

Where is History Going? Europe and the New World

The phenomenology of the intercultural dialogue at the dawn of modernity

by **Professor Ilie Bădescu,**

Faculty of Sociology and Social Work,

University of Bucharest, Romania

**

The idea of this study is that different historical epochs reveal us predominant cultural themes that Thomas and Znaniecki used to call social schemes. If we ignore such social schemes, they said, the culture itself becomes incomprehensible. These predominant themes are the main items characterizing a cultural paradigm. These cultural themes come often to contending each other. Such famous paradigm which proved working out to shape our social behaviors are memorized and preserved by and through famous cultural vehicles called landmark-books of humanity.

**

The master-books and the dawn of the modern Europe

It is a basic assumption of the modern world the idea that individuals, human groups, peoples and cultures take part to information and communication, to the dialogue as a channel of informing others and of getting information of them, as the only way of promoting our own identity. We inform others and wait for them to inform us. But who are this “we-group”, who get together in a special “locus”, a community of encounters, a community of narrations, which is like an ideal narrator, a mirror of us all, that is, a pure idea against of which we our self being but imperfect copies. Like in the well-known Plato’s story-myth of the cave’s walls on which we are but the reflected shadows of the pure ideas, and those shadows are the only reality man has access to. In the light of Platonic teaching, therefore, the dialogue and story-telling are the pillars of a society. The only problem is to know if there is such an ideal locus where we are put together even before we meet actually each other, so that we can be assured that our meeting is a real one, that we really encounter each other. Such an ideal locus where

we get together before actually encountering one another appears us to be just the master-books of humanity in front with the Book of all books, the “Holly book”. In such books is accumulated the teachings full of wisdom for the city. Such books are a sort of the “ideal locus” where is located an ideal narrator who gets the spiritual teachings to be put in the service of governing. None of an esoteric group can produce for us such spiritual teachings we have access to due to those master-books of humanity. We can use them as the spiritual frames of our own behavior in lack of which we fail to keep up order in our own life. Such spiritual frames make it possible for anybody to act like an agent of the spiritual order in the world. By using them we are enforced to make rational our own society, to rationalize it, to make it intelligible, ideal, “freed from the variability of sensitive images”. They play the role of an ideal “locus” which makes it possible that the “narrative acts” we are involved in on a certain subject matter not to collide with each other. The modern man thinks that the prototype of this narrative community, postulated by Plato as a basis of human knowledge, is the community of scientists whence the pattern of the reflected object is taken out. “Have the astronomers, for example, got to an identity of their concept of the sun; is the sun, or the moon, identical to all astronomers? As a postulate, yes, as the moment an astronomer narrates about what the sun is, the other astronomer interferes and from putting together their narratives there comes the definition of the unchanged sun, identical with itself. If there are differences, one could only hope that, dialectics, through continuous conversation, one will get to a clarification of the concept. This also applies to everything there is, to the whole world, and to any particular body” (Tr. Brăileanu). Thus the condition of knowledge is not a purely logical one, but also a socio-logical one and this consists in the possibility of human groups’ manifestation as the narrative community, the community of dialogue and narration which produces the “words” and “concepts” that the world appropriates, thus becoming communicable. We get information, acquire an image, that is we have a visible image of things and of our self because we mirror one through the other and, on the same time, we all find a mirror in the narrator, so that the story is always the same, but “allays retold by an eternal mouth”, as the poet puts it. And the prototypical narrator, the deathlessness’ one, is a narrative community of a continuous narration, and its ideal place is entailed by just the *master-books* of the humanity and their live memory, the occasion of their memorizing evocation is the symposium as Plato called it. These

books are the ideal locus of the narrator and of a given rationalized type of society. A book like that is L. B. Alberti's book, "Trattato dell' governo della famiglia", a book focused on the sacred spirit of order within the small and large communities, like families and nations themselves. In my present paper I made a brief examination of this book in linkage with some other books throughout the Mediterranean and south-eastern European areas, revealing by such a research an European spiritual series at the dawn of modernity, a series which laid the foundation of the modern Europe. Those books, put together, make up the ideal locus of European narrative community, i.e. the spiritual frame of what we may call the European mind at the dawn of modern era, which is also the ideal narrator of our own story as European people. Within this narrative community we can encounter three master-books, or crucial books: L. B. Alberti's book aforementioned, David Ricardo's book, a sort of book on the international governance, and Ion Heliade Rădulescu's book, "Holly City", on the city's governance, on how to governing a city.

The inner Europe

On November 9th 1793 the elites of the French Revolution were rededicating the Notre Dame cathedral to the goddess of Reason. There were the embryos of a new Europe, containing explicit and strange inspirations to reject the "revealed religion", reorienting all questions towards human reason, as towards the unique, and therefore, the ultimate authority and source of answer. In its doctrinal form, this new orientation was synthetically explained in one of Kant's *famous books* "Idea of Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View", translated by W. Hostie¹. In the light of interpreting/*translating* the world on the screen of an Europe like that, and, therefore, of a world like that, history is a "rational process", because "reason is the one providing the plan and purpose of history" ("the history of the human race, seen in its entirety, can be considered the achievement of one of nature's hidden plans, aimed at implementing a political structure, innerly perfect, and precisely because of that, outerly perfect, under the form of an unique statal form, in which all the capacities implanted by it in

¹ Reedited in Paul Gardiner, ed., "Theories of History", Glencoe, III: Free Press, 1959.

humans can fully develop”²). This “inner” Europe was for the first time shadowed during the great Romantic era, by another model of Europe, having another destinal (of destiny) or *spiritual rhythm*. Together with these “subjective” Europes of the 18th and 19th centuries, a third Europe came along at the dawn of the same epoch, which the intellectual groups ignored, but which later on was transposed in a first project and in a first movement of universalization by the American agent. We can conventionally call that *inner Europe*, whose *model* triumphed in America, “*the Florentine Europe*”, as it has its first forms and formations deposited as testimonies and models in the works of great Florentines, among whom we have studied in the present paper, Leon Battista Alberti. His work is a spiritual document wherefrom we obtain information on a “model” of world.

In the light of this model, the world is the *product of the spirit*, rather than the *product of economic, or political or military forces*. The expression of the *spiritual power* in the process of modeling the world is that of *ethnomethods*, or, to use a somehow more common term, *ethnoparadigms*. The world is spiritually building through the contribution of ethnomethods, or ethnoparadigms, and through them, it moves into a dimension of ethno spiritual or ethno historical competitions, in which it is not the people, nor the social classes that confront themselves, but the *ethnomethods*, that is, the *ways of spiritually organizing the world*. Therefore, the ethnomethods are “ways of spiritually organizing the world”, in and through which the providential work of God (his care for the world, God’s grace) reaches the world. This providential work is communicated to the world through charismatic persons, saints, heroes, geniuses, great reformers, etc., and through their works where one can find the ethnomethods summarized under the form of models, typologies, protocategories, prototypes, protoorientations, archetypes, etc. These exceptional “works” are, thus, spiritual protoorganizations, nuclei of the “spiritual organization (structure) of existence” (and they take various forms, from rites and habits to maxims, rules of life, teachings, works of art – literary, philosophical, ethical, plastic, theatric, theological, scientific, etc. - institutional formulas, practical guides, etc.). They contain the “spiritual survey”[refer at spiritual] of the world, and thus acquire, along other qualities, that of “spiritual documents” regarding the status of the

² Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 30, apud J. W. Montgomery, “Where is History Going?”, Zondervan Publishing House, 1969, p. 13.

world and the course of history. *Ethnomethodology* tells us that reality is, essentially, the outcome of our *interpretation*, as it is always constructed and reconstructed (the essence of deconstructivism). Noology specifies that before our interpretations there are our “inner (spiritual) experiences”. The *innerly experienced* world becomes (due to the inner experiences) an organized world, so that we can say that the *patterns of inner experience* pass onto the world as *patterns of spiritually organizing daily life*. This is the operational meaning of ethnomethods. Therefore, they are at the same time *preorientations*: patterns of spiritually orienting daily life. The noologic study of the world begins, thus, with the inventory of ethnomethods, and ends with emphasizing their architecture, that is, their degree of latency and actuality, respectively, of their efficiency at a certain moment. Compared to ethnomethods, all the other products of the spirit, especially the “scientific theories”, are secondary, that is, they can be used only as angles of *reading* the ethnomethods, and in no way as “primary descriptions” of world’s status. The primary description can be found in the ethnomethods, that is, the draft/design of a possible world, read through the hypothesis of the ethnomethod at its foundation, where the prophecy of a certain kind of world is also comprehended. Several ethnomethods have continuously confronted each other on the stage of Europe. Currently, we witness the competition of two *ethnomethods* having European roots: *the Florentine ethnomethod*, and the other, let us conventionally call it *illuminist*, having its roots in the Franco-German spirituality of the enlightenment age.

The Florentine ethnomethod appears fully triumphant in the model of the American Peace and in its spreading worldwide. We notice, therefore, that the study of a particular culture, of a particular cultural epoch, can offer the access key to the understanding of universal history. The study of this type of culture, having its roots in Renascent Florence seems to offer the key for understanding present tensions among actors who compete to impose the *project* of tomorrow’s world, a project of universal history. This is due more than we can imagine to the Florentine model and the first step we will take refers to its description in the framework of its competition with two other models that have competed for the role of “models” of spiritually organizing the world: the Manchesterian model, and the one related to the alliance between Charles V with the Fugger Brothers’ Bank. The study of the Florentine culture is, therefore, crucial for understanding this moment of world history, and for searching

a way of access to the visionarism of the “new world”. The Florentine model was transmitted throughout history by agents like B. Franklin, and the present small or great cordial polemics among the present presidents of the three states – France, Germany, and America – are nothing else but the expression of this background competition of the two ethnomethods which dispute their primacy/primary character/ in the spiritual organization of the world.

“In this process, [of spiritual organization of the world], Hegel underlines, the hour of every nation chimes only one time, a moment in which it serves as a vehicle for the rational spirit of the world, and thus brings its specific contribution to the history of humanity”³.

History is, in the Hegelian view, Oriental, Greek, Roman, Germanic in turns. For a sociologist, Hegel’s “solution” is “speculative”, lacking any “descent” into the real, everything being fulfilled/solved by the simple ongoing/unfolding of the “objective spirit”. The fact that this objective spirit “chooses” in turns a different cloth, first of all Oriental, then Greek, Roman, and, in the end, Germanic, claims for explanations that Hegel does not offer. And then, he does not understand the reason for which the objective spirit decided to keep, in aeternum, the Germanic cloth. It is true that Hegel refers this entire dynamism to the role played by the “great people”, those who make the decisions in the crucial moments, but why they appear and disappear in a certain time and in a certain place, remains an obscure issue. Hegel tries to save his vision by appealing to a unique method, a sort of “reason” that self-generates itself, like Aphrodite from Zeus’s head. This self-generation is called by Hegel “dialectical” and it consists of the universal tendency that the idea has while unfolding throughout all dimensions of reality (from the biological to the historical one) to manifest itself as a thesis that produces its *antithesis*, and from this fight synthesis is born, which, becoming thesis, produces a new antithesis, and so on.

Applying it to France, for example, “the absolutist and authoritarian monarchy of the former regime can be considered the *thesis* relative to which the imminent anarchy and the liberalism of the revolutionary period appear as antithesis; the outcome of these two extremes is a *republican* form of government, which adopted certain elements from both extremes”⁴. This manner of seeing things is, as it has been said, a legitimist one, as it offers the justification

³ Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 14-15.

of *evil* in history, as it is related to the fatal (necessary) unfolding of the *idea*. From this point to the legitimacy of the two great pagan invasions in the history of Europe – Nazism and communism – there is only one step, and it was made by Marx, for communism, by Lenin, for Bolshevism, etc. The only super-historical justification of “accepting” evil would be the promise of an ultimate liberty, so that everything is assimilated to an incontinent soteriological preaching, which advises people to accept evil in the name of the freedom that “will come”.

This reversed theology was perfectly successful in Marx’s doctrine of the “class extermination” and in Lenin’s theory of the “state” that had the right to kill (“the proletariat’s dictatorship”), to throw anybody “different” from an ideological point of view (in terms of idea and orientation) in concentration camps and in prisons. We realize that history cannot be like this (or not just like this), so that we have to find another *plan* of manifestation that would enable our access to the (moral) *sense of the movement of history*, to a *sense of history*. This “plan of manifestation” prevents us from any reductionist attempt at assimilating the “comprehending reason” to a historical agent such as the *state* (be it even the democratic state), to any type of historical agent (race, class, elite, etc.). *The comprehending reason, as it is not reducible to any human agent whatsoever, becomes manifest only in and through the groups of people that are dia-logging.* Those who dialogue are those who *gather* in the same meaning (conventus), and the force that keeps them together is the Word itself, the en-humanized Word, the Logos become man, through which the being itself was renewed. The Word is the very “rationality” (the logos) of – their - existence together, a logos that works in and through them, in a mysterious way, through gifts. Any “reality” is, therefore, an “encounter” between the two dimensions: the dimension of the *working gifts* and the dimension of the *community* of those who “gather”, who are together in the same “meaning” (word), as those who share it and confess it at the same time.

Any time the gifted ones succeed in using these gifts (or graces) together, they will form a *charismatic working solidarity (born in and through the gifted manifestations)* in space and in time, which allows us to say that they have found *their way* to “rationalize” the world. Therefore, we call it *ethnomethod*, or *ethnoparadigm*, because it is instituted in and through the community of the charismatics/engraced, of the gifted. Or, it is obvious that, as charismas do not derive from anything real/actual, moreover, they are, compared to everything that is

something/actually given, simple latencies (energies that can be actualized), it means that their arriving into the real is mysterious, and that the only institution that has the right to ritualize the mysteries (in all their range) is the one that received this kind of teaching either indirectly (prophetic revelation), or directly (supernatural revelation), that is, from God the Son, and further on in collaboration with the “saints” who are the “charismatics” of the mysteries (including miracle makers), that is, they are the channels for the Spirit, and, therefore, **Vessels** of the sacred. However, these charismatic people are not isolated, but they are always “encountered” and “confessors”, “living-together”, *communities* constituted in the process of “administering”/making use of the gifts. This is why their spiritual organizations acquire a paradigmatic value, they radiate, and they are adopted as “spiritual methods” of ordering individual and collective life (ethnomethods). The “actualizations” are spontaneous and thus, the actualized “item” turns towards its source, as if wanting to re-cognize its “model”, its source, its *cause*, and what follows is a process of “unilateral resembling”, that is, of continuously relating the “item” to its ideational source and model, a process by which the respective “item” is also “becoming perfect”, that is, it fulfills through itself the *very model*. It is in this resembling (search for the model) that the “hypostases” of that which *resembles* is born, its subsistent gradations, without the “model” becoming “degraded”, or lost (diminished).

If the one who has its source, and therefore its resemblance in a model ceases to search for it, to reflect in it, his manifestations will be marked by precariousness, by unfulfillment, which leads to the abortion of the hypostases, of the secondary “actualizations”, as is the case with the incapacity of the woman to become a mother in her soul, to feel and to behave as a mother after the child is born. It makes her “frigid” towards the creature she has brought into the world (given life to), as it happens, for example, to mothers who abandon their children, or who actually have an abortion. Although she is biologically a mother, as far as her soul and her spirit are concerned, she is “far” from the hypostasis of “maternity”, which throws her being into precariousness. We deal with a “spiritual deficit”, with a tragic unfulfillment, due to the lack of “assuming the model”, to the refusal of the “resembling”. The world is the fruit of multiple resembling, but also the locus of “non-resembling”, more precisely, of the refusal to

resemble, especially the most severe of the refusals, that of resembling God, which is the refusal of the image itself.

This refusal affects continuity, the transmission of the “meaning” from one generation to the other (the dimension of the individual and collective “origin”), and the solidarity (the horizontal dimension of the individual and collective “affiliation”) of societies. The issue becomes intelligible as soon as we study the phenomenon of eponymy, of the common ascendance, by which different “biological individualities” acquire unity. The common ascendance makes possible for diversity to acquire unity without losing the characteristic of differentiation.

Ascendance takes symbolical forms, as in the case of the founding father, often embodied by an ideal fictitious character. Memories, an entire real-symbolical imagery, deep feelings, etc. are articulated around this fictitious or real person, but very distanced in time, and all this narratology, this entire saga is mediating the transmutation of the biological diversity of individuals having a common origin, into a spiritual union, a unity of communion among the living, and among the living and the dead. The cult of the dead, of the saints, and of the heroes also has this function for great collectivities such as peoples. It is not by accident that the term of people is kept in a close synonymy with that of “kin”. Without transmuting the biological origin into a spiritual one, the social group, as a social and spiritual reality, therefore, as existence in time and beyond time, would be an *impossibility*. It can propagate its being in time only as “common fictitious ascendance”, that is, only because it claims itself to be from an eponymous hero, it shares a legend, etc., that is, it uses the same noological referent, the same spiritual frame.

What is different in the dimension of biological, psychological individuations becomes unitary as “collective individual”, to use the term of Radcliffe-Brown (1935), due to the phenomenon of the origin from common fathers, real or symbolical, from eponymous heroes, of sharing the same symbols, myths, legends, traditions, saints, heroes and martyrs, etc., the same founding religion, the same spiritual frames, like those offered by reading the same master-books. Thus, this common spiritual sharing and ascendance “covers” two realities: the inner organization and the belonging, and, within the scope of individual and collective

manifestations of the self-identification, the appeal to this kind of symbolical ascendance is tantamount with the appeal to an ethnoparadigm or to an ethnomethod.

The relations with the outer world (which is represented by everything that transcends the frontier of belonging given by the sharing the same model with the other people), the temporal relations (the evoked and evoking model “moves” from one individual to another, from one generation to another, it “installs” in their moral being, over adding a sense of duration, solidarity, cohesion, comprehensibility, regulating the right to participate in a possession – goods, territories, etc. – which one can acquire only by “belonging” to a group, the preemption right, etc.), all these are possible, and they exist in and through the mediation of the ideal narrative locus like the one given the “eponymous ancestor” narration⁵.

The concrete moral person

The spiritual frame of eponymy regulates the “manner of affiliating to a group”, which cannot constitute a benefit, which cannot be expressed as such outside this meta-narration. Of course, from the “eponymy” proper to the clan, where it takes the form of the founding father, to the “eponymy” of the village, the passage is done through “idealizations”, and what makes a *sensible reality*, belonging to the soul, from the *abstract ascendance*, is precisely the “tale”, the legend of the “founding hero”, etc. It is due to this “narrative”, to such a saga of the real-symbolical ascendance, that the feeling of belonging, the pride of being who you are, functions and endures. In this case, the founding ancestor “becomes founding hero, eponymous hero”, founder of a “village”, of a “settlement”. A certain family “x” placed in the direct line of that “symbolical filiation” acquires the entire prestige of the “eponymous hero”, and thus becomes “noble family”, a *communitarian reference frame*, a “locus” of example, depositary of the “model”. The mind of the members of the *enlarged community* defends the memory, and sometimes the “glory” of that family more than the endeavor of the family members themselves does so. Due to the eponymy and to its narrations, the village community acquires the quality of *concrete moral person*, and in the absence of this ethnosymbolical “saga”, the

⁵ M. Verdon, Dictionary, 1999, p. 176.

moral reality of the village becomes abstract, “doubtful”, “disputable”. This is the new element that noology brings into Radcliffe-Brown’s theory of the “moral person”. The theory of the “concrete moral person” as an absolutely necessary correlative for the equilibrium and efficiency of the “abstract” moral person is of an exceptional gnoseological and pragmatic importance. When the *abstract* moral person of a group (ensemble of representations and rules regarding the order of the group), in this case, a village, does not pass into the *concrete* moral person of the same group (that is, it does not express itself under the form of certain inner experiences of varied intensities, of feelings, attractions, etc., sometimes passed, as it has been mentioned, on to other families and persons, real or symbolical, known for their exemplarity), when, otherwise said, the “abstract moral person” does not take the *concrete, sensible* form of *inner experiences* that are defining for the culture of belonging, then the common ascendance loses its efficiency, and, together with it the “endurance”, the solidarity, the collective recognitions, are threatened, so that the members’ need to belong to the respective community diminishes towards zero, and this triggers the danger of the young “emigrating”, searching for other spiritual “loci”, which seem more stable, more prestigious, more attractive, etc. In all the processes of individual or collective passage from a frame of common life to another one, as in the case of social mobility, of migration, etc., there is also the risk of the moral person in a collectivity becoming abstract. The ancient ascendance weakens, while a new one has not crystallized yet. The young man getting out of his father’s occupational environment, and passes into a new one, is often accompanied by abandoning the residence environment, he will not only lose the skills related to the father’s occupation, but also forget the sense of belonging, the spiritual forms in and through which the origin, and therefore, the belonging to a group was expressed. He is no longer a member of the village, or a farmer, closely tied to the grandfathers and ancestors of his origin family, but he also does not yet know how to be a man of the town, as he has not yet acquired the customs and patterns of life in the environment he has entered. He no longer is the “villager”, or the “peasant”, but he is not the “proper” inhabitant of a town either, in everything that this means and in all its sensible expressions. His inner experiences have lost their old concrete peasant character, but have not acquired the concrete character of new patterns of living. This is the well known phenomenon of alienation.

A *village* can often face this phenomenon, that is, it can lose attraction for the youth, and, in this case, they lose “interest” in their village, they search for reasons to emigrate to towns, or even to other countries.

The issue is the same for a country in its entirety. It is when the phenomenon of losing one’s country appears, when the emigration to town no longer is an attractive drive, and the “emigration” to another “country” intervenes.

States confront an alarming phenomenon in this case: the loss of youth and, therefore, the diminution of the respective state and country’s “attraction” for the youth. The *abstract moral person* of the state (country), that is, the ensemble of laws, symbols, representations, patterns, etc., in and through which the respective country and state are self-identified, cannot be transmuted into the “concrete moral person”, that is, in the *ensemble of inner experiences* (representations, feelings, symbols, attractions, etc.) that are shared by the majority of the members in the respective collectivity.

Faced with such situations, modern states have reacted by special actions meant to lead to the *re-concretization of the moral person of national belonging*, and the most adequate means for this purpose have been the *history textbooks*, those of *geography*, *ethnography*, and *folklore*, the atlases, dictionaries, and encyclopedias, which are elaborated on the foundation of *literatures and arts*, of the *philosophy*, *ethics*, and *pedagogy systems* (of ethnospirituality, myths, legends, and religiosity of a people, of ethnotourism, etc.). France acted in this manner after the Franco-Prussian wars, when its elites realized that the “moral person” of the state was in great danger. France, humiliated by the “defeat”, risked to become a France lacking attraction for the new generation, without heroic virtues, and, in the end, an un-attractive France. The reaction to this danger was represented by textbooks and manuals. The “Lavisser” textbooks appeared, and they recuperated the model of glorious France. France of the eponymous heroes, of the “people’s heroes” (the French people’s heroes) passed into a textbook and thus the *re-concretization of the abstract moral person* of the French State was achieved. The abstract person of the French State transformed into the concrete moral person of the “Lavisser” textbooks France. The phenomenon was followed by the great intellectual movement of urban and academic France. The schools of human geography, of sociology, of

ethnology, had become the great “enterprises” at the service of this “metanarrative” in and through which the energy of eponymous France, of identitary France was being recuperated.

The same thing happened with Romania during the monarchy. After the 1848 attempts, after I. H. Radulescu’s illusion of the “universal Library”, the eponymous Romania of the founding voievods (Romanian Countries Rulers used to be called so) passes into the textbooks of Spiru Haret’s school reform. The intellectual movement had set the background that made possible the emergence of the new history and geography textbook. Xenopol’s and Hasdeu’s history, Hasdeu’s Etymologicum, Bolintineau’s and Alecsandri’s lyrical legends, Cosbuc’s moral poems, and, later on, the rural liturgical lyrics of Goga and of the *Sămănătorist* (The Sower) movement, made possible the transformation of the Romanian State’s abstract person into the “concrete moral” person of the sensible, spiritual, experiencing Romania. The abstract Romania of the Phanariot period and of the long transition century, remembered as the 1848 epoch (the 19th century) is metamorphosed and becomes the concrete Romania in the history and geography textbooks, in Creanga’s primer, in the 1900-style illustrated book. It is from this “renewed and concrete reality” that emerged those who became Nae Ionescu’s students, and those who later on formed Dimitrie Gusti’s sociological teams, and that miraculous movement of ethnographers and folklorists who, together, form the glory of the interwar period, an epoch of great moral uplifting, due to this endeavor to move the abstract moral person of a more and more “uncertain” Romania into a concrete moral person.

How do we recognize “collective persons”?

In order to recognize an individual having an unmistakable appearance, and an untransmissible proper name, we may rely on procedures like a photo, the biography, the CVs, all marked by identity, from the identity card to diplomas, and, eventually, to medical records (which any institution interested in establishing a contractual relation with the respective individual requests).

But how do we recognize collective persons?

Let us review some of the procedures.

One of them is what we called *ethnomethod*: to know, to search for /follow the noological cycles that a community passes through. For example, in a certain interval, the respective community opts for a self-definition by stigmata, as it happened with the Romanian political community in the period between 1990 and 1993, when the parties stigmatized each other by calling each other “crypto-communists”, “national communists”, etc. Thus, the subjacent moral person of the parties was manifesting in public through what attested its deficit: the excess of aggressive psychologizing represents the evidence of weakness in the moral person of political elites. Through the passage from the political “agenda” based on invoking the political doctrine and platform, to a publicity cycle, focusing on the leaders’ “personal qualities”, we register the passage from “propaganda” to political “publicity”, which is essential in the “publicity cycle”. These methods: stigmatization, the “talkshow”, the “political publicity” are all forms of manifestations for the “moral person” of the post-December Romanian political class. Behind these forms, we distinguish the “ethnomethods” that allow the access to the “recognition” of the collective individual, according to the principle: “such and such person is not so much **what** they do, but **how** they do it”. Or, otherwise said: study *how* a group does something, *how* they behave, and you will know *who* they are” (as moral person). What can be said about the political group (in the last ten years) is that it *stigmatizes* itself, it *ex-poses* itself, it *appears* itself”. A *stigma*, a *game*, an *appearance* are the hypostases of the moral person of the Romanian political class from the perspective of the ethnomethods theory.

Another method for characterizing the moral person is that of the series computation. A collective appears in a figure that indexes the composed dimensions of its states and manifestations. In case we want to know a rural community in its current state, we will first of all place its parametrical data in a series: health, demographical behavior, education, agricultural activity, the state of the soil, etc. Thus, we obtain series of data. The problem is to “add the series” into an *index* (the computation of the series) and this is done by standardizing the variables, that is, by expressing the data in standardized forms, therefore in values belonging to intervals of variation from -1 to +1, or from -100 to +100. This way, the data regarding different variables can be added into a *synthetic index* by which we will characterize the respective community at the moment of its study. This serial computation leads to destinal

figures (of destiny) of the moral persons, as these *synthetic indexes* are parameters by which we can characterize a community from a destinal point of view, according to how it is closer to the inferior limit or to the superior limit of its *vitality*. Destinies are visible only after we obtain series of synthetic indexes which we can order into computational tables similar to those regarding weather.

Ascendence and the ethnomethods of the European construction

Let us retain, therefore, that a moral person, of the type of a group whatsoever, appears as a *definition frame* for an affiliation (belonging) and for an organization. Generally speaking, the spiritual phenomenon of representation and of self-representation of a *common ascendence*, which culture, in its entirety, “invests with a certain value”⁶ is the nucleus of the moral person or of the “collective individual”.

The same presentation of the *common ascendence* passes into a rule that “defines affiliation and organizes interaction”.

Actually, a “common ascendence” determines “descent categories” which overlap or not the categories assigned by a *common activity*. *The ascendence group is a latent noological reality that manifests itself as social entity and as a mental operator only when “a society uses this cultural representation in order to organize interaction, in view of definite objectives”*⁷.

For example, *European societies* opted in the entire *interwar period* for the use of the ethnomethod of the “kin group” called nation as a comprehensive method in international relations, but, after the war, Churchill and Stalin, and even Roosevelt, gave up this **ethnomethod**, and that was the passage to the Europe of “influence spheres”. The short period of Kissinger and Nixon resuscitated the ethnomethod of kin groups within the “nationalisms” of the final communist epoch, and thus “national-communisms” were born. The latter were encouraged, and perhaps even “created” by American politics, on the line of weakening the communist camp formed by the Russian-soviet communism. National-communisms were the

⁶ Cf. Schneider in Scheffler, H.W., 1965; apud M. Verdon, 1999, p. 277.

⁷ Verdon, 1999, 277; Scheffler, 1965; Keesing, 1975: “Kin Groups and Social Structure”, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

main forces weakening the communist systems, and not dissidence, or, in any case, more than “dissidence”.

The reaction to the ethnomethod of the kin “group” was the dramaturgic ethnomethod of the “dissidence”, that is, the “actors” appearing as “dissidents”, “fighters” against communism emerged from the backstage of the neocommunist “Internationals”. But they were fighters against eastern “national-communisms”, so that the “post-December” period began with a new “internationalist, dramaturgic cycle”, and not with a “nationalist cycle”, that is, based on “*ethno-definitions*” (the kin group ethnomethod). We notice, therefore, an alternation of ethnomethods used by Euro-American political systems. The kin group ethnomethod is used alternatively with the ethnomethod of the affiliation group, so that there is no longer congruence between the two ethnomethods, as they are controlled by different “forces” and “formations”: the kin ethnomethod by pro-national forces (based on ethno-definitions), and the ethnomethod of affiliation by international (pan-ideological) forces.

Therefore, society seems to be *floating* between the two poles: as *national society*, it inclines towards the kin group ethnomethod as ethnosociological strategy, but as *international society*, it opts for the affiliation ethnomethod. International relations are no longer spontaneous, self-instituted, but “directed”, that is, they unfold on a stage already controlled by the “backstage agents”, which are grouped under the form of “internationals”, or under other forms (pan-ideas, ideologies, etc.). Thus, we can say that life on a worldly scale unfolds through the alternation of two cycles: *the ethnosymbolical cycle* and *the dramaturgic cycle*. *Both are ethnosociological groups and they form the basic articulation of ethnosociology.*

Ethnosociology is the main offspring of noology, which tells us that the noological latency of the moral person (“the collective individual”) actualizes / manifests itself under the form of ethnomethods, which seem to be two (polarized): the symbolical ethnomethod and the dramaturgical ethnomethod.

Ethnosociology and ethnohistory

Therefore, ethnosociology tells us that societies are latencies actualized under the form of ethnomethods, that is, of the *ways*, and *frames* that a society adopts in order to define,

manifest, and organize itself. Ethnosociology warns us, therefore, that any society is manifest between two lines of exigency and constraint: the “bottom-up” one, that of “self-definition” or of “ethnology” (the sum of traditions and beliefs fixed under the form of myths, maxims, and, on a superior level, of religion), and the “top-down” one, of the “super-definition” (the super-structure) which comes from “supra-nationally” organized groups. Thus, ethnosociology speaks of the alternation of nationalist and imperialist cycles within history. For the Jewish people, for example, the David’s and Solomon’s epoch is an ethnosymbolical or a nationalist one. The Maccabean epoch is a mixed one, of wars between the two ethnomethods, while the Jeremiah’s epoch, and that of the prophets in general, is a dramaturgic epoch, of reaction to the neo-Babylonian imperialism, when “nationalism” takes the form – chosen by God – of the great “prophets”, of “prophesizing” a **cycle** of “new synthesis”, the “messianic” one, when order is defined by the descent from Christ. Peoples are self-defined from that moment on through Jesus Christ as the unique and true founder, that is, they self-define as “Christian peoples”.

Finally, let us retain that the “moral person” can be an “entity” “sub” or “supra-individual”, but also an inter-individual entity, therefore, an “ensemble of persons interacting in the present moment” (as in the case of ethnodefinitions that are also called “nationalisms”), “in a determined place, and claiming to spring from a common descent in order to justify their association in view of achieving definite purposes”⁸.

Actually, the moral person is always an “inter-individual entity”, and when it cannot manifest as inter-individual entity we are dealing with sub or supra-individual expressions, which, in fact, are segmented expositions of this total and integrating interindividual reality. Thus, a certain segment poses itself as a backstage agent (an internationale) which claims for itself the function of “social definition” (ideologies), and this is how “ideocracies”, internationales, empires, “secret societies” etc., appear. They are all expressions of the segmentation (fracture) of interindividual entities called societies (integral or integrated and integrating).

Ethnosociology calls these societies “nations”, as it calls segmentation and interacting segments “internationales”, “ideologies”, and “secrete societies”.

⁸ Verdon, 1999, p. 277.

Let's examine what happened with the European society at the start of its modernity. Which ethnomethods had disputed the leading role to rebuilding new Europe in accordance with a new inspiration the scholars used from that time on to call the *secullum*, i. e. the spirit of the century?! As I said, the ethnomethod or ethnoparadigm which reveals to have played the pivotal role in that starting moment of European history has been the Florentine ethnomethod. Let's search for the spiritual or noological documents in order to comprehend that paradigm that seemed to be a destinal one for the new Europe. We shall start by examining the spiritual documents that the long sixteenth century created and which we have to study in order to understand what happened then and which was the image that century created for the the new historical epoch, i. e. for the new European man.

The New European Mind. The Ethnomethods and the new Europe

We start by evoking the idea of W. Sombart that the “social type” newly emerging in Europe at the dawn of modernity was “formed within the bourgeois groups” comprising merchants or craftsmen, townsmen, and it could be located in Florence, towards the end of the Quattrocento; “it had been of course born during the Trecento”⁹. Besides being the representative of a social class, the “bourgeois” emerging in Florence embodies a new “human type, a new type of European man” that can be later on recognized in the entire series of social behaviors which mark the modern evolution of the modern world (from Quattrocento until today). The representative figure of the new human type could be – still according to Sombart – the Florentine L. B. Alberti, whose letters allow us to emphasize the “state of mind” and the type of social behavior that are specific for this stage of the new historical cycle called modern evolution. We owe to Alberti the famous books on the “family behavior” (*Del governo della famiglia*) in and through which this new man at the gates of the modern era has drawn his spiritual portrait, transmitting it as such to the posterity.

“They have already been admired and read by his contemporaries; they have, even from their first appearance been considered as a classical treatise which other family fathers

⁹ Cf. W. Sombart, *Le Bourgeois*, Payot, Paris, 1926, p. 129.

have used in their chronicles and in their memories, be it totally or only excerpts. Thus, Sombart concludes, the ideas which Alberti expressed in his books on family (...) *were widespread* in his time, and they reflect a *general manner of seeing...*¹⁰ (italics supplied).

L.B. Alberti is, therefore, a “representative figure” for the new series of social behaviors that is present in the European societies in the 16th century (1450 – 1640; according to I. Wallerstein’s chronology). He is “representative” for the new type of social agent in the European culture, that succeeds another type of social agent also widespread in Europe, that of the “project makers”. Evidently this succession is not rigorously chronological, but it only has a cultural significance. In a certain way, the *albertine type* is simultaneous in the European time and space with the type of “project makers”, to which it is very close, but from which it is also very distinct. As a representative figure, it has only expressed a new spiritual orientation, in which one can read the “historical option” of the European man, in relation to the state of interregnum. By this orientation and due to it, the new historical rationality and a new cultural paradigm will triumph, and it will mediate other spiritual framings of the early modern European’s social behavior.

The new social behavior has European extension, because it is present both in the Mediterranean Europe - in the Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese world – and the north-western world. Still, as we shall see, it is not unitary, but contradictory, with discontinuous unfolding, with a spirit and a mentality that are anything but unitary. The Florentine society in the times of Leon Battista Alberti had a sensualist-empirical inclination, but through its new “propensity for form” (Jakob Burkhardt), it had surpassed the state of interregnum. In the “circles” (reunions) that are so brilliantly described by Burkhardt there were three series of behaviors: a. sensualist, focusing on frivolity, easy grace, on immoral little stories like those of Bandello, a famous character of that epoch; b. esthetical, intellectualistic, consisting of a taste for philosophy and music (reciting “canzone” was one of the daily conventions of organizing time in reunions that were dominated by the figure of the woman); c. rationalistic, so well synthesized in L. B. Alberti’s *Trattato del governo della famiglia*. For the sensualist behaviors, Lorenzo Magnifico’s *Hawk Hunt* is very significant, a work wherefrom we find that the Florentine was glad to praise in the most grandiose manner the pleasures of the life within the

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 130.

society. An extremely relevant element is the way in which Lorenzo satirically portrays Piovicino Arbatto, who (and I quote here from Burkhardt): “wanting to regain his lost thirst was walking around with loafs of pastrami, a herring, a piece of cheese, a sausage, and four sardines hanging on his body (...), and all were cooking in sweat”¹¹.

In the society of the Italian city we also encounter the representative figure of the other type of social agent, which has forced social behavior out of interregnum – “the project maker” – as in the person of Castiglione. In the same world, in the same social space coexisted the model of “idealized society”, which Castiglione presents in Guidobaldo of Urbino’s yard\home as a supreme goal of life, with the model of a “society belonging to a type like Bandello, with all its frivolities”, an ideal which “gives the most proper measure of entertainment, of easy gracefulness”, just as in the same social space we also encounter the “delicate taste for poetry and art” and also the ideal of reforming the family expressed by L. B. Alberti, the one who, by his “treatise” sets the basis of the concept of “rationalist realism of the bourgeois household”. This ideal will found a new historical series of social behaviors, as, eventually, “the desire for higher and higher forms in the social relations” will receive program, direction, and model precisely in and through L. B. Alberti’s *Trattato del governo della famiglia*. Thus, out of the three “desires for form”, giving expression to the three said social ideals, the one expressed by Alberti in his treatise will be the winner, the one which places in the center of the new cultural order the motif *Sancta masserizzia*. The utilitarian (instrumental) rationalism had decidedly won both against Castiglione’s “idealized society” and against Bandello’s “sensualist society”. The European man had placed at the center of the new cultural paradigm the *Sancta masserizzia*, which did not promote the sensualist orientation of distinction and of the fine taste for the arts, nor Castiglione’s idealizing-intellectualist one, but a new orientation which will conquer the behavior of the European man in all its dimensions, expressed by the “*common sense*” “with which all the problems of life within a community are examined and weighed”¹². This orientation, this new model of action is expressed by the motif *sancta masserizzia*. As we have already mentioned, “the most valuable document in this respect is Leon Battista Alberti’s dialogical work, which refers to the art of

¹¹ I. Burkhardt, *Cultura renaşterii în Italia (The Renaissance Culture in Italy)*, Bucharest, 1969, p. 31.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 150.

administering a house. This is, in a summary made by J. Burkhardt, the content of this work: “There are all the details of keeping a big and rich house, which, through thinking things through in an efficient manner, and through leading a relatively moderate life, can ensure the happiness and welfare of an entire line of generations. To this one can add an “estate”, whose products cover the needs of the household, and maintains it from an economic point of view, a «household industry, a weaving mill, be it for wool or for silk». The house is solid, the furniture is valuable (...). *Everyday life has to be as simple as possible...*”¹³ (italics supplied). All expenses, from those of representation to the pocket money of the youngest of the sons, are calculated according to rational divisions, and in no way to conventional ones. The “master of the house” gives education not only to the children but to the entire family: First, he forms his wife (“a shy girl at the beginning”) in the direction of a *massaia* (wise mistress of the household), “teaching her how to lead her servants.” After he makes of her a true *massaia*, he raises his sons “by carefully watching over them,” and leading them “more with his authority than with his force”. Then there are the servants and the employees, whom he forms “according to the same principles, so that he makes them feel tied to the house”.¹⁴ Therefore, *masserizza* is the new spirit of “domestic economy”, having become the object of rational construction, achieved by the *massaio* (the all-moderate and all-knowing master of his household). Economy, even in its form of domestic economy, has become the center of the master’s life, the object of his thoughts and actions, the supreme value of his life, of his activity, and of his feelings. Thus, rational economic activity is raised at the value of ideal of action, expressed in a new doctrine whose postulate is *Sancta masserizza*. On the basis of the new postulate of the system of social action, the element of behavioral orientation, the *center of man’s life* is no longer *pleasure, the gallant party*, but the *household, the domestic economy*, “the holy spirit of order” which has to dominate all facts and actions. This is the great leap that took place in quattrocento Florence, the equivalent of a *historical reform of social behavior*; L. B. Alberti is the one who theorized it. Nothing of what concerns the household “has to be avoided by the consciousness” of a *massaio* (the master of the household), moreover, everything that a *massaio* has in mind has to gravitate around, to agree with, in one form or

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Ibidem, pp.150-151.

another, with the ideal of the *Sancta masserizzia*. In this respect, *Sancta masserizzia* becomes a social myth, it embodies the latent tendencies of a world, of a new society, and it guides the thought, the feeling, and the action. This new orientation is based on the “radical rejection of all maxims of the feudal, senior-like manner of living”¹⁵ and on adopting new maxims, synthesized in the *Sancta masserizzia* ideal, which, essentially, are maxims of “rationalizing economic behavior”, of the “economical spirit”. This ideal has as a noological axis, the following two maxims: 1. “Remember this well, my sons: your spending should never exceed your income” (*tenete questo a mente, figliuoli miei. Siamo le spese vostre piu che l'entrate vostre, non mai maggiori*). 2. “One nickel saved gives me greater honor that a hundred nickels spent.”¹⁶

We realize that we are witnessing here, in Florence, the great historic event by which the European man’s social behavior irreversibly broke away from that of the senior, whose purpose was to spend as much as possible. The pleasure of spending and of consumption makes way in this renewed man to the pleasure of saving, or of reducing consumption, which would have seemed incomprehensible to the senior, to the ancient man.

These are other derived maxims, excerpted from Alberti’s dialogue: a) “The more waste of a bad thing, the more saving a good, useful, and praiseworthy thing”; b) “Saving does not damage anyone, and it is useful for the family”, c) “Saving is a sacred thing”; d) “Therefore I say: they are *massai*, good masters of their households and of their families, those who know how to strike a balance between what is too much and what is too less. Question: But how do we recognize what is too much and what is too less? Answer: With the help of a means that is easy to handle. Question: I would like to know what means. Answer: Here it is: no spending must exceed the limit of what is absolutely necessary, nor to be inferior in relation to what honesty requires.”¹⁷

Here we are, therefore, in this 15th Florentine century, in front of a new social behavior, directed by a new ideal, which refers in the same time to the European man’s soul, body, and time. Sloth, lazy sensualism are all banished from the body, the spirit, and the time of the European man. Sombart believed that “*the doctrine of bourgeois virtues* (which he does not

¹⁵ W. Sombart, *op. cit.*, p.132.

¹⁶ Cf. notes extracted by Sombart from Alberti’s *Trattato...* in *op. cit.*, p. 454.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.

see as plenary represented in Alberti's *Treatise* – our note) did not suffer any intensive change from the quattrocento until now (...). What the following centuries have inculcated to successive bourgeois generations summarizes what Alberti had tried to inculcate to his disciples. Between the way of being of Leonard's grandfather (Leonardo da Vinci – our note) and that of Benjamin Franklin the difference is insignificant. The fundamental principles have not suffered radical modifications between the two epochs. Each century repeats them almost word by word, as they had been formulated by Alberti..."¹⁸

Sombart was searching and finding the evidence for the manifestation of the same human type in Spain, in France, in England, in America, through Benjamin Franklin, the one through whom the world's "bourgeois conception" reaches its climax. Sombart understood the genesis of the "bourgeois" type in a continuing, evolutionist manner.

"...Thinking in a bourgeois manner had in time become an integrated part of the capitalist spirit, so that, Sombart underlines, the spirit of Leonardo's grandfather (Leonardo da Vinci; therefore, the spirit emerging in the Quattrocento – our note) animated circles that were both vast and numerous. (...) Leonardo's grandfather and the father of the American republic are as similar as brothers. In the four centuries interval that separates them from each other, no feature of the painting suffered any change..."¹⁹

Sombart's scheme is debatable because, as we have already mentioned, the European man in the new capitalist epoch is contradictory in time and space. *The new human type* underwent a process of transformation: *he was born in the Quattrocento under the social form of a massaio*, in historical Florence, becoming a "gentleman pirate" in 16th century England, the one who set the *bases of the mercantile-commercial Europe*, and, through another process of historical transformation, it will acquire the image of the *utopian prophet*, of the national "messianic" in the Bucharest of 1848, represented by the figure of Ion Heliade Rădulescu, and in Transylvania through the series of the tribunes, represented by the prophetic and tragic figure of Avram Iancu. These transformations will, of course comprise the entire European area, so that limiting their unfolding to only one center – the Quattrocento Florence, as Sombart does, or even to the entire Western Europe – would mean an "amputation" of one

¹⁸ W. Sombart, *op. cit.*, p. 144 .

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 150-151.

region or another in which the process has taken place in totally particular forms. This process relies on three distinct social types: “massaio” in the 15th century, the “gentleman pirate” in the 16th century, and the rationalist-utopian “messianic” in the 19th century. When we study the historical movement of cultures the insufficiency of the diffusive synchronism thesis, based on the model “center” – “periphery” is evident. The so-called “unity” of the European man in the modern epoch is in fact a unity in diversity. The cycle of modern culture comprises three historical series of relatively contradictory social behaviors, which are unitary only in one point: that of the “social myth” of a rational social unity, be it the *Sancta masserizzia* or *Santa cetate* or the “legions” led by the tribunes of Avram Iancu’s Transylvanians, or on the southern bank of the Danube, the Aromanian *captains’ offices* led by the “captains.” The cultural paradigm has retained the same central element, the same orientation of social action in all 400 years, the ideas of the *instrumental “rationality” of the world and of an order so dear to God, guarded against all excesses, but, most of all, centered on the care for the more general order of life and of the world*, an idea that, in its essence, had been synthesized in Alberti’s *Sancta Masserizzia*, and reiterated by Franklin’s 13 virtues: temperance, silence (discretion), order, decidedness, moderation, enthusiasm, loyalty, justice, self-control, purity, moral equilibrium, chastity, humbleness, or meekness. Both in Alberti’s treatise and in Franklin’s list of virtues we read the triumph of the Christian values and way of life, in the midst of a bourgeois, capitalist mentality. The nucleus of the new social, capitalist system was formed, therefore, by Christian values, an issue entirely significant for the one who is interested in understanding the possibility of the European world’s renewal at the dawn of modernity. The new world emerged everywhere on a clearly religious foundation which it will lose towards the end of modernity, sliding thus into the crisis of the end of a historical cycle, which philosophers mainly relate to the entire modern period.

But how were the representatives of the new European man in 16th century England? Did they not really add anything to the behavioral maxims of the type theorized by L.B. Alberti? Here is their gallery: sir Walter Raleigh, whose slogan was “I serve both Mars and Mercury at the same time; Francis Drake, the “nobleman-pirate,” sir Martin Frobisher, “scientist and dangerous pirate,” etc. They inaugurate the “grand style merchant”, who unites

in the same person the “trinity”: adventurer, pirate, and trader. He had a plundering warlike spirit”, which oriented all overseas relations.²⁰ Could this type be less significant for the European man and for the modern Europe as we know it?

Already after the Cateau-Chambresis peace, northeastern Europe becomes the center of the global European economy.²¹ The towns of the Italian republic pass onto the second plan, after they had so closely tied their destiny to the Habsburgic trend (the Habsburgs’ attempts under Charles V to absorb the entire Europe in their empire). The new European economic trend has two cycles. The first one has one end in 1450, then an ascending curve followed by a descending one, and the other end in 1557. It also expresses at the same time the failed attempt of the Spanish and French *empires* to incorporate the European economy. This is the historic period of the “failure of the empire,” according to I. Wallerstein’s expression, and it creates the conditions for the victory of another type of “global system,” radically different from empires, founded on a “global economy.” The mechanism of acquiring the surplus in the new global system is the market, while in the empires’ “global system” the mechanism of acquiring the surplus was the tribute (Eisenstadt). The ascending phase of the first economic cycle in the 16th century determined prosperity for all commercial centers forming what is called “Europe’s spine: Flanders, southern Germany, northern Italy, and Spain. The towns aspiring to become the center of the global European economy were Seville, Lisbon, Antwerp, Lyon, Genoa, and Hamburg. But none of these was prominent in 1600, but another one, which was not even a candidate for such a rank in 1450, Amsterdam”.²²

But if this economic cycle (beginning in 1450 and ending in 1557) consumed in the historical current of the “failure of the empire”, only the second economic cycle (which begins around 1550 and ends in 1640) decisively imposes the new historical course of the rise of the modern European civilization. It is related to the modern international trade, so that the emergence of Europe’s powerful states and the configuration of the West’s new class structure are simultaneous processes with the expansion of international trade. The latter is now decisively related to the English agent. Beginning in 1550, industrial activity starts to

²⁰ Ibidem, pp. 91; 96.

²¹ I. Wallerstein, *Social World Systems*, Academic Press, New York, 1974, p. 225.

²² Ibidem, p.165.

concentrate in certain northwestern states and to be reduced in others.²³ Europe's industrial zone was divided into two areas: the area comprising northern Italy (the state-towns), France, and Switzerland, and the area comprising countries in northern Europe: England, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and Scotland.

In the first there was an important growth in the artistic and luxury industries products, a development of art, and handicraft, but only a weak growth of heavy industries (...). In the second area there was an unprecedented expansion of heavy industries and of products thereof'.²⁴ However, from our point of view, the essential issue is that of the human or social type related to this kind of differentiation, and thus it remains relatively incomprehensible. Or, as opposed to the Florentine *massaio*, we encounter a totally different type in the England of the epoch we refer to, that of the gentleman-pirate, an agglutination of some curious spiritual patterns.

The central event, the one which will reveal the true position of the "gentleman trader's" behavior with respect to the Florentine "il *massaio*" (in general, with respect to the urban north Italian merchant) is the transformation of the commercial pattern within the English trade, which has at least two distinct aspects: wool trade transforms, in this case, into textile (wool) products trade, and, on the other hand, the industry becomes rural. "Textile industry" is more and more a rural industry, and for England it involved the need to search for larger and larger export markets.²⁵ This situation triggered the "restriction of foreign traders' activity, especially Italians – a process that took place in the 15th century".²⁶ The same restriction was imposed on the hanseatic traders a century later (in the 16th century). Thus, this is the origin of the "gentleman-merchant." *He originated in a rural area and was related to a certain attitude towards space, and even to a certain social configuration of the latter, which, as we will see, developed for him a completely different cosmogonic vision compared to that of a Florentine *massaio*. The English textile industry involved an entire regional space, a "hunger" for space which generated the entire politics of "enclosures" and of devastating those *masserizzia* (rational households) of the banished English peasants, or, more precisely,*

²³ Ibidem, p. 226.

²⁴ John U. Nef, *War and Human Progress*, Norton, New York, 1963, p. 6, also quoted by I. Wallerstein in *op. cit.*, p. 226.

²⁵ I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

²⁶ Ibidem, p. 339.

to use the so plastic expression “eaten by sheep.” The enclosed space, with a sole center was devastated, decentered, swallowed by the great regional space of borderless pastures, as in front of a growing textile industry, called forth by an international trade also borderless and without a center, yesterday’s margins of the nobleman’s pastures became points from which the rush for new lands was launched once again. The English nobleman acquires a new attitude towards space, and at the same time a new vision of the latter, a space without center and borders, a regional space which did not have its center or its borders within it, but in the productive capacity of the new textile industry. The attitude towards lands incorporated in the pasture space is transposed by the English nobleman into commercial attitude towards the new markets, in order to present his textiles. In front of the setback registered by textiles trade and in relation to the need to sell on many markets (thus the area of commercial competitiveness and the dimensions of political difficulties involved by the conquest of new markets being enlarged), the “gentleman-merchant” transposes the new type of social behavior – the expansionist one, of conquering new spaces – into a new model of commercial organization: *The Fellowship of Merchant Adventurers of London*, created in 1486. It monopolized the export relations with Antwerp, and thus the expansionist social behavior is definitely fixed into institutional structures, and therefore regulated, launching the model of a new norm of rationality, a norm that orients behavior towards the exterior, and not towards the interior of domestic economy (towards the attachment of new commercial spaces and raw material providing spaces). *Sancta masserizzia* had developed the model of a space with only one center – the household – and its model of rationalizing behavior referred to the actions of a *massaio* (the master) within its domestic economy. The new rationality had indeed developed the mentality of the economic calculation – a new feature for the behavior of the European man – but it aims at only one term – “masserizzia”. The rationalization way of a *massaio* can be classified into what Lucian Blaga called rationalization through “generic concepts”, which permits “the organization of both the empirical and theoretical world into larger and larger (upwards) and tighter and tighter (downwards) «generic concepts»”.²⁷ This is the mental model of a *massaio* directed by the “*Sancta masserizzia*.” He acts through a rationalization by

²⁷ Lucian Blaga, *Experimentul și spiritul matematic (The Experiment and the mathematical spirit)*, Ed. Științifică Publishing House, Bucharest, 1969, pp. 173 – 174.

gradually enlarged stages of the social-economic world of his household: first he educates himself *in the spirit of the new concept – model* - of behavior, then *he extends his behavior upon those around him* – his wife, then his children, the servants, the employees, etc. – so that, gradually, *the complex system of simple interactions* represented by the “masserizzian” economy will be integrated into the order requested by the new spirit (the new ideal of behavior). “Sancta maserizzia” is thus the “symbolic center,” the “generic concept,” on which the rationalization of the domestic economy will be founded, and the behaviors of its members will be gradually placed under the imperative of the new maxim: “do not spend more than you earn.” Of course this new maxim is based on a mentality operating with calculations, but, as we have said, the calculation scheme is in accordance with the Euclidian spatial models – with only one center. It is precisely this type of rationality that was replaced when the “gentleman – pirate” emerged on the historical stage. The latent, unconscious, obvious spatial model, which orients his actions, is completely different. *As such, the calculation scheme and the manner of rationalizing the empirical world which this social type will develop are different from those of a massaio.* His rationalization manner can be classified under what Blaga called the type of “rationalization on the line of the contradictory identity. This type of rationalization is the one that we currently name – dialectic manner. The dialectic manner is constituted by the most concessive adaptation of rationality to the structures and articulations of the empirical world. The dialectic manner *“searches the similar not only in various forms, but also under contradictory forms (italics supplied)”*.²⁸ Thus, it is clear the distinction between the mental schemes of the two (“massaio” and “gentleman-pirate”). *The first adapts the structures of the empirical world to a generic concept (of a platonic order), the second one acts in an opposite direction, adapting rationality to the structures of the empirical world. His spatial model admits several centers and no borders, wherefrom the idea that the similar can acquire “contradictory forms”*. His scheme is therefore based on a calculation with two or more competing terms, therefore, in a contradictory relation, so that the rationalization interest is displaced from the *term* itself to the *relation* between terms, which can be marked, as we have shown, even by *opposite tendencies*. From the fact that in such a situation each of the two has to chose between two strategies – “being aggressive” or “being cooperative” – a “pervert

²⁸ Ibidem, p. 175.

structure” is developed, in that none of them has the first preference for the cooperative strategy. Each of them has the advantage of choosing the strategy of aggressiveness in the case he is right to be afraid that the other one will be aggressive. In this kind of system, the competitor (to read, the trader, the merchant), notices that irrespective of the other’s option (in relation to the two strategies of action) he is in the best situation by choosing the strategy of aggressiveness. If the other is being aggressive, he will use the strategy of aggressiveness in a defensive manner, and if the other chooses the strategy of cooperation, he will use aggressiveness in an offensive way. Therefore, his aggressiveness reveals as being the preferentially-dominant strategy for both competitors. Thus one can explain why the “gentleman-merchant” becomes a “trader-pirate” whose code of behavior is fixed in the norms of a corresponding institution: *Merchant Adventurers*. In the competition with merchants in the Netherlands, *Merchant Adventurers* act in a manner that “calculatedly avoids” any kind of commitment, “maintaining themselves in a position of economically favorable transaction”.²⁹ *The “gentleman-pirate”, the “nobleman-trader”, had invented a new type of social behavior, which will defeat the behavior based on the Sancta masserizzia ideal.* No matter how strange it seems, the modern variant of capitalist social behavior in the mercantile epoch is developed in the space of the rural industry and not in that of the urban productions of the Italian state-towns. In fact, between 1550 and 1600 England begins to lead capitalist Europe, and the center of the new international system “moves” from the Mediterranean area to the north of Europe. This change is not reducible to the simple fact of the development of industrial techniques (let us not forget that Spain maintained a textile commerce whereby it successfully competed with England), but it is mainly related to the fact that *The Merchant Adventurers* had invented a new type of social behavior, a lot more efficient in relation to the new condition created precisely by those textile industries. In the new circumstances it was not the techniques in themselves that were important, but the social behaviors putting them in action, that is, the spiritual and mental structure of the new social agent.

A social behavior is, through the values and symbols it participates in, in relation to a culture in its ensemble, which it redefines, it reorders in a new vision on the world, but from which it can never break, except with the price of a dangerous deculturation, of a historical

²⁹ I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

regression. If we keep in mind the *Merchant Adventurer*, we will be able to bring as argument in the support of this idea, even I. Wallerstein's conclusion which proves that the success of the English merchant was related to the "new" English society in its entirety. England's position was distinct from the position of other commercial powers by a complex of aspects which we will only enumerate: a) its taxation system was a lot less oppressive than those of other old commercial centers (Flanders, northern Italy) and its technical organization was at that time more economical, thus ensuring the advantage of competitiveness compared to the other centers; b) the internal unification in an early period (the monarchical centralization and the "administrative revolution" of kings Henry and Tudor), which explains England's ability to pursue its industrial advantages in the "second stage" of the 16th century; c) England had already developed a powerful and centralized main city, a both economic and cultural force, and, as a consequence, the capacity of maintaining an internal peace without a *standing army*, etc. thus, from inner unity and outer trade, the "nobleman-pirate" was born, the man who was at the same time merchant adventurer, on world's seas, an politician (citizen) with powerful religious conviction within the monarchic state. The entire 17th century and then the 18th century represent the period in which the type of behavior of the merchant adventurer was generalized, which determined Goethe to say: "War, trade and piracy form an indivisible trinity."³⁰

The Dutch company of the Oriental Indies had such "heads", characterized by a warlike disposition, doubled by entrepreneurial spirit. The risk had become the new means of rationality, and aggressiveness its sole form of manifestation. This is what E. Laspeyres writes about the Dutch merchants: "At the beginning of the 18th century, the Dutch displayed warlike dispositions, and this because trade was then a true adventure; all discovered regions were rapidly exploited, and when a region ceased to bring great benefits, they oriented towards others, and they started to exploit new branches."³¹

But in the 18th century, the ideal expressed by *Sancta masserizzia* reappears within another historical series of social behaviors, which reveals another hypostasis of the European man in the modern cycle of his evolution. The new series expresses the attempt to develop a

³⁰ W. Sombart, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 96.

new model of social behavior, which to reconcile the ideal put forth by *Sancta masserizzia*, with the “new spirit” that had emerged together with Merchant Adventurers in the mercantile epoch. The fact that the new model of behavior proves to be utopian helps us understand that the western European cultural paradigm did not yet have a real solution for reconciling the two opposite tendencies in the modern European man’s personality: the tendency for rationalization and equilibrium “at home” (illustrated by *Sancta masserizzia*), a Christian pattern of social personality, and the expansive, non-rational tendency for a devastating attitude in the “external area.” This is the (antinomian) pattern of structuring the “capitalist spirit” which Sombart considered “homogeneous: a behavior according to a self-centered capitalism, whose ideal was *masserizzia*, a construction at the center of which was *il massaio*, the “master of the house”, guided by an economic morale, having a Christian nucleus, and an expansionist, aggressive capitalist behavior in the exterior, well defined by the merchant – warrior – adventurer “trinity”. Through the ideal of the *Sancta masserizzia*, which guided in its first phases the Florentine bourgeois’s behavior, the capitalist spirit was in relation both with the ancient model of the Roman house, considered a *sacred place*, and with the pattern of the “Christian householder”, preoccupied of making out of the Christian virtues founding values of his household. For the “gentleman-pirate”, *massaio* is a petit-bourgeois. The vision of the world for the two is opposite. Their cosmogonic models come from different sources: one is platonic, the other one is Kantian; one comes from the Greek-Roman (Latin) cultural paradigm, and the other from the Nordic, Anglo-Saxon cultural paradigm.

Capitalist behavior of Florentine model (the Latin spirit) is emerges again in Eastern Europe, but here there is a modification: the *masserizzia* of the individualist Florentine merchant is here the “*nation*”, the “*people*.” Serving in a rational (the new, modern spirit in Romanian culture) one’s country, leading it on the path of fulfillment, of its “mission” is the new call for the modern European man of Romanian variant. Nothing is above raising one’s “*nation*.” Alberti’s *Sancta masserizzia* becomes *Santa cetate* with Ion Heliade Rădulescu. *Massaio* is here the “prophet of the nation,” the “spirit of rationalization,” of the “domestic economy,” “becomes “national positive messianism.” Just as Alberti had discovered a rational norm for the expenses of a *massaio*, the forty-eighter was searching a rational norm for the expenses of the one responsible for the nation’s wealth. From Dinicu Golescu (the one who

had the nostalgia of the expenses fruitful for the nation) to Constantin Conachi (preoccupied with the moral reform of society), to I.H. Rădulescu and M. Eminescu (“the theory of compensation”) there is the same “modern spirit” of rationality, of the equilibrium between what is spent and what is earned. The modern Romanian’s “masserizzia” is the country, the “holy city.” Eminescu bemoaned the weariness of the Romanian people. The order which leads to the degradation of the biological background of a people, to its social declassing and to cultural decline is not a rational order. Seen from Bucharest, the “holy spirit of order” of modern capitalism, as it appeared to Sombart in the western metropolis, appears destructive, irrational, blind and rapacious. The face it turned towards London, Berlin, Paris, Florence is radiant, rational, just, but the face it turned towards Bucharest, Sofia, Belgrade, is dark and hideous, it is a “monster” totally hostile to these “young nations” in the east of Europe, which yearned for harmony. This is how, in three European places (the Mediterranean area, the Nordic and the Eastern one), just as many different visions of the “capitalist spirit” emerge, and just as many hypostases for the type of the capitalist. A “nobleman-pirate” in London, and “massaio” in Florence, he becomes salesman and money lender in Moldavia, or budget-pension “politician” in Bucharest. Against this series of social behavior, the ideal of the *sancta masserizzia* is reaffirmed through the symbol of the “Holy city”, expressing a collective need for rationalizing social behavior in the area belonging to the “Danube’s Latin people” (Eminescu). Between its first doctrinary- symbolical expression (Alberti’s Treatise) and this last one (an ideological cycle starting with Alberti’s “Sancta masserizzia” and ending with Heliade Rădulescu’s poem *Santa Cetate* [the Holy City]) there is an interval of 400 years. Meanwhile, the utopian socialism, especially the Fourierist one, a sort of evangelist socialism, had itself resuscitated, in a doctrinary expression (the “societary” theory), the same Florentine ideal regarding the rationalization of the bourgeois “household”, so that *Sancta masserizzia* can be considered a representation of a perennial ideal of the modern man. On the other hand, precisely because the Fourierist socialism developed a new doctrine, a more complex one, in relation to this social ideal, explains why Heliade does not go directly to Alberti’s Treatise. In its essence, however, the ideological cycle wherefrom *Sancta Cetate* was born expresses the same social ideal which had oriented Alberti’s behavior as well. This is why we have considered that in both time and space, the area of European synchronization of the Romanian

“heroic culture” is a lot larger, and it does not only refer to the *circulation of literary motifs and idea*, but also of the circulation of *social ideals*, and especially of *social ideals*. Moreover, this circulation is not imitative, but creative (L. Blaga) and it answers collective needs and not certain individual intellectualist aims. The creator who, borrowing cultural elements from other areas, gives the shape of a new work under the impulse of this collective need, does so by placing himself at the service of a social ideal. In order to acquire the complete form in the cultural work, the new ideal has to be the deep expression of an “exemplary personality”. The affirmation of the new ideal thus passes through the transformation of the type of personality (the social type of man). It is on the success of this process that depend the new ideal’s force and expansion.