches made by M. Măciu, the sociologist of Iasi made his publishing debut in the year 1941 through an article on "W. Wundt's Metaphysics", in the magazine *Convorbiri Literare*. In the year to come, 1915, he published a somehow longer work entitled "Mecanicism and Teleologism in Contemporary Society". He might have published with even more difficulty on this theme if he had not benefited from a favourable conjuncture: in the time period when he worked in Iasi, D. Gusti founded the Seminary of Sociology and Ethics, and the works of this seminary were published in the magazine "Sociological and Ethical Studies". In the summary of 1951 of the magazine, this work of P. Andrei was included.

After a few years of intense work to his doctoral thesis, in the year 1919, he had his author book "Philosophy of Value" ready to be published. Most of it contains some aspects on the sociology of value and it represented the very essence of his doctoral thesis that he presented for public debate in 1918. Unfortunately this book would not be published until 1945 and only after admirable efforts of his faithful son, professor of law, Petru P. Andrei.

In the year 1921, it came off the presses the book “Sociology of Revolution” to whom P. Andrei had been working for three years. Immediately afterwards (1922), he started to work for the most important of his works “General Sociology” which he would finish and publish in 1936. The year when he died (1940) this book had already been reviewed but he had not time to republish it. He did not neglect his publishing abroad especially that he had studied – for a short period, that is true – in Germany, he had friends among the personalities of the German sociology and he knew exactly what were Germans’ preferences and expectations on sociology. That explains why he had two books published in Leipzig and Berlin: 1923 – *Die Soziologische Auffassung der Erkenntnis* and 1927 – *Das Problem der Methode in der Soziologie*, and why some of his studies on the sociology of value and sociology of knowledge were known by a collaborator of Max Weber: Werner Sombart.

Responsive to the ascent of the extremist political groups, in the year 1927 he published the work “Fascism” that irrevocably brought about the hatred of politicians of radical right on him. The latter would not forget the affront he had put on them and would not miss a chance to take revenge and launch terror on P. Andrei in 1940. It is worth mentioning some other titles of the sociologist and the man of culture of Iasi as well: “The Issue of Happiness. Its ethical and sociological fundamental”(1972), “Sociological Questions” (1972), some posthumous courses having been remade after some students’ notes – “History of Philosophy” (1983, 1997), “General Ethics” (1999), “Special Sociology” (1983) – and even the “Handbook of Sociology for Secondary Schools” published in 1938 together with Vasile Harea, one of his former assistants.

We could keep on passing P. Andrei’s works in review while enumerating studies and articles which he had resumed and developed or integrated to more ample works. We could also delimit only his works having been published during his life or the works that the researcher M. Marciu had succeeded in gathering together in four volumes under the title of “Sociological Works” after having worked a decade on it (1973-1983).

Equally ingenuous is the editorial selection made by the “Petre Andrei” Academic Foundation which orientates itself according to the socio-cultural impact of the sociologist’s works (“General Sociology”, “About Ideal”, “Philosophy of Value”), but also to their unprecedented features (“Parliamentary Discourse”, “Lectures on Ethics”, “Lectures on the History of Philosophy”). We find it too reductionist Traian Herseni’s recommendation to analyse P. Andrei’s work starting from his “fundamental works”. (Herseni 2007, p. 168) If we were to agree on the idea transmitted by Herseni that only the books: “Issues on Sociology” and “General Sociology” are representative, then we would greatly affect Petre Andrei’s image of “comprehensive” cultural model. It is nevertheless true that one can deduce many essential features of his sociology from these two books, but we could find out too little about his philosophical, logic, ethical, political and

pedagogic concerns. Or he had been attracted by these interpenetrating fields all his life and this is proven by specialisations of the professors whose courses he attended when he was young (1914, 1915) in Berlin and Leipzig (W. Wundt – psychologist, E. Cassirer – philosopher, Ed. Spranger – sociologist) and by the types of lectures he had delivered to his students of the University of Iasi (General Sociology, Ethics, History of Philosophy).

Conclusion to these lines centred on the bibliography inherited from P. Andrei is obvious: *he wrote a lot, much more than any professor who taught sociology at the University of Iasi, more than his professor, D. Gusti, and he owned an intellectual openness which not only featured multiple areas but it was also particularly profound.* In other words, his works can be fruitfully consulted by many categories of specialists. To this highly quantitativist conclusion we add others having been drawn from the qualitative dimensions of P. Andrei's sociological works.

Therefore we shall recall here one of his first merits, may be the most important of all, respectively the merit of being an *author of sociological system*. Any assembly to significantly and functionally include more correlated elements is simply called: system. In sociology, it requires coherent concerns on general sociology, history of sociology, sociological methodology and field-related sociology from the same author. Presence of systemic discursivity as stated by sociological points of view is only achieved when the following conditions are observed: to own an overall vision on the society (general sociology), to know arguments having been left behind by our predecessors (history of sociology), to master strategies and methods of research of social reality (sociological methodology), to explain and do specialised research on some domains or parts of sociology (field-related sociology). Sociologist Petre Andrei met all these requirements. He wrote a general sociology – a work having been labelled as a “vast treatise” (Herseni 2007, p. 168) he wrote about the points of view of some famous sociologists who had inspired him (H. Spencer, G. Tarde, K. Marx, E. Durkheim, M. Weber), he published, in Germany, a book on sociological methodology (which he partially resumed in “General Sociology”) and he attempted several approaches on field-related sociology: sociology of culture, sociology of value, sociology of knowledge, sociology of morality, etc. The discursive unity of these parts of P. Andrei's sociology determines us to register the presence of a sociological system while concomitantly noticing that only the great sociologists of the world may enjoy the systematic quality of their creation.

A second qualitativist merit of the conception assumed by the sociologist of Iasi is acknowledgment of the superiority of the “*cogitans sociology*” to “*militans sociology*”. In D. Gusti's vision, the hierarchic situation of these two “forms” of sociology is reversed. He would appreciate in the first place practical and militant valences of the science about society that is its “orientation towards life” (Gusti 1935) and “action survey”. (Gusti 1941) To put it differently, the sociologist should definitely go “in the field” to identify different dysfunctions and to

contribute to their immediate “solving”. Magister P. Andrei understood cogitans sociology as a theoretical, abstract and generalising appearance with a more hypothetic character which is to be met in university lectures; speculative propensions of the cogitans sociology, Gusti would let us understand, diminish scientific attributes of sociology, while militans sociology would increase our trust in the “power of sociology”. Petre Andrei did not deny the role of the militans sociology but he signifies cogitans sociology in a new manner which renders it more important than its alternative. The clear difference between Andrei’s point of view (cogitans sociology) and Gusit’s point of view (militans sociology) comes from the fact that the former starts from professor’s position and mission to teach students sociology while the latter relates himself to the application of sociology. As a consequence, dominated by the “spirit of the truth” or by the idea of “scientific objectivity”, professor should teach his students not only an algorithm to help them know the facts but rather a way to assess and interpret consequences of those facts. Practically, departure from empirics means science (Andrei 1936, p. 7), P. Andrei would tell us, and cogitans sociology is militant by itself if it spreads the truth and the science and it urges on the creative spirit to increase the level of the cognitive capital that should be transmitted to the new generations.

Another qualitativist merit of P. Andrei’s overall sociological creation is intimately related to the way in which he understood *relation between general sociology and sociology of culture*. We start from a statement of M. Măciu in his attempt to explain this relation: “P. Andrei’s concerns on general sociology are not materialised only in the volume with the same title, published in 1936; they are also to be met in other studies on fields of human activities which express the *everlasting*, everything that aims at the general: *value, knowledge, culture*. In other words, he subscribed sociology of value, sociology of knowledge and sociology of culture to general sociology”. (Măciu 1986, p. 228) If we refer to the broad meaning of the notion of culture, then we can deduce that value and knowledge are forms of culture and that, in sociology, connection between general sociology and sociology of culture remains fundamental, before any other relation. The former, since it is *general*, naturally helps to the organisation and operationalisation of the latter. However when reading P. Andrei’s writings, we very easily come to the following finding: *arguments of general sociology are very massively arguments of the sociology of culture*. Consequently, sociology of culture is not only the most important field that P. Andrei had analysed but it is also the creation that reflects the most part of the intellectual model it represents itself.

2. Sociological Performances and Conceptual Flexibility

A summative look over P. Andrei’s sociology points at a series of conclusions, the most part of it having the force of evidence. The most important of it is that the entire sociological system is either an explicit form of sociology of culture or an

approach compatible and complementary to it. Through such significance, the sociologist of Iasi actually tells us that sociology is compelled to be cultural in as much as society cannot live outside some cultural appearance. When we think this type of membership, we should nevertheless have in view that the “living” culture, which is adapted to needs and which cannot exist only for itself, but becomes a way of living and a cultural attitude. For the sociologist Petre Andrei, such an attitude had been materialised by cultural facts specific to a “full” intellectual, as it can be easily drawn from the following conclusions:

1. He elaborated a general sociology and, at the same time, he replied the necessity to study thoroughly and cognitively the functioning of the society through the elaboration of several field-related sociologies (such is the case of “sociology of politics”, “sociology of knowledge”, “sociology of value” and especially “sociology of culture”). Thus he accomplished the connection between general and particular while providing sociology not only with its adjustment to reality but also with its actuality. The impression of present-day thinker derives from almost all his works and it is usually to be found only to the creators who can accede the essence of the issues under discussion. Oblivion and removal from world’s cultural memory act more difficultly in such situations since they are either rejected or inhibited by the consistency of negotiation between general – or preponderantly perennial, current – aspects and particular, contextual or preponderantly caducous aspects. The cultural substratum of Petre Andrei always leave the sensation of sustainable, perennial and well-done thing and confers creator’s personality the aura of his cultural completeness.

2. Besides his being familiar with news on sociology of his time, he thoroughly knew the science about society, too. Hence he critically drew his inspiration from theories with pronounced radical features, supporting different types of determinisms: biological, (organicism of H. Spencer), social (sociologism of E. Durkheim), psychic (psychologism of G. Tarde), economic (K. Marx’ theory), geographic (geographism of Fr. Ratzell), and determinism of social forms (formalism of G. Simmel). Similarly to the sociologists of his time, he considered that knowing history of socio-cultural facts and explicative theories on it means not repeating the same errors of the old times. As a consequence, P. Andrei would let us understand, it is not through comfortable embracing of radicalism of determinist explanations that we would gain cognitive satisfactions on social facts, but through the understanding of their becoming and *discovering of the cultural rationality* of their production. Consequently a sociological explanation could be appreciated as valuable and correct only if it had been brought sufficient cultural arguments to support it.

3. He rejected the reductionism of determinist explanations and he supported in exchange the “integralist” even systemic variant of analysis and interpretation of social life. Thus he approached more to the conception of his contemporary – the French sociologists M. Mauss and L. Dumont, who designates the unity and

integrality of social facts through the concept of “total social phenomenon”. (Mauss 1950; Dumont 1996, pp. 210-212) Essentially these two great sociologists claimed that any ordinary fact is not only economic, not only moral, not only psychic, not only religious, not only historical, not only aesthetical, etc. but it is a synthesis of all these “cuttings”. Its “total” nature, even if it is defined and affected by one or more of the enumerated structures, it derives from the very synthetic, cultural and functional unity of its constituents. Even non-cultural factors should be considered by sociological explanations on the grounds that they trigger very many cultural effects in social media

4. To human existence, individual spirit represents an identity element. Nevertheless we should not understand it as a “power in itself” but “only within real circumstances of life” (Andrei 1936, p. 173), “that is the “achievement” process. To proceed to it differently is equal, P. Andrei claimed, to falling into another type of excess – the culturalist excess – that is in the study of the spiritual ideal separated from reality. We cannot deny the existence of such an ideal, only that we should find in its contents “forms of organised and non-organised spiritual cooperation” materialised in “churches, sects, theological doctrines, science with its research institutes, with different schools and professional and technical issues, cultural peculiarities of people, evolution of culture, etc.” (*Ibidem*, p. 165) Finally it is only the sociologist who orientates himself in the sense of cultural objectivisation or of materialisation of culture that would avoid culturalism. A “special” sociological study on culture and “cultural sociology” could be therefore obtained. For the importance that it preferably gives to spiritual factors – without denying the influence of some non-spiritual factors: climate, soil, heredity, etc. – the sociology of culture gets a slightly different signification as compared to general sociology. Moreover it may be defined not only as a certain field-related sociology, but it may be additionally and referentially labelled as “special sociology”.

These very few conclusions having been drawn from the entire sociology of P. Andrei actually represent the essential premises due to which we could identify more easily a series of cultural fundamentals of sociology in general. It is also from their point of view that we could establish missions in principle of special sociologies and design the “geometry” or the nodal components of a sociology of culture. Many of the elements of such a sociology, remarkable through the fact that it assumes the difficulty to study the most complex part of the society – the culture – had not only been nominated by P. Andrei, but they had been also analysed in compliance with cultural imperatives of his time. But here how they should be, the objectives and structure of this sociology with a privileged statute, in the vision of the sociologist of Iasi:

a) *To establish the contents of notions of culture and civilisation and their significance.* This issue has been and it still is controversial: some theoreticians would absolutely refuse to differentiate the two notions (example, P. Andrei’s contemporary: S. Freud), while others would distinguish them from the perspective

of their complementarity (A. de Peretti) or they categorically oppose one against another (Spengler, Hegel). P. Andrei situates himself on this last position. The correctness of his option is confirmed by contemporary research on the issue: over 83% of current individuals understand by culture some contents such as morality, arts, education, science and they adopt an illuminist meaning of the term (Ionescu and Stan 1997, pp. 148-149) or even more simply, as Th. Mann stated, "Culture is equivalent to predominance of spirituality, Civilisation implies mechanisation". (Uscătescu 1987, p. 79) Since there is a multitude of meanings of this notions and many difficulties to differentiate them starting from their contents, P. Andrei recommend to adopt a famous point of view on this matter, the one having been expressed by O. Spengler. According to him, "culture is dynamism, becoming and life, while civilisation is something that has become ... Culture requires an inner energy, civilisation an outer energy... World is concerned with expansion of civilisation and not with souls which create culture" (Andrei 1975, p. 203), and if there is crisis within society it is the result of neglecting approaches on soul modelling. The central notion of sociology should be therefore the culture and its most influential field should be the sociology of culture. With its aid we always know that if societies properly develop their culture then society and its ingredient come from themselves.

b) *To delimit sources for establishment of the cultural capital.* With regard to it, P. Andrei makes his choice for those spheres of culture which guarantee for national "survival" (Andrei 1975, p. 195) and which provide for the functioning of a "national ethics" in confrontation with the "universalist ethics". Technically the cultural capital of a state is mostly induced by religion, tradition, science, school and its cultural politics. All these are spheres of culture and the sociological analysis on it should establish the extent to which compatible "values of the same type" are to be accomplished within a ("national") unitary cultural space and to clarify the nature of relationships among cultural spaces. Whenever two foreign cultural spaces maintain only relations of contact and cultural dialogue, the national ethics and national values are less affected than when they develop an intense cultural transfer. Especially in the case of the latter we should consider whether benefits are unilateral or reciprocal, whether cultural mobility is peacefully or, on the contrary, aggressively achieved, etc. Out of these minimal specifications we could easily realise that P. Andrei, as a sociologist of culture, had in view both the "universal" processes of change and cultural mobility and the "national" local contexts for the establishment and metamorphosis of the cultural capital. Humankind is unceasingly being constructed / deconstructed / reconstructed through the relationship between national and universal, and to minimize the role of one of these parts equals to the loss of many sources of cultural development.

c) *To use the longitudinal perspective in the analysis of the facts of culture.* Our great sociologist certainly knew the methodological rule suggested by Durkheim according to whom sociological explanation of a certain fact requires knowledge of

the antecedents of its production. When complying with this rule, the researcher can easily establish both its generating causes and the tendencies of its evolution. P. Andrei uses this perspective in all his writings whenever he applies the comparativist method. Hence the situation of his contemporaries is related to the situation of primitives, the state of war is explained starting from the previous state of peace (or reversely), and peculiarities of the child are much more clearly outlined when compared to the elderly and so on. (Andrei 1927, p. 154) Such a (culturalist – comparatist) option does not mean acknowledgment of another type of determinism and it neither means the departure from sociology, but it means obtaining the explanatory comfort in relation to the reality we live in.

d) *To facilitate access to culture.* Relatively recent research of educational sociology has proven that democratisation of education is required but it is not sufficient to reach a real equal educational opportunity. Educational selection inevitably bears the mark of the social class while at the level of each social segment educational investment is being kept with specific efforts /effects. Consequently, lower classes have fewer opportunities to spread out expenses for education or find amortised costs of this type too distant and unlikely to happen. (Boudon 1973)

P. Andrei's optimism was overflowing in this matter as well: state is habilitated and should assume its cultural policy to: "enlighten crowds" since it is also the main beneficiary of promoting such a program. If access to educational culture is democratized, individuals in the basement of the social pyramid acquire contents of "aristocratic culture". (Andrei 1975, p. 206) In this manner, the state obtains significant increases of the acting effectiveness, individuals get a quicker awareness on the unwanted effects of the critical states, society searches more persistently solutions to attenuate it and remove dysfunctions, etc. Nevertheless P. Andrei launches a warning on facilitating access to culture: "This increase ... does it bring a decrease intensity of it?" (*Ibidem*) Otherwise stated, to make access to culture easier should not be seen materialized and continued only in right, moral, responsible, effective and beautiful deeds, etc. Relaxation of requirements providing for cultural access may sometimes trigger attitudes of disinterest, of contestation of intellectual elites or rejection or even disregard to contents available to all categories of individuals.

At the same time we cannot ignore the fact having been proven by contemporary sociology that "a plus of schooling means a plus of chance", at least as far as the professional placement is concerned. Or, the "meritocratic plus" could be induced by higher education institutions providing for training and not at all by primary education institutions. That is why, the sociologist of Iasi stated it, a minimal or basic cultural level should be insured by all socio-residential environments but it should be developed and amplified in higher stages of schooling. To keep on studying thoroughly the quality of cultural capitals would be

a requirement for guaranteeing cultural progress and permanentisation of a democratic life.

e) *“University – the highest institute of culture within state”*. On the higher education institution between the wars there is currently a very favourable representation. The university space of that time has been labelled as the “brain of our nation”, it used to have privileges, the “university exigency rose itself to European level”, and members of the university used to be “persons of high culture”, dominated by the “passion for science, scientific and moral objectivity”. (Neculau 1997, p. 49) Most of these characteristics are to be found in the model of university suggested by P. Andrei. Hence, he wrote that the task of the university is to historically and systematically teach students in the first place the data of the science that they had acquired, and to show them the different aspects that the truths had been considered in the process of their development; secondly, the University should show them the method of research, of creating and working, in order to take data of science and objective culture further on” (Andrei 1975, p. 206). In other words, higher education not only enables inclusion of the most important cultural capital but it also provides for the most prestigious degrees, respectively the “institutionalised cultural capital”. (Bourdieu 1979)

At the same time, we cannot ignore the fact that society expectancies in relation to the university demand the highest requirements; it is from this institution that one hopes to obtain the most successful objectivisations (applications) of cultural capital. The academic space should essentially be one of the domination of science, research, creation and communication of validation of competence, of political impartialness and professional specialization. To say it simpler, an environment of intellectual elites and cultural challenges. Field research in Romania of the recent decades fortunately confirms the hypothesis that the “level” of schooling” still remains a prior criteria to distinguish the elite from the non-elite: “university graduates enters without fail the professional intellectual elite and they may possibly join the social elite; the higher the number of those who accede university training, the lower are their chances to obtain social recognition of their training while placing them within a proper statute to match it”. (Stan and Stan 1997, p. 78)

We are convinced that P. Andrei intuited the consequences of the process of “degrees inflation”, such distressing nowadays, but he considered that it is to prefer it to the effect of inferiority and cultural insufficiency. The same effect, of increased owners of higher cultural capital, is no longer as attractive as it used to be since it triggers routine, disinterestedness, aspirations broken from reality, cultural crisis.

f) *Mediation between cultural ethnocentrism and xenocentrism*. Many times, people have the tendency to exaggerate superiority of culture they belong to the disadvantage of foreign cultures they make a relation with. Some other times, on the contrary, they obstinately underestimate their native cultural values and overestimate foreign cultural values. In a first phase, they would adopt an

ethnocentrist attitude to “cultural assets” and they would further promote a xenocentrist position.

P. Andrei perceived these extreme options in the orientation of the cultural consumption. It is from this reason that he suggested we should accept an enlightened “cultural nationalism” instead of our xenocentrist preconceptions. He would therefore mention: “the most reasonable and effective national policy is constructive and it raises the native element without ... turning the foreigners in our country into irreducible enemies”. Furthermore we should not cease “showing those looking over other horizons that we have a culture and especially that we can make a future for it under beneficial conditions”. (Andrei 1975, p. 207)

Responsibility of the cultural increase assigned to this purpose could not be due to another institution than the University (Andrei 1975, p. 210) (that he would always mention as a proper). It is the only one to have the ability to impose recognition of the Romanian space as space of a major culture. And another finding that amplifies P. Andrei’s prestige even more: the cultural solution to the national issue is to be found in the dialogue between ethnocentrism and xenocentrism: “nation is not something that is fixed and formed once and for all, it is a cultural community which is being creating uninterruptedly where individuals of different races may enter but they should acquire aspirations and culture of the nation they live in” (*Ibidem*)³.

g) *Roles of the auspices and mercenariness in cultural formation.* According to P. Andrei’s point of view, the cultural elite of the state should have the duty to watch over promotion of the truth, to create and disseminate culture. These goals are possible especially through the engagement of the actors within university field – either professors or students. It the professor “almost kills his physical being for the triumph of spirituality” (*Ibidem*, p. 207), the student “becomes a factor of preaching culture if he understands to give another what he has been taught”. (*Ibidem*, p. 209) Cultural dissemination should aim at crowds in the first place, and the “peasantry” – the most under-developed class” within it.

In inter-wars Romania, “poor in intellectual”, these missionary cultural actors actually carried out acts of a Maecenas. When the idealism of the formative elite dilutes itself, then cultural apostleship tends to come to an end, while the intellectuals gradually turn into “mercenaries” of the field of culture, E. Morin claims. (Morin 1962) If in other departments of the social action, the mercenariness is not very prejudicial, on the plan of the cultural life it becomes a sign of the lack of ideal, an indication of cultural crisis. Action “university extension”, The action “university extension”, carried on by the people of Cluj according to the Austrian model, was a cultural movement of exceedingly esteem” and it was maintained by

³ If in other themes, as far as the “issue on nations” is concerned, P. Andrei detached himself from his professor D. Gusti, their theories obviously converge. (See also Gusti 1995).

the vigour of the ideal and much liked by P. Andrei for its having proved accomplishment of some imperatives by the way of the cultural maecenatism. The benefit in such cases should not be understood only directed from up to down, on the contrary, the sociologist of Iasi claimed, the “leading stratum can be renewed with new elements of the peasant class, our only reserve of energy and health”. (Andrei 1975, p. 210).

h) *Civilian culture – source of social order and stability.* In 1928 P. Andrei was writing the study on “Social and Political Culture in Schools”, to warn the authorities of that time on the deficit of social and political knowledge of the Romanian citizens: they did not know the electoral mechanism, they mistook the type of state for the type of government, they were not familiar with the stipulations of the Constitution, they used words (communism, socialism, pacifism, etc.) whose meaning they did not know and so on forth. We cannot fail to notice the great resemblance between the level of the civilian culture described by P. Andrei and that tested by Romanians after the events of 1989. At the same time we find in both cases that school was indicated to be the most important institution to compensate for informative insufficiencies. That explains why in 1990 the discipline entitled “Notions of democracy” was introduced in the syllabus or why P. Andrei recommended study of sociology in the very secondary education. If there are some critical moments in the functioning of democracies, they might be consequences of the fact that the “people who has the right to universal vote and liberty does not know how to use them to the benefit of the state”. (Andrei 1975, p. 219).

The study of notions of social and political culture should nevertheless be done from nonpartisan positions, while avoiding school subordination in relation to political parties, either governing or not, and under the form of some objective presentations of social-political values. On the whole, we could tell that wherever a really assumed civilian culture exists, there is also stability, constructive social order and chances to rational establishment of the social equilibrium. Or all these are only possible if the school is given the responsibility to train both ordinary people and scholars or political leaders. (*Ibidem*, p. 211)

The “segments” of the sociology of culture that we have stopped to for a while are only a few from those that we can deduce from P. Andrei’s vision. Equally evident are those on the cultural crisis, genres and styles of creation, roles of authorities in social-cultural arrangement, etc. From their correlation we obtain a geometry of dimensions and variables useful to local and/or trans-local research of cultural reality. If all these issues have been approached by almost all sociologist of culture, then what individualises and over-ranks P. Andrei from the others is the fact that he made axioms out of these for his own life and activity: he was preponderantly ethnocentric to the detriment of xenocentrism, he staked on the force of the mercenariness while categorically rejecting mercenariness, he appreciated spiritual culture to be more important than material culture, he reached

exceptional cultural performances within university, he mastered and applied a solid civilian culture, etc., he imposed himself through all these and that is what we have tried to demonstrate, both as a cultural model of exceptional vitality, and the highest authority of the sociology of Iasi.

Following the performing strategy proposed by P. Andrei, nowadays sociologists could generate similar or even more important social-cultural results. To arrive to such consequences they should pay respect to the intellectual model that the man of culture Petre Andrei promoted, to know his life and works. They would implicitly arrive at the axiological truth of understanding that he was not accidentally called the “first and until now the greatest pride of the sociological education in Romania”. (Costea 2001, p. 22)

In all fields – and especially in sociology – if we are exclusively concerned with the present, we risk of losing the force of preceding examples and at the same time and of not being aware of how much we can do. For not falling into this error, I would remind you a warning launched by the Romanian sociologist D. Draghicescu: “men, like people, who do not know themselves or know themselves insufficiently, either act over or under their possibilities”. Consequently knowing P. Andrei as cultural model and author of sociology, we come nearer to a national value and we have our individual/collective chances of social-cultural growth optimised.

References

1. Andrei, P. (1996). *Discursuri parlamentare (1929-1933)* [Parliament Discourses (1929-1933)]. Editura Ankarom, Iași.
2. Andrei, P. (1927). *Probleme de sociologie* [Issues on Sociology]. Editura Casei Școalelor, București.
3. Andrei, P. (1993). *Jurnal, Memorialistică, Corespondență* [Journal, Memoirs, Letters], edition under the auspices of Petru P. Andrei, Doru Tompea, Florin Valeriu Dobrinescu. Editura Grafix, Iași.
4. Andrei, P. (1975). *Opere sociologice* [Sociological Works], vol. II. Editura Academiei R.S.R., București.
5. Andrei, P. (1936). *Sociologie general* [General Sociology]. Editura Scrisul Românesc, Craiova.
6. Andrei, P. P. (2001). Personalitatea lui Petre Andrei [Personality of Petre Andrei]. In *Petre Andrei and the Intellectual Model in Romanian Culture*. Editura Cantes, Iași.
7. Boudon, R. (1973). *L'inegalité de chances*. Armand Colin, Paris.
8. Bourdieu, P. (1979). Les trois états du capital culturel, *Actes de la recherche et sciences sociales*, IV, Paris.
9. Costea, Șt. (ed.) (2001). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie* [Romanian Sociologists. A Little Encyclopaedia]. Editura Expert, București.

10. Dumont, L. (1996). *Eseu asupra individualismului* [An Essay on the Individualism], Editura Anastasia, București.
11. Gusti, D. (1941). *La science de la realite sociale*. Alcan, Paris.
12. Gusti, D. (1935). *Sociologia militans. Introducere în sociologia politică* [Militans Sociology. Introduction to Political Sociology]. București.
13. Gusti, D. (1995). *Sociologia națiunii și a războiului* [Sociology of the Nation and the War], Editura Floare Albastră, București.
14. Herseni, T. (2007). *Istoria sociologiei românești. Sociologia academică* [History of the Romanian Sociology. Academic Sociology]. Editura Renaissance, București.
15. Ionescu, I. and Stan, D. (1997). *Elemente de sociologie* [Elements of Sociology], vol. I. Editura Universității "Al. I. Cuza", Iași.
16. Iorga, N. (1981). *O viață de om așa cum a fost* [A Man's Life as He Used to Be]. Editura Minerva, București.
17. Mauss, M. (1950). *Sociologie et anthropologie*, PUF, Paris.
18. Măciu, M. (1986). *Petre Andrei*. Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
19. Mills, C.W. (1980). *Imaginația sociologică* [Sociological Imagination], Editura Politică, București.
20. Morin, E. (1962). *L'esprit des temps*. Grasset, Paris.
21. Neculau, A. (1997). *Câmpul universitar și actorii săi* [University Field and Its Actors]. Editura Polirom, Iași.
22. Petrovici, I. (1966). *De-a lungul unei vieți* [Throughout a Lifetime. Memories]. Editura pentru Literatură, București.
23. Stan, D. and Stan, L. (1997). Universitatea – mediu de formare a elitelor societății și de manifestare a unor disfuncții specifice [University – an Environment of Training Society Elites and Manifestation of Some Specific Dysfunctions]. In *University Field and Its Actors*. Editura Polirom, Iași.
24. Uscătescu, G. (1987). *Ontologia culturii* [Ontology of Culture]. Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.