

Romanian sociologists in Paris in the 1930s

Sanda Golopenția

Brown University

In the following I will present the case of four young Romanian sociologists who went to specialize in Paris in the first half of the thirties: Ernest Bernea, Harry Brauner, Ștefania Cristescu and Ion Ionică. All of them were promising members of the Sociological School of Bucharest, led by Dimitrie Gusti. All of them wrote regular letters to their colleagues in Bucharest as well as to those who were studying abroad. Ernest Bernea, Harry Brauner and Ion Ionică spent, each of them, approximately one year in Paris between 1931-1932 or 1932-1933. Ștefania Cristescu spent two years in Paris (1932-1934) and obtained the diploma of the Institut d'Ethnologie. I consulted the unpublished letters sent by Ernest Bernea, Harry Brauner and Ștefania Cristescu to their colleague and friend, sociologist Anton Golopenția, then Rockefeller grantee in Leipzig, as well as the letters addressed by Ion Ionică and Dumitru Cristian Amzăr (who was in Germany with a fellowship as well) to Ștefania Cristescu. During a number of months of her stay in Paris, Ștefania Cristescu systematically marked in a diary her activities and impressions and this represents the second type of document that I used for the present article.

To fully assess the reactions of the four Romanian sociologists, I will first rapidly address the situation of sociology in Romania, which corresponded to their point of departure and horizon of expectations, and that of sociology in France, which each of the grantees had come to study. In order to do so, I will mainly refer to two syntheses written in the thirties, the first, by D. Gusti, entitled Sociologia Militans. Introducere în sociologia politică (Sociologia Militans. An Introduction to Political Sociology, Bucharest, 1942¹) and the second by C. Bouglé, Bilan de la sociologie française contemporaine (Paris, 1938).

Dimitrie Gusti's School of Sociology

Dimitrie Gusti was a vibrant Professor who felt the need to combine from the very beginning teaching sociology as a theoretical discipline with applying it in order to address the numerous problems that faced his country as well as Europe. In 1918 Gusti created the Association

for Social Science and Reform (*Asociația pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*) that he transformed, one year later, into the Romanian Social Institute. The Association/Institute was meant to study Romanian social life, to propose the reforms that logically resulted from such research, to militate for the implementation of those reforms and to contribute to the social and political education of the masses. It

brought together the best local and foreign specialists in the fields of agricultural, commercial, industrial, and financial studies, historical, political and administrative studies, law, medical, biological, psychological and hygiene studies, and cultural studies. And it organized public lecture sequences that explicitly articulated Sociology with Ethics and Politics, debating the future Constitution of unified Romania (23 lectures, 1921-1922, published under the title *Noua Constituție a României*); the doctrines of the political parties (18 lectures, 1922-1923, published as *Doctrinile partidelor politice*); the external policy of Romania (20 lectures, 1923-1924, published as *Politica externă a României*); social life in post-war Romania (17 lectures, published as *Viața socială a României după război*); capitalism and social life (20 lectures, published as *Capitalismul în viața socială*); rural vs. urban (21 lectures, published as *Sat și Oraș*); cultural politics (27 lectures; *Politica Culturii*); theory of culture (10 lectures; *Teoria Culturii*); and Romanian problems in an international context (156 lectures hosted by the 12 sections of the Romanian Social Institute; *Probleme românești în cadrul vieții internaționale*). This was the first articulation of Gusti's system of sociology and it addressed, as we can see, both national and international (European) issues.

While teaching, first at the University of Iași, and then at the University of Bucharest, Gusti decided to perfect a method of plural sociological description aimed at facilitating broad sociological reflection as well as making known to the administration and the government the then current situation of the country. Since the circumstances of the rural population were in most need of change, he decided to start with the study of Romanian villages. To do so he organized

multidisciplinary research teams of between 40 and 90 specialists (sociologists, demographers, economists, historians, folklorists, linguists, musicologists, choreographers, painters, specialists in hygiene and medicine etc. – students as well as renowned professionals) that went to study typical villages chosen from various regions of Romania during the summer vacation months. As a result, at the beginning of the thirties, Dimitrie Gusti had articulated a sociological system and a “monographic method” that were widely disseminated by means of University courses, textbooks, anthologies of specialized questionnaires, studies published in *Arhiva pentru știința și reforma socială* and, later on, also in *Sociologie Românească (Romanian Sociology)*, as well as a growing number of volumes due to D. Gusti himself and to numerous members of his school (Traian Herseni, H.H. Stahl, Mircea Vulcănescu, Anton Golopenția, Octavian Neamțu, D.C. Amzăr, Ernest Bernea, Ștefania Cristescu, Ion Ionică etc.). To produce the accurate sociological monograph of a social unit (be it a village, and later on a district, a town, or a region) the Gustian pioneering teams of so-called “monographists” had:

a) to account for its genesis by describing what he called the natural (that is, cosmical and biological) and the social (that is, psychological and historical) “frames” (*cadre*);

b) to describe its current constitutive (that is, economical and spiritual) and reglementative (that is, political or juridical) “manifestations” (*manifestări*);

c) to assess the current social reality by defining its essence (that is, the *social will* behind all the socially creative activities and interactions under b), its phenomenological existence (that is, the *social units, relations and processes*), and the parallelisms between social will and social

“manifestations,” between “frames” and “manifestations,” and between the four types of manifestations respectively ;

d) to define the main directions of that unit’s social evolution ;

e) to optimize the aims and means of a future social reality deemed both possible and desirable by resorting to Ethics and Politics.

This was the *second articulation* of Gusti’s system.

In order to accomplish the necessary teamwork, a strict division of labor between “monographists” according to the tasks enumerated above was encouraged by the Professor. Thus, while collecting all the interesting material with which they were confronted, Ștefania Cristescu, D.C. Amzăr, Ernest Bernea and Ion Ionică, for example, were typically involved in and responsible for assessing the “spiritual manifestations” of a social unit and, in a similar way, A. Golopenția, who was their correspondent, focused his research on the phenomenological description of social processes.

Understood in such a way, Gusti’s monographic research had in common with Frédéric Le Play’s family monographs only the name. Suffice it to remember that, limited to the diagnostic study of family budgets and often undertaken by Le Play’s adepts in countries whose language they did not speak, the Le Play monographs did not consider any social unit beyond the family and that, consequently, units such as villages, towns, cities, districts or regions remained unaccounted for ; and that they did not examine the set of cosmical, biological, psychological and historical contexts, the set of economical, spiritual, political or juridical activities and the social will that was behind them ; the social units, social relations and social processes ; the intricate relationships between all these aspects ;

or the current trends and the perspectives for change of the social unit considered. While fully acknowledging Le Play’s pioneering merit, Gusti was always careful to underline the differences that made his approach unique.

At the beginning of the thirties, Gusti’s system and monographic method were fully developed not only as a result of the time he spent writing about them or discussing them with his assistants and students during his seminars, but also as a consequence of their multiple testing by pluridisciplinary teams in villages such as Goicea Mare (Dolj, 1925), Rușețu (Brăila, 1926), Nereju (Vrancea, 1927), Fundu-Moldovei (Câmpulung, 1928), Drăguș (Făgăraș, 1929, 1932, 1933, 1938), Runcu (Gorj, 1930), or Cornova (Bessarabia, 1931). Gusti’s *exhaustive monographs* were exemplified by works completed during the thirties, such as H.H. Stahl’s three-volume monograph *Nereju, un village d’une région archaïque* (1939), by Ion Conea’s two-volume *Clopotiva, un sat din Hațeg* (*Clopotiva, a Village from Hațeg*, 1940), by the eight volumes and twenty articles published by different “monographists” on the village of Drăguș, by articles and studies on different aspects of the villages of Runcu, Șanț, Fundu-Moldovei, Leșu or Cornova and by the monumental four-volume *Enciclopedia României*, coordinated by D. Gusti, M. Vulcănescu, A. Golopenția and H.H. Stahl, and published between 1938 and 1939. (In this extraordinary *Encyclopedia*, sociological portraits of the counties and cities in Romania, as well as detailed presentations of industry, commerce, transportation systems, Romanian law etc. counterbalanced the up to then mostly rural dimension of the monographic research.) In parallel with the exhaustive monographs, members of the Sociological School of Bucharest developed summary monographs

(*monografii sumare*), aimed at informing the administration of the country and the specialists, in a realistically concise manner, with respect to a greater number of social units, such as A. Golopenția and D.C. Georgescu's *60 sate românești cercetate de echipele regale studențești în vara 1938* (*60 Romanian Villages Studied by the Royal Student Teams during the Summer of 1938*) and, later on, *thematic monographs*, such as D.C. Georgescu's *L'alimentation de la population rurale en Roumanie* (1939), A. Golopenția's *Starea culturală și economică a populației din România* (*The Cultural and Economic Situation of the Rural Population in Romania*, 1940), L. Costa-Foru's *Cercetarea monografică a familiei. Contribuție metodologică* (*The Monographic Study of the Family: A Methodological Contribution*, 1945), T. Herseni's *Probleme de sociologie pastorală* (*Problems of Pastoral Sociology*, 1941) or H.H. Stahl's *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești* (*Contributions to the Study of the Communal Property Romanian Villages*, 1958-1965) (cf. Larionescu, 2001, 225).

The culmination of the Sociological School of Bucharest's activity was clearly registered in the 1930s, when the research activity of Gusti's "monographists" was not only widely published, but also put to systematic formative use in the Royal multidisciplinary student teams that, each put under the leadership of a well-trained "monographist," went into villages, collected vital sociological data, elaborated rapid and comparable syntheses (*summary monographs*) and tried to effectively intervene (with the administrative authorities or directly in the villages) in order to facilitate evolution or even initiate positive local changes. In A. Golopenția's words, these teams acted as "mobile sociological laboratories," at a ratio of over 50 at the same time. During one year, between

1938 and 1939, work in such a Royal student team became an obligation for each and every student in Romania (the so-called *Serviciul Social*, or Social Service) and, to face the challenge of organizing an investigation and intervention of such magnitude, the Romanian Social Institute was transformed into *Institutul de Științe Sociale al României* (The Institute for Social Sciences of Romania). The whole student youth of Romania was at that moment familiarized with sociology, came to know the deep problems facing the country, and was thus largely kept away from the extreme right or left movements that were developing in Europe at the time. The research dimension was amplified by organizing sociological exhibitions (in Bucharest and abroad, in Barcelona for example), building the open air Museum of the Romanian Village (*Muzeul Satului*), which is still existent in Bucharest, giving a sociological accent to Romania's participation at the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris in 1937 (where D. Gusti was the General Commissary), and using the new possibilities of aerial photographs and sociological films in order to complement and synthesize the results of the monographic work. In recognition of the extraordinary fertility of Gusti's School, Bucharest was chosen as the place for the 16th International Congress of Sociology. Unfortunately, all of this came to a halt in 1939, due to WWII: the Social Service was suspended, the Congress was postponed *sine die*, and the extraordinary research and publication activity by means of which the Romanian sociologists were preparing for the Congress was temporarily interrupted. After the war, the communist regime discouraged the activity of the Romanian Social Institute² and of D. Gusti, eliminated sociology from among the disciplines to be taught in Romania (which is a last, indirect

proof of the large impact of the Gustian School) and, for a long while, basically until the end of the fifties, the Sociological School of Bucharest was either decimated, with many of its members spending long years or even dying in prison (this was the fate of A. Golopenția, M. Vulcănescu, E. Bernea), leaving the country (as did C. Brăiloiu, Ion Ionică, D.C. Amzăr) or unable to publish until the sixties, some even until 1989 (H.H. Stahl, Octavian Neamțu, Ștefania Cristescu, Xenia Costa-Foru, Christina Galitzi etc.).

Between 1930 and 1935, when Bernea, Brauner, Cristescu and Ionică came to study in Paris, the Sociological School of Bucharest was, however, in full and spectacular expansion. It was focused on interpreting the national and European context and, to an even greater extent, on the methodologically complete and coherent description of the country, in view of establishing the perspectives of evolution and change of its different social units. It was embraced by a large number of eager young scholars and students that formed an active, resilient and organized structure, disseminated all over the country and directed by the Romanian Social Institute in Bucharest with its subsidiary centers in Timișoara, Cluj, and Chișinău, as well as by the Cultural Foundation Prince Carol (*Fundația Culturală Principele Carol*), both led by D. Gusti. This large community of followers, capable of informed social vision and of work conducive to reform was as important a feature of Gusti's School as its research and methodology. The Gustian sociological movement had come to be greeted and taken as an example in many countries and students from Germany, Hungary, and the United States³ were officially sent or chose to participate in the monographic campaigns, while numerous articles and studies published outside Romania addressed

the main innovations of the Romanian sociologists. Gusti was widely invited to give lectures (in France, England, Germany etc.) and received an impressive number of honorary degrees. Briefly put, sociology was in Romania a dynamic and visionary discipline. Largely studied in the Romanian Universities, it was also well-known to the general public due to a variety of Gustian initiatives. Suffice it to mention the lecture cycles that had been organized by D. Gusti since the 1920s, the wide popularization in the media of the research monographic campaigns, the organization of Cultural Centers (*cămine culturale*) in every village of Romania by the Royal Foundation Prince Carol led by Gusti as well, the Royal student teams' summer work and the huge amount of professional publications that it generated. Most importantly, Romanian sociology was, as Gusti had proclaimed it, a *Sociologia Militans*, devoted not only to social description of but also to an informed social intervention in Romania.

French sociology in the thirties

Reading Bouglé's synthesis, we can immediately notice both similarities and differences between Romanian and French sociology.

1. Like in Romania, French sociology evolved around a most prominent figure which was in France that of Emile Durkheim (himself a continuator of Auguste Comte). The difference was, however, generational. Since Durkheim had died in 1917, the French sociology of the thirties was mostly practiced by his former students who had become in the meantime well-established continuators of their master's thought.

2. Again like in Romania, sociology was at the time a pilot discipline in France. However, in contrast to Romania, where it functioned in a centripetal way bringing together and synthesizing different disciplines into Gusti's *Sociologia Militans*, in France, sociological thought spontaneously infiltrated the main social sciences, leading to a widespread and characteristic *sociologisme*. Bouglé (1938) chose to stress in his *bilan* the encounters between sociology and psychology, ethnology, history, as well as social morphology (based on the convergence of demography, statistics and *géographie humaine* with a sociological approach), juridical sociology (*sociologie juridique*) and economical sociology (*sociologie économique*). He could well have added to these the flourishing research in sociolinguistics (by Meillet, Vendryès, Brunot or Delacroix); Hourticq's, Focillon's and especially Lalo's preoccupation with the social dimension of art in his book entitled *L'Art et la vie sociale* (cf. Bouglé, 1938, 159-160); the development of the *Collège de Sociologie*, through which Roger Caillois, Georges Bataille, Jean Paulhan and Leiris (the first three strongly marked by Durkheim's and Marcel Mauss's ideas) were trying, during the same thirties, to bring together their moral, sociological and literary concerns; the relationships between technology and society as described by Weber in his work on the *Rythme du progrès*, Hubert in his research on the *Celtes*, or Abel Rey in his examination of *La Science dans l'Antiquité* etc.

Bouglé's *bilan* is rich and revealing. It is centered, more or less, on (a) discussing Durkheim's contribution to the "sociologization" of psychology, ethnology, history, demography, geography, law and economics and (b) assessing the adoption and further development or the contestation of Durkheim's ideas by specialists

in the fields mentioned above during the post-WWI years.

a) We thus find a detailed analysis of Durkheim's critique of introspective *psychology*⁴ as well as of his development of the hypotheses of collective representations and *conscience collective* or of the social mediation that allows the evolution toward concepts, categories and reasoning; of his *ethnology* inspired distinction between *mechanical solidarity* (based on a rigorous process of uniformization, and characterizing simple social structures like the Australian, Kabyle or Iroquois clans) and *organic solidarity* (that implies differences between relatively free individuals) and theories of the genetical and morphological classification and evolution of social forms from simple to complex, of the (conjugal) family as gradually evolving from political groups (and not the opposite, as had been sustained by the traditional thesis that explained the appearance of the city starting from the family), of totemism as the hypothetical basis of both religion and science. In the domain of *social morphology* (and rural sociology), Durkheim's hypothesis of the division of labor being dependent upon social density and representing a *solution adoucie* to the struggle for life and, in the domain of law, Durkheim's correlation between the increased complexity of a society and the *adoucissement du Droit pénal* (or, by contrast, the correlation between simple societies, with their religious conception of criminality, and the ferocity of the law) are discussed at length.

b) To prove the relevance of Durkheim's ideas, Bouglé illustrated their fertility when taken into account by socio-psychologists, socio-ethnologists a.s.o. Thus, for example, Durkheim's *sociologisme* had an *action fécondante* on the team of psychologists that published in the 1930s, under the direction of G. Dumas, the

Traité de psychologie (in particular on Gustave Belot, M. Paulhan, Ch. Blondel), on Maurice Halbwachs' *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, on Albert Bayet's, Halbwachs' and Max Bonnafous' studies on suicide; on socio-ethnologists such as Abel Rey; Gilbert Murray and Harrison (*La formation de la pensée grecque*) and especially on Maurice Granet's *La pensée chinoise*, or Marcel Mauss and Hubert in their studies of sacrifice and magic. The opposite case, in which ethnologists brought institutions that had not been known to Durkheim to the attention of sociologists, is exemplified by the interpretations of *potlatch* in Marcel Mauss' *Le Don, forme archaïque de l'échange* or in Davy's *Foi jurée*.

Bouglé also stressed the fact that, when attacking Durkheim's ideas, people did not take into account the fact that these often had the status of *hypotheses* to be developed and tested rather than that of theories adamantly affirmed. Thus, when concluding on Durkheim's *conscience collective*, Bouglé (1938) wrote: "*Idée directrice, elle conserve en tout état de cause la valeur d'une hypothèse de travail; elle nous met en garde contre les explications prématurément individualistes, auxquelles prête tout naturellement l'analyse réflexive. Qu'après cela il nous soit difficile – pour nous dont les sens ne saisissent que des êtres séparés et dont la conscience ne connaît qu'un être personnel – de nous représenter le mode de vie et d'action de la conscience collective, nul n'en doute. Mais serait-ce la première fois, en science, qu'une force dont l'imagination se représente difficilement le mode d'existence et d'action joue un grand rôle? Si nous pouvons seulement dire que tout se passe comme si une conscience collective présidait aux destinées d'une nation, d'une église, d'une corporation, c'en est assez pour que la notion soit un guide utile à la recherche* (11)."

In a similar vein, Bouglé demonstrated that certain oppositions (between Durkheim and Tarde, Durkheim and Bergson etc.) were widely exaggerated. Thus, in psychology, he signaled the fact that the opposition between Tarde's theory of imitation and Durkheim's theory of synthesis could be attenuated and that, likewise, the opposition between Bergson's primacy of inner life and Durkheim's insistence on social life was not as absolute as it had been thought to be: "*Bergson nous invite à briser la glace des concepts d'origine sociale, pour retrouver le courant de la vie intérieure. Il n'en reste pas moins qu'en assignant à l'intelligence la fonction, non pas seulement d'agir sur la matière, mais d'unir les hommes à l'aide de concepts communicables par des mots, Bergson indique la grande place occupée par la vie sociale dans la vie spirituelle. Que cette vie spirituelle-sociale ne soit pas à ses yeux la forme supérieure de la vie, et que même on devienne incapable de saisir celle-ci lorsqu'on se fie aux seuls concepts construits par celle-là, d'accord. Mais ce jugement de valeur n'empêche que, même pour l'auteur des Données immédiates de la conscience, si l'on veut comprendre quelque chose à l'orientation et au développement de l'intelligence humaine, il importe de s'en représenter les tenants et aboutissants sociaux* (Bouglé, 1938, 29)."

3. While the laboratory of the Gustian School was represented by Romania as a whole and by the European trends of the moment, the Durkheimian *équipe* focused on a hugely extended "primitive corpus" gathered in the colonies, brought to the attention of the general public by the *Exposition coloniale* and the *Musée Trocadéro* (future *Musée de l'Homme*), and institutionally studied at the *Institut d'Ethnologie* directed by Rivet in Paris.

The interest for the diversity of social groups and for humanity in general prevailed over the sociological study of the social reality in contemporary France or Europe.

Because of this difference in purpose and scale, while in Romania the development of the sociological method and theory went hand in hand with the interest for sociological description and applied sociology, in France those who continued Durkheim's line of thought tended to postpone for a later time not only practical intervention in social life, but even the articulation into a sociological whole of the different facets of a social unit. One can see for example Bouglé's remarks concerning the ethical considerations of socio-economist Charles Gide or, even more convincing, those dedicated to the possibility of a general synthetic sociology: "*Mais pour qu'on en puisse juger, celle-ci [general synthetic sociology] est-elle d'ores et déjà intégralement constituée? Nous en sommes loin. Et les sociologues ne sont pas les derniers à le proclamer. Qu'on mesure plutôt l'étendue du programme que lui trace M. Mauss dans son article sur les 'Divisions et proportions des divisions de la sociologie' (Année sociologique, nouvelle série, 1924-1925). Elle aurait à coordonner les résultats de recherches sociologiques spéciales – économiques, juridiques, religieuses etc. – en les rapportant toujours à ces tous que sont les groupes. Elle mettrait en lumière ce qui constitue les systèmes sociaux et ce qui est dû à leur influence, elle relèverait la propagation des faits de civilisation par-dessus les frontières des groupes. Toutes tâches qui supposent d'immenses enquêtes, des réponses à des questionnaires méthodiquement établis, des études*

'sociographiques' de toutes sortes, un travail cyclopéen (Bouglé, 1938, 93)."

4. Romanian sociology was, in fact, able to deliver such considerable sociographic studies during the inter-war period. On its part, French sociology focused its efforts on reorienting the study of philosophy in France and on stimulating a convergent approach between psychology, ethnography, demography, statistics, geography, law, economy etc. For the philosophical and scientific impact aimed at by the Durkheimian School, one can see the following concluding passage in Bouglé (1938): "*En réaffirmant le postulat positiviste et en s'efforçant de prouver par leurs conquêtes la valeur 'heuristique' de leurs idées directrices, ils ont amené nombre de philosophes à réagir, ils les ont incités aussi à réfléchir sur les positions classiques de la philosophie en France; ils ont ainsi contribué, tout au moins par les problèmes qu'ils ont posés en termes nouveaux, à enrichir l'enseignement philosophique. Mais d'autres résultats, plus modestes en un sens, leur importent davantage: ceux qu'on obtient en faisant converger pour la mise en lumière d'un certain nombre de types et de lois, les résultats des disciplines qui s'attachent à l'étude des hommes associés. Après notre rapide revue des résultats dus aux interventions de l'esprit sociologique en psychologie ou en ethnologie, en géographie humaine ou en histoire, en science du droit ou en économie politique, on jugera sans doute que cet effort n'a pas été vain (169).*"

While the last preoccupation was common to the two Schools, the first singularizes French Durkheimian sociology with respect to the Romanian Gustian one.

Francophile openness vs. professional choices

Romania was and still is considered to be a “francophile country”. Its language, one of the five Romance languages with a national destiny, was modernized, during the 19th century, by intensely borrowing from French. The Romanian revolutionaries of 1848 were in strong contact with those of France. During the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, various groups, such as the absentee Romanian landowners living from rents, Romanian intellectuals, or Romanian politicians, mostly originary from the south-eastern part of the country, used to spend a considerable part of their lives in Paris. Among them, especially during the 19th century, francophilia manifested at times the naïve exaggeration and the excessive imitation that made it (under the name of *franțuzism*) the subject of literary, theatrical and journalistic satire in Romania. Romanian writers writing in French and living in France as well as Romanian artists, philosophers or scientists were numerous in the 20th century. One can think of Tristan Tzara, Marthe Bibesco, Anna de Noailles, later on of Emile Cioran, Eugène Ionesco, Constantin Brăiloiu, Brâncuși, Lupasco etc. Even during the communist regime, with the exception of the closed fifties, Romania continued to have privileged cultural ties with France and French continued to be widely taught in schools and universities. “I couldn’t exist without French books” used to say, during the sixties and seventies, the prestigious linguist A. Rosetti, even though Romanians did no more proclaim themselves francophile as before.

While we still define francophilia as love of things French, there are in the use of the term intimations of free preference for the culture of a magnificent other,

neglect of one’s own culture and therefore excess, cultural passivity from behalf of a dominated culture and elitist consumerism contrasting with that of one’s co-nationals that could be clarified by adding to this rather vague definition a number of distinctions. I will limit myself here to briefly mentioning those that are related with the subject of the present article.

First of all, we can distinguish between *punctual* and *general* francophilia. In the first case, francophilia is limited to a certain geographical area and to certain social groups of a given country, in the second it would extend to the whole surface of the respective country and to its whole population. During the 19th century, Romanian francophilia was limited from both points of view. It was registered mostly if not only in the south-eastern area that corresponded to Muntenia, Oltenia and Moldavia and especially among the elite groups enumerated above. In fact, I do not believe that francophilia or any foreign culture-philia for the matter, could ever be general, it seems to me that it is always the exception with respect to the whole population of a country.

Second, we can distinguish between *intense*, that is, zealous, excessive francophilia, like the one that was registered and ridiculed in the Romanian Principalities and later on in Romania during the 19th or in England during the 18th and 19th centuries (*cf.* Brockliss and Eastwood, 1997; Eagles, 2000) vs. *normalized*, relaxed and critical francophilia, which I think characterized Romanian society during the 20th century. In contradistinction to the fervent francophiles of the beginning, the relaxed francophiles of later years were characterized not so much by compulsive imitation or consumption of things French but, rather, by an elective dialogue with French culture, that could,

at times, express discontent or disapproval. Thus, for example, during the 1930s, Mircea Eliade would voice what I propose to call a *dépit francophile* (coined after *dépit amoureux*) in an essay where he spoke of the fact that, despite selling 10% of its book production in Romania, France did not serve as the mediating cultural agent in Europe that it could have been with relative ease. By continuing to opt for an exclusive translation club that was limited to French, English, German, Italian, Spanish and Russian, Eliade would say, by not encouraging translations from Romanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Danish, Swedish etc. into French and thus not helping bring into existence a wide and unified European readership, France perpetuated a cultural bias and hiatus that could have been surmounted and neglected the grand cultural role that historically belonged to her.

When Bernea, Brauner, Cristescu and Ionică went to specialize in France, they did so in a context of relaxed and at times skeptic Bucharest francophilia. One can say that, during the interwar period, students originary from south-eastern Romania continued to go to France (they all knew French), while those from at times germanophile Banat and Transylvania tended to learn German and often went to study in Germany. Gusti was an exception since, although originary from Moldavia, he had obtained his doctoral degree in Germany. Among his young associates, Dumitru Cristian Amzăr, Anton Golopenția and Traian Herseni went to specialize in Germany, while Christina Galitzi, Xenia Costa-Foru and, before them, demographer Sabin Manuilă and art critic Petru Comarnescu, both widely involved with the activities of the Sociological School in Bucharest, obtained doctoral degrees or simply studied in the United States.

The main reason behind these choices was, however, not francophile, germanophile or americanophile, but *professional*, since French, German and American sociologies were all widely acclaimed in the interwar period. As far as France was concerned, let me mention that Dimitrie Gusti had strong relations of cooperation with colleagues such as Marcel Mauss, Célestin Bouglé, Jean Marx, to mention just a few, and was often invited to give lectures in Paris. On the other hand, in Bucharest, the French Institute directed by Alphonse Dupront was most active and efficient. Due to his efforts fellowships of the French government were regularly attributed, on the basis of strong and prestigious competitions. Our four young sociologists went therefore to France mainly because they valued French sociology and only secondarily because they knew French, were familiar with French culture and could, in fact, live in Paris without feeling complete strangers. What is more, Romanian sociology was itself internationally recognized. Gusti's work as well as his "monographic" research teams were well known to French, English and American specialists. "Monographic" research Gusti-style was emulated in Hungary, Bulgaria, Germany, while American, Hungarian and German students joined the Romanian interdisciplinary teams in the field in order to get acquainted with their method of work. Romanian sociologists went therefore to study in France without cultural apprehensions and actually enjoyed a special status and treatment that were due to the prestige acquired by their Professor and the "monographic" research of the Bucharest School. Furthermore they functioned as desirable experts with respect to both Gusti's and their own sociological work.

Individual choices and common reactions

Since all of them had worked in the “Spiritual manifestations” subteam during the monographic campaigns at Runcu, Drăguș or Cornova, the French choices of Bernea, Brauner, Cristescu and Ionică normally focused on ethnology. Ștefania Cristescu took Bouglé’s courses at the Sorbonne, those of Marcel Mauss and Jean Marx at the *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, or of Mauss and Rivet at the Institute of Ethnology, as well as Sjoestedt’s “Celtic Mythology” course. Since she was also interested in linguistics (being a former student of the brilliant Romanian linguist Ovid Densusianu), Cristescu studied Celtic languages and general linguistics with Vendryès at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, dialectology with Oscar Bloch, and took a linguistic course with Marcel Cohen. We are less informed as to the details of Bernea and Ionică’s course choices: they both seem to have taken courses taught by Fauconnet and Mauss.

In two letters addressed to A. Golopenția, who was then in Germany with a Rockefeller grant, Ștefania Cristescu stressed the efficient and collegial openness with which she was welcomed by the top French sociologists in Paris, who immediately included her in their activities. Thus, for example, she recounts in a letter, as soon as she arrived in Paris for her first year of study, she was invited to spend an evening with all of them in order to get to a basic understanding of the possibilities of work and study that were available at the moment: “[In the restaurant, I found] Mauss, Lévy-Bruhl, R. Maunier,⁵ Simiand and two others whose name I did not retain. I spoke a little with each of them. Maunier who, besides functioning as a Professor at the Faculty of Law, is also the President of the Folklore

Society, took my address in order to send me invitations to the meetings of this Society; Mauss has the nicest Alsatian accent; Maunier, who comes from Provence, recited verses from *Mireillo*, while Bouglé the Breton would constantly tease each of them. Mauss invited me to come to the Institute of Ethnology in order to talk more. Around 11 o’clock the old Bouglé accompanied me to my hotel. Saturday afternoon I went to Jean Marx: his gentleness perfectly resembles that of Dupront. He gave me two other letters, one for the Custodian of the Museum of Ethnography, Rivière and the other addressed to the General Secretary of the Institute of Ethnology, Rivet. At last, I know all that I will have to do. Bouglé is somebody whom I can always ask for help and Mauss, quite unexpected: he loves the young (he told me) and is ready at any moment to guide you in any kind of projects (27.XI.1932).”

“Monday evening, when I returned home, I found a parcel. René Maunier had sent me some of his works: *Le Ménage kabyle*; *Le chien de Montargis (Travail de folklore juridique)* and *Les débuts et les formes du contact des races* (30.XI.1932).”

Cristescu’s diary gives a number of details on the courses usually taken by a student specializing in French ethnology at the time. We find the schedules and locations of the courses and, most importantly, remarks on some of the courses that she followed and on the professors who taught them. Among all, Marcel Mauss, Célestin Bouglé, Jean Marx and Meillet recur most often in Cristescu’s notes. While noting that Mauss’ course is not relevant to her work (“*neinteresant pentru mine*,” 5.XII.1933), Cristescu’s remarks show a warm professional and human relation that was surely most helpful: “Saturday, December 2 [1933]/(...) p.m.: course with Mauss. He greeted me

with great joy before starting the course. At the end of the class I went to say hello. Toward the conclusion [of our talk], he suddenly asked about my mother. His eyes were in tears at my answer [Cristescu's mother had recently died].

Thursday, January 11 [1934]/10-12 : Marx./5-6 : Mauss. (In the middle of the course he praised me!)

Saturday, February 24 [1934]/Mauss spoke without notes. He had taken with him other ones than those he needed."

The same is valid with respect to Bouglé, Marx, and Allier: "Tuesday, December 19 [1933]/At 2 o'clock I went to say hello to Bouglé.

Friday, December 22 [1933]/10-12 Vendryès./I received an invitation from Bouglé – for a lunch on Sunday, with his family at Bois de Boulogne.

Sunday, December 24 [1933]/I was at Boulogne sur Seine. With sad eyes. (Circle – 'Autour du monde:' Bouglé, his wife and daughter, two German Professors of Sociology, refugees – Salomon and? –, Dupront, who had just come from Romania for several days.

Saturday, December 9 [1933]/10 1/2 : Rivet. I met Raoul Allier's daughter, who invited me for tea at their home on Monday afternoon. To meet her father. He has been in Africa, knows some African language./5-6 : Mauss./I didn't yet go to see Bouglé!

Monday, December 11 [1933]/At four o'clock, tea at the home of R. Allier. (Bd. Raspail 282)./R. Allier: old, tired. He still works, though.

Thursday, December 14 [1933]/10-12 : Marx. His course on 'Le vase de Gundestrup' is more interesting than I thought./5-6 : Mauss."

The diary comments devoted to courses taught by Vendryès, Meillet and Sjoestedt attest to their being more connected with Cristescu's preoccupations at the time:

"Friday, November 24 [1933]/10-12 : Vendryès' (Celtic) course. Most interesting.

Monday, December 4 [1933]/(...) Morning at 10 : Meillet's course (*salle IV, Collège de France*)./Well attended. A frail old man with a young and pale childish face, white beard – Meillet. He speaks slowly, clearly, in a plain voice. Thinks with finesse./The course is the continuation of an older one, on familiar and affective terms in the Indo-European grammar./'If my health will allow it, I will tell you my ultimate thoughts on this matter next year.'/A young gentleman marks on the blackboard the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin etc. terms that Meillet pronounces during his lecture.

Monday, December 18 [1933]/Meillet is sick./Today I had planned to talk to him after his course./11-12 : Mauss.

Wednesday, February 28 [1934]/Ms. Sjoestedt lent to me G. Dumézil : *Le festin d'immortalité. Etude de mythologie comparée indo-européenne*, Paris, 1924."⁶

Soon, however, Cristescu would conclude not only that many of the courses at the Institute of Ethnology were only partially relevant for her already quite specialized work but, more importantly, that even the most interesting courses offered were poorly attended. Thus she discovered that in France social sciences did not have the wide and lively following that she had grown accustomed to associate with them: "At the Institute of Ethnology I work with Mauss and Rivet. I am not interested in everything, though. I go to J. Marx out of obligation. (I had a recommendation to him from Dupront and he appears to be very closely interested in my preoccupations.) With Vendryès, I study the 'Comparative Grammar of Celtic Languages.' My rather tangential interest in the subject is compensated by the joy to know the man more closely. Meillet does not teach and Delacroix gives a course in

Psychology. I hope to get more from reading at the Library. I am extremely surprised to see that in Paris, where there are so many students, interesting courses are attended by twenty persons at most. (In Vendryès' course, I am the only woman, together with seven men.) Anyhow, Anton, if there were but the enthusiasm and the interest that our research raises [at home], I would still have to consider it as being much above what is done here. I hope that the practical works (*travaux pratiques*) at the Institute of Ethnography or the meetings of the Folklore Society, where I will go for the first time on Thursday, December 15, will offer more interesting stuff (14.XII.1932)."

This was indeed in total contrast with the wide audience of Sociology among the students of the University in Bucharest and with the large interdisciplinary teams that went to do fieldwork in Romanian villages every summer as we mentioned above.

As a result, Cristescu would often wonder, even during her second year in Paris, about the essential purpose of her French fellowship: "Why am I here and not in the country where, who knows, an exam of *capacitate* [needed to get the license to teach] would give meaning to my life? Out of vanity? Because A. was going to study abroad as well? And the next year, and after that? I don't know to will anymore. I lack the sense of orientation. Life turns around me, huge and incomprehensible, as if before blind eyes (Ş.C. to A. Golopenția, 4.XII.1933)."

"Yesterday evening a group of women students were talking in the restaurant, at a table near me, about the irresponsibility (*inconștiența*) of those who work without envisioning a practical and immediate goal. (Ş.C. to A. Golopenția, 8.XII.1933)"

"To work simply in the country? Maybe it's still there that I will get to

achieve what I think. (Ş.C. to A. Golopenția, 23.XII.1933)"

Bernea's letters to A. Golopenția speak of a similar uneasiness, followed, however, in his case, by the abandonment of his "almost concluded" sociological formation in favor of a "more scientific" French one: "We all run, and break while struggling with life's boulders; we follow paths that we think are ours (think only) and in fact? ! God knows what we are doing! We look, each of us, for our golden calf... and let pass our life, our life that is not ours (21.V.1931)."

"Last year, in Paris, I entered ('learned as I was'⁷) in a serious scientific milieu. True, it took me out of my 'almost ripe' sociologist's old habits, but once I shook the ashes... (for I had burnt...) I could again set going; of course, by starting anew! This year, the grief is even deeper. Totally lacking the knowledge of the language [Bernea had decided to combine one year in France with one year in Germany], I went, I could say in a tragic manner, through a total and prolonged prostration. This made me close into myself (...). (2.III.1932)"

The clearest expression of the preoccupation for the lack of direct relevance of studying primitive cultures with respect to the specific problems faced by Romanian sociology appears in a letter addressed by D.C. Amzăr to Ștefania Cristescu, in which he tries to explain the reason of his insistently asking for more details concerning her studies in France: "I did it out of a fear, that might be unfounded and useless, concerning our scientific *preparation*. Namely, the fear of following a wrong path in pursuing things that, for us only – *pròs i mäs*, are less important than others, near which we might indifferently pass by, and which concern us truly and to the highest degree. I have the impression – to tell it

directly – that, in our monographic studies [D.C.A. uses the familiar *monografie*], we are giving too much importance to ‘primitivology,’ or primitive ethnology, while neglecting the Indo-European material. This is an old quarrel of mine with Ernest:⁸ I never understood what our *historical connection* with the primitives from Australia or who knows where might be and why do so many of us, who went to study abroad (Nelu,⁹ himself and, it appears, you as well), have to study them in such detail. For we must not forget one thing: we are not doing comparative ethnography, not even Romanian ethnography, but the *sociology* of *Romanian* society, which can’t be separated from the *history* of this society. And Romanian history guides us not toward the ‘primitives,’ but rather toward the Indo-Europeans with whom we came in contact or, if not, at least shared the same cultural area and destiny. Don’t you think that the Slavs, Greeks, Celts, Balts (Lets and Lithuanians) – not to mention the Traco-Illyrians – concern us more than even the most interesting tribes from America, Australia or I don’t know what little island lost on the Pacific Ocean? I have the impression that we err on wrong paths. And the fault is of course not ours – if there is a stray –, it belongs to our mentors, proving that they fare no better in this respect. But let us leave the question of ‘responsibility,’ which usually remains unanswered with us, and, if you agree with me, simply register the fact and take measures to straighten it. I, for one, would have set you to learn *Lituanian* (you didn’t expect this, did you?) and to compare our folktales with the Lithuanian ones, or our *doinas* with their *dainos* (sing. *daina*), the parallelism with respect to motives, form, and music as well, being most striking. And this would have been enough to fill a human life. Lithuanians are the only

ones, among the Indo-European peoples of today, who saw the Dacians – on their way from India to the Baltic Sea they appear to have lingered about for a while in the Balkans –, their literature, folk art and customs, strangely resembling ours, could, by comparison, help us in reconstructing Getic mythology and in understanding ourselves. Even more, since we are ‘monographists,’ somebody should go on the spot, for this is the strength of our method: fieldwork instead of books. And how many more, besides the Lithuanians and rather than the ‘primitives?’ You see, I have a great fear that, besides being rather few and needy, we loose ourselves in things that, for us, aren’t absolutely necessary, as they are for the Occidental researchers, who can afford to study other people, since they have more or less finished [the work] at home. I don’t want you to misunderstand me. I am not telling you all these thoughts in order to accuse you of anything. But, rather, I share them with a good fellow traveller (*tovarăș de drum*). I tell all this to myself as well and often wonder if I am not erring likewise, even more than anybody else. For it isn’t bad (*nu strică*) to judge oneself from time to time, looking right and left to see where one stands. For us Romanians, the danger of wandering is especially great, since we are too easily attracted by the passing luster of fashion, by conquering *gloria mundi* or I don’t know what other ‘values,’ and we strive, while still in scientific swaddling (*sumețindu-ne încă din fașă științifică*), to get elbow to elbow or even to surpass our poor Western colleagues... (7.VI.1933)”

As for Ion Ioniță, in a letter addressed to Anton Golopenția, he stressed the “doubts” expressed either by some of his colleague students, or, more politely, but also more difficult to bear, by Marcel Mauss, concerning Gustian terminology

and Ionică's systematic use of it: "I passed the two catalogues of the Drăguș [sociological] museum,¹⁰ together with some explanatory pages in French that I added, to professors Fauconnet and Mauss. There was a whole story with a young American lady¹¹ who, seeing them before they were offered to the two professors, asked me, 'candid and full' if such pretty stuff can be published in Romania. (...) More than a week ago, professor Mauss communicated to me his favorable impressions. '*J'ai lu votre chose, je suis tout à fait d'accord avec ce qu'il y est dit. Oui... peut-être certains termes...*' I tried to show him that these terms are part of a whole system, that guides our research. '*Oui, je le sais, mais c'est que précisément il ne s'agit pas de concilier...*' etc. I mention all this to you as a simple curiosity. The conversation continued for a while. I closed it by promising to read some field notes to him. /I am happy to learn that people are working on methodology in Bucharest. There are many things to reconcile. The research will become a lot more fruitful, I believe, in the effort of putting it in writing: the conditions of its scientific formulation will act like a reducing agent upon the diverging opinions of those who are willing to accept it. If it is among these conditions, intuition imposes itself as the normal method of research. Personally, I accept it, to the extent that it expresses – maybe not in the most proper way – the need to get to the inner workings of the reality to be studied. I wonder, however, whether 'objective intuitionism' does not contain a contradiction in terms or an immeasurable difficulty of realization since, if intuition is what Bergson says it is (that species of sympathy etc.), it is still not less true that a science that wants to remain a science has to express itself in the universal language of the concepts. It remains self-understood

still that, in this domain, the fruitfulness of the results one obtains is the sole judge of the ways in which one proceeds (19.IV.1932)."

Bouglé's "Préface" to the volume *Les convergences des sciences sociales et l'Esprit international*, edited by the *Centre d'Etudes de Politique Etrangère* in 1938, can help understand the way in which the difference in vision between the Romanian and the French Schools was expressed in those years. Speaking of some recent lectures given by D. Gusti at the International Conference of Social Sciences organized in Paris with the occasion of the International Exhibition, Bouglé affirmed that "social sciences still need to overcome the national phase" and to establish universal methods (12), citing Descartes who declared he wrote even for the Turks, or Pascal who mentioned that a scientist might have a homeland, but a science never did. To Bouglé, sociology as practiced "in Central Europe" was exaggeratedly political and national. Gusti's insistence on the monographic research of Romanian villages, he thought, stemmed out of the ideological "conviction that rural population, with its conservation of precious customs and practices, was the main moral and material force of Romania (13)." In his answer to Bouglé, A. Golopenția (1938b) stressed the fact that while extremely important, the methodological and theoretical instruments developed by social sciences were far from representing their only and essential purpose. He wrote: "The purpose of social sciences is to clarify the situation of the social units that raise problems, a village or all the villages, or a whole country, to make the possible predictions about their future evolution, and to propose the measures to be taken in their case. This fact has been brilliantly emphasized by the great French founders of sociology: Saint-Simon

and Comte, who insisted that the sociologists' research aims at helping the social engineer to reorganize social reality in the best possible way. Professor Bouglé's opinion on the activity of the Romanian School of sociology does not take into account the correlation between the activity of elaborating methods and constataions and the activity of applying them for the understanding of certain parts of the social reality. The Romanian School of sociology does not find itself in the phase of developing methods: it did so, long before 1925, when the monographic research was started. The village investigations are not, for this School, 'the real center of sociology,' but the application of a method, that the passing years have confirmed, to the special circumstances of Romania. This method (...) stems from the decision to clarify social reality by means of the immediate and simultaneous study of all its facets (...). It has no relation whatsoever with the Romanian villages [that were attesting traditionally conservative as well as urbanizing trends at the time] and corresponds to the attitude one could have with respect to any social unit: a region, cities, countries, groups of countries or the humanity as a whole. The fact that the Romanian School of sociology has applied this method during a whole decade mostly to [the study of] villages is the consequence of Romania's social structure, which is rural to a large extent, and of the Romanian administration's needs, which point toward clarifying the situation of the villages and indicating what could be done for them. In France, the Gusti School would have probably been preoccupied mostly with the cities and would have studied those and their workers on the spot, taking into consideration all their aspects (86-87)."

A musicologist by formation, trained by Constantin Brăiloiu, together with whom

he had participated in several "monographic" campaigns, Harry Brauner's letters articulate in a most detailed and epical manner the differences between the Romanian and the French ethnomusicological research. In fact, Brauner's letter of 3.IV.1933 contains a number of "sketches" that are precious for their vivid and humorous details. These narratives, written on the spot, concern three main topics:

1. the division into or affiliation between disciplines such as folklore, anthropology, ethnology and musicology;
2. the conditions under which a musical corpus could be considered relevant; and
3. the conception of the ethnographic film in the two countries.

Meeting Schaeffner, who would later on become one of the French specialists who were instrumental in making widely known Constantin Brăiloiu's revolutionary work in ethnomusicology, Harry Brauner was at first shocked to discover not only that folklore was a four-letter word for the musicologists at Trocadéro,¹² but also that their extensive research lacked the rigor to which he had been accustomed in Gusti's "monographic" teams, where he had worked, as mentioned, under the exceptional guidance of Constantin Brăiloiu: "Since I busy myself with collecting Romanian popular songs, I thought I should see what they do here, for with them being occidentals and us orientals, I'll have plenty to learn. So I got in touch with Dr. Rivet, a great anthropologist whom you surely know better than the undersigned. He received me most warmly and put me in contact with a Mr. Schaeffner, Director of the musicological research at the Trocadéro museum. By mistake, I mentioned to him¹³ I was a folklorist. I say by mistake, because I instantly saw him smile ironically, while measuring me with compassion from head

to toe: 'Well, sir, you'll not benefit much if you are a *folklorist* (the last word was uttered with utmost emphasis and very subversively), here we do ethnography and you have to admit that, in the end, ethnography is anthropology. So that, in fact, all our studies, including the musical ones, are pursued on an anthropological basis.' I tell to myself: 'Good for you, Harry Brauner, you hit the jackpot and will learn a lot indeed.' So, I ask him to make the effort and explain to me what they do, while promising that I'll do whatever I can to understand it. He started as follows: 'Here, in this hall (it was a three by two meters hall) we have the *discothèque* (the word was pronounced proudly and forcibly). In these archives of songs we have melodies from all over the world.' (As for me, seeing that the archives contained about as much as what we collect in a single village during a campaign, I dared to ask whether they also had melodies from Romania.) 'How not? Look!' And he opened a little drawer that contained five records sung, by who would you think? By master Mihail Vulpescu, the famous and immortal. Then I took heart and, shy as I was, I started to ask: 'Well, my dear sir, I am very moved by the anthropology that you practice even with respect to music, but what about the songs of Mr. Vulpescu, or rather, which are the conclusions you draw from this material? Personally, for in this (that is, in Romanian music) I have some knowledge, I dare ask you to give me some indications as to how you collect this music, or rather what method you are using on the field for, be it ethnography or anthropology or whatever you call it, I still don't understand a bit what you're doing, or rather I am afraid I begin to see.' The young man, seeing that I ask such questions, started to retreat, telling me, ashamed, that he had taken Vulpescu's

songs because the occasion to do so presented itself and that, indeed, they had no relevance, that he could see by himself that they cannot be used, but that what they do in their colonies is indeed apocalyptic. As a curious and scientific (with the accent on the last *i*) man, I asked him to enlighten me in this respect as well. And he told me that, right now, they have a formidable expedition in Mexico, where they hope to collect a remarkable material. When I asked him who is studying music, he answered, quite embarrassed: 'You see, this is a difficult thing, I asked the engineer of the expedition to also collect the songs there.' When I heard this declaration as well, I got some courage and I started to tell him about our campaigns and how we work, that the engineer, the musicologist, the anthropologist, and the coordinator are apart and that, in our way of doing research, we concentrate on just one village. I showed him, excusing myself, that, although I am only a 'folklorist,' with us, when we go on the field, music is collected according to specific criteria and methods. I was pleasantly surprised to see that, while he had been on the offensive before, he was now retreating and ended by confessing to me: 'I understand very well what you are saying, what you do is magnificent, *if indeed you succeed to do so*, what we lack is a musicologist that would occupy himself only with music and, after all, what we do is but a sort of propaganda. As you see, Anton dear, in the end, by putting to use the monographic method of investigation, I managed to realize what the ethnography and anthropology of the great Trocadéro consist of: propaganda.' I can't describe to you the joy I felt when I thought that, quietly, without a lot of noise and with far less money than they have, we are centuries ahead. Really! I don't exaggerate at all, this is my firm belief [3.IV.1933]."

To understand Harry Brauner's reaction, we have to take into account a number of factors. First, the fact that because of the opposition Eastern/Western Europe, combined with the reality of relaxed, and therefore semiconscious francophilia, the expectations of a Romanian scholar coming to study in France tended to be rather great, while those of a French (or foreign) specialist meeting him (who couldn't be imagined not to be a francophile) tended to be, on the contrary very low. The Romanian specialist would tend to overvalue and the French or foreign one to undervalue the other's preparation. If we combine this fact with a difference in attitude with respect to folklore between the Romanian and French musicologists, we can understand why the dialogue between Brauner and Schaeffner did not start in the best possible way. Like in Romania, folklore was an important discipline, well represented in the sociologist French movement. It so happened, however, that the French ethnomusicologists viewed it as an obsolete specialty, although the President of the Folklore Society, Maunier was a distinguished ethnographer, folklorist and sociologist.

While sociology was quite dynamic in France at the time, its achievements went in a direction quite different from the one adopted in Romania. French sociologists were preoccupied by the philosophical relevance of sociology. To establish it, they appealed to the huge corpus accumulated throughout the French colonial empire and beyond. This extensive approach was, however, unfortunately associated with the fact that French sociologists (who were using data accumulated by ethnologists) and, at times, even the ethnologists did not always know the languages of the innumerable social groups they were examining. What is more, every researcher studied a well-defined problem in a particular

society and there were rarely cases in which a number of researchers approached the same social group from different points of view at the same time. This led to unavoidable discontinuity and fragmentation. In contradistinction to their French homologues, Romanian sociologists started by studying the same social unit (villages at first, counties later on, and even whole regions) in their own country, with extended field teams in which trained dialectologists made sure that the material was phonetically transcribed and fully understood in all its finest shades of meaning.

One can understand therefore Brauner's reaction, formulated in the youthfully excessive tone that characterized him, when he saw the relativistic, nonchalant way in which popular Cambodian music was selectively and "artistically" sung on a stage, rather than scientifically described or cited by the researcher, and even, most adventurously, compared with Romanian popular music: "This man [Schaeffner], who is a musicological personality in France, became a good friend, so that I see him often, for I go all the time at Trocadéro to listen, being convinced that I will benefit most from listening to their records. He took me to the lecture of a Ms. Lavergne, to whom I had myself a recommendation from home, and of whom he spoke with great respect. It was a lecture with illustrations on Cambodian music, that had been organized by *Musée Guimet* and had therefore an official character. The lady on the stage tried to convince the honorable public that, in fact, exotic music can't be analyzed until one comes to like it, to feel it, and so she proceeded to make us feel it so as to understand it. She put some rather interesting records but didn't let any of them go till the end, for princess Kura-go had told her that that song sounded better in this way and, as soon as saying so, she

would start singing in Cambodian (better than the recorded singers) and beating some pans. I couldn't hold my laughter, but the French in the hall fell into a hysterical trance and applauded till they could clap no more. *Hochwissenschaftlich, wissen Sie, mein Herr...*¹⁴ And at some point, with no remorse, the lady made a revolutionary declaration: in general, Cambodian songs resemble Romanian *doina*-s¹⁵ (I jumped from my chair, ears pricked up, and waited in suspense for the explanation). As a supreme argument, the lady cleared her throat, beat in the pan a bit, started a Cambodian melody, after which, smiling, she sang a *doină* (probably learned from Vulpescu or God knows who). People, enthusiastic, went on and on applauding, the lady smiled most modestly, blowing kisses, while poor puzzled me waited for her to tell why they resemble each other. To no avail whatsoever, nope sir, for the lecture was finished. I quickly went to her, introduced myself, and when she heard that I was Romanian and that I even studied music, she suddenly got ill at ease. Probably a Cambodian would have experienced the same embarrassing moment [I did]. I soothed the lady by convincing her that what she had said was 'curious' indeed and, therefore, most interesting. Yes, mister Antonică, and I got the courage to 'get my teeth' into occidental intelligentsia [3.IV.1933]."

In his slightly truculent way, Harry Brauner who, by the way, was the brother of painter Victor Brauner, gives us a vivid sketch of another aspect of Romanian sociology that was quite developed with respect to what was being done in France at the time, namely the *sociological film*. Dimitrie Gusti, as I was saying above, had been deeply preoccupied with the ways in which the results of the "monographic" campaigns could not only be

used by specialists in sociology in order to develop the theory and methods of their discipline, but also best communicated to the general public. Among the new means to do so, the Gustian sociologists used aerial photographs (that allowed a historian-and-sociologist like H.H. Stahl to "see" the ownership of the land and therefore the spatial projection of the family structure in the villages he studied), sociological exhibitions, sociological archives and libraries and, most important, sociological films. There were three films that were made in order to transmit the gist of what had been discovered by the "monographic" teams. They were called, after the name of the village and the campaign it had occasioned, Drăguș, Cornova and Nerej respectively. With such a background, it is no surprise that Harry Brauner was deeply disappointed to learn that the French anthropological films of the time had waltzes and composers' music on their sound track while, at the same time, realizing that his professional reaction could easily pass in turn for propaganda: "Let me tell you another story. I was again invited to a highly scientific meeting where they presented a documentary film recently made in Guinea, with lots of money, by a French expedition. The meeting started with a presentation of the two explorers by Dr. Rivet, who proudly, but really proudly, said that they had managed to put together an ethnographer and a geographer and, as a result, the expedition appeared to be most serious. And he passed the word to the geographer who delivered a sort of entertaining and funny lecture (if I may say so). The ethnographer was tricksier, he put on his head all kinds of hats and leaves to demonstrate how things went with the redskins... All this, before the film. And finally came the presentation of the film, that I was by now eagerly looking for. I will speak only from

my point of view, it was called sound film, so I thought to myself there was no way for it to be uninteresting. I swear to you they had doubled the film with *waltzes*, whenever you saw water and black men, and with some Wagner at the more impressive moments. And, in fact, whenever the chiefs of the expedition were shaking hands with the chief of the tribe, a noblest best composed march was not missing. What had they done? They brought the film in a Paris Studio and asked a composer to write the music for it. So, that was the *documentary film*. I had a discussion in which I told them that, with us, documentary films involve not only geographers and ethnographers and that music, when the film has no sound track, is restored exactly with the help of phonograms¹⁶ (as we did with the Drăguș film when it was presented at the National [Theater in Bucharest]). They liked what I said a lot, I believe though that they began to think the Romanian state sent me here for propaganda and, truth to tell, I never praised our little country so much, neither was I so proud of it as I was on that occasion. Now, for the first time, I seriously realize what monographic research (*monografia*) means and I am convinced that, even were I in Germany, I would get to the same conclusion [3.IV.1933].”

Brauner’s conclusion, which clearly surprised him, was that from the point of view of field research, the Romanian multidisciplinary teams led by D. Gusti were much more advanced than what was being done in France at the time. So, while trying to learn more about the wide range of ethnomusicological research in French colonies or the manner in which the Trocadéro library had been organized, Brauner decided to go back to Romania for other monographic campaigns rather than to India, as it had been proposed to

him by his French mentors: “I am now working here so that I can say that time goes by unnoticed. And day by day I realize that, as I wrote you already, our monograph[ic research] is more than all that I have seen here, with the risk of appearing to lack modesty, [I can really say] that the way we work in the domain of music in our monographs can’t be even conceived here. The last big piece of news I will communicate to you is that I was proposed to go to India to organize a methodical collection of songs. I don’t know, I am rather too fond of our ‘monographs’ to be able to do so. And the project would have lasted several years so that, if I had accepted, it would have meant a total life change. I told you that I met a huge number of people so that I became a man ‘with relations.’ Right now, I am racking my brains to understand the way in which the Trocadéro library is organized, for they have adopted a new American method which seems to be quite interesting (before, they had used the decimal system) (2.V.[1933]).”

Final remarks

Francophilia varies in time and always reaches only some among the “elite” social groups in a country according to spatial and social trends that have to be carefully examined.

With the development of modern Romanian culture, it tends to be gradually limited (to only some of the possible options), relative (embracing openly critical forms and marking a simple openness with respect to French culture rather than the yielding to a “superior” culture that it had represented during the 19th century), and relaxed.

The possibilities offered by French sociology to the four young sociologists

whose reactions we have examined were appreciated as well as professionally problematized in the context of a relaxed francophilia that combined at times with the oppositions Eastern/Western or developing/fully developed culture. While French *sociologisme*, still mostly fed by the ethnology of primitive peoples, could open up new general perspectives, which Cristescu, Bernea and Ionică embraced with varying degrees of interest, Amzăr's reminder struck a chord that each of them deeply heard. There was a risk of deviating from their principle tasks in adopting problems and a type of theoretical stand that were irrelevant to Romanian culture. Later on, in fact, Bernea and even Amzăr would abandon the Gustian School for reasons that had to do with a hierarchical view East/West. Cristescu combined from the very beginning the

interest for whatever element of theoretical ethnology she could use in her systematic study of Romanian household rituals and magic incantations and the conviction that the real work would have to be carried in her country and according to distinct parameters. As for Brauner, he fully realized the importance of the Romanian School of sociology only when coming to see the style of work of the French musicologists at the Trocadéro Museum and became a real convert of the method only after his Parisian stage.

Cristescu and Brauner were offered to apply the Romanian "monographic" method in somewhat "exotic" settings (New Caledonia for Cristescu and India for Brauner). They chose to continue the research they had started and, in the case of the first, a line of research that was already clearly defined.

Notes

1. The book contained pieces written beginning with 1920.
2. Gusti's Institute had resumed its former name after the Social Service was suspended in 1939.
3. This was the case of Max Beier (Germany) – and Philip Mosely (USA).
4. In criticizing introspective psychology with its metaphysical "phantoms," Durkheim was continuing Auguste Comte's line of thought.
5. R. Maunier had been the student, not only of Durkheim, but also of Tarde and Worms. His work in general sociology as well as that in colonial sociology were widely appreciated in Romania, the last because of its applicability to the problems of Romanian Europeanization and urbanization. On the occasion of Maunier's visit to Romania, A. Golopenția (1938a) wrote: "Professor Maunier's colonial sociology is particularly interesting for us. His analysis of clash and fusion processes between the civilization of the white rulers and that of the indigenous peoples contains numerous indications and suggestions that are valid for the study of our accelerated Europeanization during the 19th century and for clarifying the process of urbanization in our villages, in other words, for understanding the contact between the traditional culture of the villages and the by now European civilization of the cities (524)."
6. Cristescu had listened with great interest to his lecture on the "Characteristics of the Caucasian languages" (on Thursday, February 22 [1934]).
7. Bernea is here citing a passage from A. Golopenția's previous letter.
8. Ernest Bernea.
9. Ion Ionică.
10. This sociological "museum" had been presented at the University of Bucharest as well as in Barcelona. It consisted of field notes, statistics, archival items, photographs of people, places and activities, musical and spoken records, as well as artifacts by the Drăguș women and men. The material had been organized according to Gusti's methodological scheme for the articulation of collected data into an exhaustive monograph.

11. Who was studying in France, like Ionică did.
12. Soon to become *Musée de l'Homme*, under the leadership of Rivet.
13. Harry Brauner refers to Dr. Schaeffner.
14. German for "Highly scientific, you see, sir..."
15. *Doina*-s are Romanian lyrical songs characterized by a restricted number of specific tunes.
16. Phonograph records.

References

- Bouglé, C. (1938). *Bilan de la sociologie française contemporaine*. Paris: Félix Alcan.
- Brockliss, Laurence and Eastwood, David (eds). (1997). *A Union of multiple identities. The British Isles, c. 1750 – c. 1850*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Costea, Ștefan (ed). (2001). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie*. București: Editura Expert, Academia Română, Institutul de Sociologie.
- Dutton, David. (2004). A Francophile. În Richard Mayne, Douglas Johnson și Robert Tombs (eds). *Cross Channel Currents. 100 Years of the Entente Cordiale* (pp. 136-138). Londra și New York: Routledge.
- Eagles, Robin. (2000). *Francophilia in English Society, 1748–1815*. Houndsmills și Londra: Macmillan Press Ltd., și New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Golopenția, Anton. (2002a). Profesorul René Maunier. *Sociologie Românească*, III (1938a), 1-3, 93; retipărit în A. Golopenția. *Opere complete*, vol. I, *Sociologie* (pp. 524-525). București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Golopenția, Anton. (2002b) „Naționalismul” sociologiei românești și „empirismul” ei. *Sociologie Românească*, III (1938b), 10-12, 600-602; retipărit în A. Golopenția. *Opere complete*, vol. I, *Sociologie* (pp. 85-88). București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Golopenția, Sanda. (2001). Cristescu Golopenția, Ștefania. În Șt. Costea (ed.). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie* (pp. 138-141). București: Editura Expert.
- Gusti, Dimitrie. (1946). *Sociologia Militans. Cunoaștere și acțiune în serviciul națiunii*, vol. I, *Cunoaștere*; vol. II, *Acțiune*. București: Institutul de Științe Sociale al României.
- Larionescu, Maria. (2001). Gusti, Dimitrie. În Șt. Costea (ed.). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie* (pp. 221-230). București: Editura Expert.
- Stănculescu, Irina. (2001). Brauner, Harry. În Șt. Costea (ed.). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie* (pp. 68-69). București: Editura Expert.
- Tănăsescu, Florian and Costea, Dumitru Dan. (2001). Bernea, Ernest. În Șt. Costea (ed.). *Sociologi români. Mică enciclopedie* (pp. 56-58). București: Editura Expert.
- *** (1938). *Les convergences des sciences sociales et l'Esprit international*. Paris: Centre d'Études de Politique Étrangère, Hartmann.

Abstract

The text is a social documents based analysis regarding a certain encounter between the interwar French sociology and the Romanian one. In the 1930s, when a few young Gustian sociologists went studying abroad in Paris, an opportunity seemed to appear for a new contact between the two strong sociological perspectives...

Primit la redacție: ianuarie 2005