

**UNIVERSITY *BABEȘ-BOLYAI* OF CLUJ-NAPOCA  
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHYLOSOPHY**

**Ph.D. THESIS**

**PHILOSOPHY OF NATIONALISM IN T. BRĂILEANU**

**(Summary)**

**Doctorate Coordinator:**

**Prof. LIVIU PETRU ZĂPĂRȚAN, Ph.D.**

**Ph.D. Candidate:**

**SORIN-DINU MĂDUȚA**

**CLUJ-NAPOCA, 2012**

# *Contents*

<b>Chapter 1 - Preliminaries .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 2 – Professional and political career.....</b>	<b>19</b>
a). Option for the Legion of the Archangel Michael .....	25
b). Professor.....	29
c). Minister .....	32
d). Calvary .....	39
<b>Chapter 3 – Theory of the community grounded on nation .....</b>	<b>55</b>
a) Philosophical premises of the theory .....	55
b) System of social philosophy .....	61
c) Centrality of the nation in the system of thought.....	64
d) Messianism, the new man and the great man .....	87
<b>Chapter 4 – Political meanings of nationalism .....</b>	<b>141</b>
a) The place of “Politics” in the Romanian political theory .....	147
b) Pure political energy .....	166
c) Nationalism – between reality, utopia and poison .....	172
<b>Chapter 5 - Conclusions .....</b>	<b>181</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>201</b>

The personality of Traian Brăileanu has become object of research recently when various exegetes have republished some of his writings and, based on them, there has been carried out an analysis as regards the theoretical approaches aimed at highlighting the contents of ideas, their assembly in a system of thinking, his originality, his timeframe, both as a professor and politic activist, as well as author of a relevant philosophical and sociological work; relevant for the general condition of the Romanian culture in the first half of the past century and for the politic-social situation of the country experiencing truly historic moments: achievement of the unitary national state, social and economic development, evolution of the politic system, involvement in two wars with severe consequences for the people's lives.

Traian Brăileanu intended to respond to these convulsions, taking up the construction of his own system of thought, connected to the ideational movement of his times, but focused on the idea that nationalism had to be his coronation and that a practical approach in promoting it would be the best path of the social-political life.

The two sides of Traian Brăileanu's personality – thinker and politician, have been perceived differently: in his age, he was largely ignored by the academic exegesis and, during the socialist age, he was not published and ideologically seen as a ultra-reactionary thinker; recently he has been judged in various ways – from the greatest sociologist of the interwar period to a systematically unitary thinker, full of contradictions; as politician, he was involved in the construction of an extremist right movement, harshly judged by history.

Taking into account the close connection between his activity as professor, theoretician and politician, we have considered that it is necessary to detail them for a better understanding of the reasons that led him to the specific construction of his system of thought and the reasons that triggered certain options related to his social-political commitment and firmness in their promotion. Choosing a philosophy of nation and nationalism, T. Brăileanu was “compelled” by his own way of thinking to embrace certain political stances. In everything he was both consistent and full of contradictions. We could say he was a captive of his own

biography, which entailed certain trends of his social-political thinking and, thus, consequent behavior.

Such captivity is rather metaphorical and it might explain how life circumstances, its imponderable factors had decided the path to be followed, narrowing the manifestation of free will in Traian Brăileanu's important decisions. Thus, "the greatest Romanian sociologist", according to Ilie Bădescu and his followers, became a sociologist by means of life circumstances and not based on an understanding of the calling he had. Then, although he studied in German, he presented courses, seminars and conferences in Kant's language and worked as a German translator at the Romanian Legation from Vienna, the reproach of some of his colleagues, such as the reproach of Nicolae Bagdasar upon the appearance of the translation into Romanian of the "Critique of Pure Reason", was that Traian Brăileanu did not know German. Later, when he decided for the Legion of the Archangel Michael, he did it because of his distrust in the morality of the politics of General Al. Averescu and Nicolae Iorga and not because of the admiration he had for those, who later would become the assassins of the great historian. Minister in the legionary government of Antonescu, he was always in contradiction with the chief of state and government, but during the trial of the "great national treason" he was seen as one of the most devout supporters of Ion Antonescu. Any of his books were translated into English, but he was elected member of a renowned academic institution of New York. Although the Christian element of his work is obvious and persistent, one of his landmarks in the Romanian philosophy is the "atheist" Vasile Conta. Finally, the idea that Traian Brăileanu was a "model of tragic destiny"<sup>1</sup> is beyond acceptance given that tragism is an aspiration only in literary-artistic works and on stage, eventually.

To the findings above, we should add that, unfortunately, when he acted as theoretician he included in his analyses a high amount of subjectivity, which meant not only the circulation of personal beliefs about a wide range of issues, such as

---

<sup>1</sup> Constantin Schifirneț: *Sociologia românească modernă*, Criterion Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009, p. 50

those related to the social system, political regime, elites, role of religion in the social life, but also the tendency to apply them in the political practice.

Upon the publication of his first books, written after his decision for sociology, ethics and politics, “Introduction in sociology” (1923), “General sociology” (1926) and “Politics” (1928), his political ideas did not emerge clearly. However, Dimitrie Gusti, in a report required by the Romanian Academy in 1926 and later in his notes dated 1929-1930, wrote after perusing the sociology courses of professor Traian Brăileanu: “Politics is approached in less serious way than the other ones although it wants to be based on an objective science of politics. The last chapters are full of subjectivity, are, in fact, highly personal and various political issues are approached in the scientific content of the politic problems.” He does not detail, but the reproach is very clear: Traian Brăileanu sometimes mixes the scientific, objective politic theory with his politic options.

This blend would be more obvious from 1935 to 1940 when, in the pages of the magazine “Însemnări sociologice” (Sociological notes), he would be the true ideologist of the Legion, removing Nae Ionescu from such position, unfairly attributed to him by the communist historiography.

As a teacher, according to the reports of those who attended his courses at the University of Cernăuți, Traian Brăileanu approached his profession in a German manner, reserving the main role for his erudition. He attended seminars regularly, engaging in debates on par with his students, thus encouraging them to develop their skills and creativity. “Teacher of great social and scientific authority, Brăileanu made his mark by means of lectures rich in information and relevant interpretations of various thinkers [...]. During his courses, he was speaking freely although he had notes his followed. He did not judge social and political events of his time. He was illustrating his ideas with examples from the Antiquity, Middle Ages and Western countries. Students appreciated the objectivity used to approach the most difficult topics”<sup>2</sup>. His former student and collaborator, Leon Țopa, stated

---

<sup>2</sup> Constantin Schifirneț: *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

that he did not encourage his students to enter the politics and the remarks about our politics, in the volumes published, do not appear in his courses.

The enthusiasm aroused by the rediscovery of Traian Brăileanu's valid works (which does not include, in any case, the volume "Sociologia și arta guvernării" (Sociology and the art of government) and especially his teaching works, entailed the idea of rivalry between the *sociological schools* from Bucharest and Cernăuți. It is true that Dimitrie Gusti and Traian Brăileanu had some moments of tension and mutual challenge, especially when Traian Brăileanu enjoyed a publishing vehicle represented by the magazine „Însemnări sociologice” (Sociological notes). But we cannot speak under any circumstances about a sociological school in Bucovina. Traian Brăileanu was appreciated by his students, his work had some sort of echo, but it did not create emulation and the professor did not have outstanding followers. His philosophy/sociology system is self sufficient.

This is why his writings aspire to a *philosophic analysis of the social*, as his most exegetes agree. This is an orientation specific to German sociologists, who perceive sociology only in full solidarity with philosophy, when they do not give sociology a rigorously subordinated role. But, for the most, sociology is nothing but a *philosophy of the society*, similar in terms of relation with the philosophy of history compared to history and, at a great extent, to the philosophy of culture, religion and politics compared to culture, religion and politics.

The opening to the theory of the human community and the completion of his doctrine by essays allow a unitary approach of the theory of the social form (politics, ethics, Christian morality and Kantian morality) as well as the issue of freedom (its philosophical and sociological interpretation, but also the logical issue of the human community), which grant certain unity to Traian Brăileanu's sociology. That's why we have insisted on the core concept, *the general form of the society*, following, by means of an extended quote, the logics of his reasoning:

“Any human community is grounded on the common ideology of its members, respectively on the common interpretation of the external world. The individuals who form a community live in the same space and at the same time,

created with the help of their individual knowledge. Such elaboration of the ideology implies an education of younger generations, granted by adults, a training of the children's knowledge according to the adults' knowledge.

From such perspective, adults represent the class of savants (*sapientes*), thus the class of the society's natural leaders, who hold the rules for the behavior and knowledge of means aimed at easing the achievement of a given purpose. In simple life conditions, this class will also be homogenous and undifferentiated. With the help of imagination, we can build an initial state where the leaders are the elders, namely humans that have more experience than the younger. However, in a complex society, there is the need to acquire various and, at the same time, extended knowledge. In such case, the class of savants, leaders should differentiate based on various areas of knowledge necessary for life. The usual concept for this leading class is the *intellectuals* or, collectively, the *elite*.

Any pure social form is thus classified into an elite and a mass led by such elite. According to the characteristics and specificity of each form, we will have: biological elites (represented by adults, the elders – *senatus*), political, economic, religious, ethical and scientific elites.

Thus, in this respect, the relation between the State and the moral community is presented as a particular aspect of the general issue of the mutual relation between the pure social forms, whose intertwining gives rise to the general form of the society. Seen from within, in terms of the balance of this general form, the problem appears as a struggle between different types of social elites for the society's governance"<sup>3</sup>.

The form used by Traian Brăileanu to expose his ideas reminds us of the fact that he published sociology books for high school. Here, we refer to his ideas' intuitive nature and to the simplicity of his writing.

Referring then to the theory of the circulation of elites and the laws on the balance of the society's general form from his "Sisteme socialiste" (Socialist systems) and his "Tratat de sociologie generala" (Treaty of general sociology),

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem, p. 62

*masterly exposed by Vilfredo Pareto*, Traian Brăileanu complained that the Italian had oversimplified the problem and “too imbued with the spirit of Machiavelli” had mistaken the general form of society for the state, for a specific form, representing *only an aspect of the general social form* and had also made an error in identifying the political elite as the economic elite. “What Pareto offers is rather a realistic description of the politicians of our time than an objective analysis of the social elite” – concluded Traian Brăileanu<sup>4</sup>.

The tendency of the sociologists to build theoretical models of states, moral communities, economic systems, religious communities, starting only from certain factors is mistaken because *substantive societies* “stem from the interference of pure (theoretical) forms and the people forming the societies<sup>5</sup>. These people, by means of the labor’s social division, differentiate and specialize, generating *complex social structures*. But the balance of such societies is instable. The solution for balance must be sought and found in moral values. The primacy of moral values is essential, crucial in society, “all the other values [...] must be shaped according to the image of moral values”<sup>6</sup>.

He starts from the *moral form*, stating that nearly all classifications, from Aristotle to Sombart, put on the same level the *autonomous* (evolutional) social forms and the elements of the autonomous forms, such as social classes, associations, church, family, etc., which is wrong because “*the autonomous social form* is a community which meets all the functions necessary to sustain the existence in time and space and, given that each function needs an organ, the organs are represented by social *tissues* (social classes, professions, etc.), thus by *intra-community groups*”.

“Tissues are composed of homogenous elements whereas the *whole*, the autonomous form, is composed of heterogeneous tissues. Society, as an autonomous form, is therefore composed of individuals, homogenous cells; individuals represent the cells in a social tissue and have a social form only because

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem, p. 68

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem.

they belong to such tissue. There isn't any society composed of overlapped individuals, there have never been undistinguished hordes"<sup>7</sup>. The natural state of the lonely and solitary individual is a *philosophical speculation* just as the *cellular organicism* of Spencer. The error can be removed only by the acceptance of the notion of *system*, but not according to the meaning assigned by Comte.

In order for sociology to have some relatively autonomy, Traian Brăileanu believes it is necessary to explain "the birth and development of the human spirituality, closely connected to the birth and development of the human society"<sup>8</sup>. *Love* is specific to human beings and it culminates with the love for God, the sublime feeling reached only by human beings. Through love, a human being finds themselves within the family: "Family, in this respect, becomes the moral community with the power to expand from the smallest unity, represented by the biological mate, up to the entire humankind"<sup>9</sup>. There are, however, communities grounded on different foundations and other cohesion principles, such as the state, for example. The state is grounded on the *principle of political organization*, which is the "domination of man over man", respectively the domination of force. This principle does not necessarily imply a contradiction beyond resolution between the moral community and the political community.

Traian Brăileanu was always a man of faith and his Christianity was firmly manifested in what he had written until the appearance of the "Teoriei comunității omenești" (Theory of the human community). His adherence to the Legion of the Archangel Michael, whose identity was forged on an offensive Christianity, made him enforce the Christian element of the human being's spirituality in his theories, sometime even exacerbating it.

In each section of the "Teoriei comunității omenești" (Theory of the human community), we can discover themes of faith expressed as per the context and logics of the issue: "Știința despre Dumnezeu" – Science about God (in „Cunoașterea de sine” – Self-knowledge), „Certitudinea existenței lui Dumnezeu”

---

<sup>7</sup> ibidem

<sup>8</sup> Ibidem, p. 12

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem, p. 13

– Certitude of God’s existence (in „Monada și comunitatea” Monad and community), „Cartea lumii” – Book of World, „Nașterea sufletului” – Birth of Soul, „Nemurirea sufletului” – Immortality of Soul (in „Primatul ordinii morale” – Primacy of moral order), „Pacea eternă și morala creștină” – Eternal peace and the Christian moral (in „Națiunea” – the Nation) or „Metafizica religiei” – Metaphysics of religion, „Știința și doctrina creștină” – Science and Christian doctrine (in „Persoana umană și comunitatea” – Human person and the community).

*True* knowledge of the spirit and of the paths towards the true God is necessary against metaphysics and, sometimes, against theology as *science about God*: “The beginning of the road is in ourselves, in the knowledge of the Self, in our attempt to learn what is spirit in ourselves, what belongs to the nature, to the material. God is outside us and above us. But we cannot reach Him with the help of our senses or body, which a mere tool to know nature. The study of the body and the functions of its organs is necessary and required as starting point for the study of nature and physical phenomena. But, in terms of the study of the spirit, the spiritual (incomprehensible) world, a different method is needed”<sup>10</sup>. This method is assigned a large part of the “Cunoașterea de sine” (Self-knowledge), without, however, defining it exactly. The search for God, Traian Brăileanu believes, does not have to be a blind one, but supported on supreme certitudes, on the understanding of the spiritual order of the world and *history*, where spiritual topics are immortal. Referring to a Kantian idea (*eternal peace*), he considers that there is a path of salvation: “The Christian teaching is the most sublime *theory of the human community*. Only when used, the peace on Earth can be found. And it has been achieved and will be achieved if people are able to love and sacrifice, if people are able to know themselves as immortal souls and stop indentifying themselves with their bodies. Thus, the community of souls, the community of the righteous will be shaped above the human societies, beyond the sensible and more real world, its ever-unchanging prototype. The image of this community forces man to seek the good. And the more will moralists paint the icon of the moral

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibidem, p. 98

community in bright and lively colors, the more they will awake and strengthen the desire and will of humankind to see it achieved. And, thus, the world will get closer to the eternal peace”<sup>11</sup>. Of course, it is not the peace between communities, nations and countries, but about the eternal understanding between people as the creatures of the same God. The fate of the human being, ever vainer because of the scientific knowledge and the technical achievements, is inseparable from the Christian doctrine - Traian Brăileanu believes: “Originating from the Christian doctrine, which has disclosed the true fate of man, science loses its value. It can become but a mere tool to help battles between the human communities and increase the sufferings of the humankind [...] Science makes man powerful and sovereign, but they would fumble in darkness and would exhaust their powers in vain if they had not been connected by bonds of love to the community where they acquired their freedom and power, their immortal soul”<sup>12</sup>.

Without accepting and pursuing the moral Christian order, everything will turn into anarchy and, in the end, it will become obvious that ““he who rebels against God shall fall under the power of the Devil””<sup>13</sup>. Of course, this principle is not always followed by all communities. The *social order* can be achieved without moral standards, but, under such circumstances, the societies become oppressive, at the will of those who dominate by force, by the art to govern disgracefully. “The mechanism of the state can function for *a while* (s.n.) and without morality just as the organization of an economic system does not require moral or political standards” - Traian Brăileanu notices<sup>14</sup>. In the end, these mechanisms become anarchic, oppressive. The remedy is not, of course, as it has sometimes been stated, the Marxist doctrine. It can undertake only *the completion of the destruction* entailed by the “demagogic democracy”. *Liberalism* smoothed the path of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, p. 453

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem, p. 580

<sup>13</sup> Traian Brăileanu: *Teoria comunității omenești*, Albatros and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000, p. 349.

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem.

bourgeois order's overthrowing. Thus, there is only one way to save the human community: a nation grounded on the moral order.

The image of a perfect community has always been very tempting for most theoreticians but, usually, only utopian constructions have been achieved: "We might try sometimes to describe the perfect *Romanian society* as imaged by all of those who fought and died for its accomplishment" - Traian Brăileanu warns us<sup>15</sup>. He will do it a few years later and the result will be another utopia. A tragic one, on the versant opposed to the communist one, but tragic and meant to complete the destruction; According to Traian Brăileanu, the mobilization of a nation to achieve the historic mission is the responsibility of the elites. According to Traian Brăileanu, any man of the elite is an intellectual, who will use skills, qualities and features of the intellect to reach their goals or to exist. Sometimes, they will use moral standards, religious feelings, but not a result of their beliefs, but as tools chosen by the intellect. We have *translated* a theory of Traian Brăileanu into the terms of the daily language. This theory is not only sophisticated, but as further detailed, it is contradictory especially when approaching the great man, the professor mistakes *doctrine* for science, the skills and purposes of the ideologist for those of the sociologist. When he asserts "Purpose first and then the means; doctrine first and then the science", all he does is to put social theory in a subordinated position, thus, in contradiction with what he had stated in his first writings. And, this only to make room in his system to the theory of the *great man*, to word and structure it specifically, but not without connection to the positions of other Romanian thinkers of his age.

In Romania in the inter-war period, the Messianism, the hope in the providential man, waited for to be placed next to Christ, arouse from all directions and created temporary unanimities and oasis of thought. And this great, providential man was not abstract as it had been said that several of them appeared only to offer the chance to a new beginning. We only had to recognize them and

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem, p. 353

follow them... As shown, it is an elitist mysticism, the mysticism of power and grace, reason slipping irretrievably in irrationality.

In the Romanian culture, the theory of elites has at least two determinations. One is just the general situation of the country before, during and after the War. Destiny had challenged us, and although we were in the desperate situation to disappear from the map of Europe, outstanding people, dedicated to the nation and country created the miracle of Great Romania. Among them were, as well known, politicians, and soldiers. To illustrate the Romanian mentality on the purpose of the man of elite, we refer first to a text of Nichifor Crainic about what Nicolae Iorga represented for the country in those crucial moments for the existence of the nation: "Iorga links our present tragic existence with the entire tragic existence of this people, which pierced out of pain, and recalls in our consciousness the harrowing and heroic resistance of our ancestors. It is not a speech, but an epic poem of dark and frowning grandeur, where the wind of history winnows the souls and shakes away the prickly husks of hopelessness. He does not promise victory demagogically, but calls for death because the life of those after us will conquer by death. The words of Iorga flashed in the dark disaster that had devastated hearts, and suddenly changed the face of this miserable world. The spiritual resistance and, why not say it, the military resistance were reorganized on his *moral* foundations. From that moment and until the end, Iorga became the *moral axis* of the war. There was no government, no anything else. There were only the words of Iorga, printed daily in *Neamul Românesc* (Romanian nation) from Iași. And because the paper was scarce, the newspaper was posted on walls, read by thousands and thousands of people, civilians and soldiers all together"<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Nichifor Crainic: *Zile albe zile negre. Memorii I*, Gândirea Publishing House, Bucharest, 1991, p. 121

Related to the first determination would be the need to create an explanatory model of the *nation's personality* – according to Dimitrie Gusti. But, as we have mentioned the name of the sociologist, we will detail the concept of elite proposed by him: "Society today cannot be conceived without a ruling elite, because the old, libertarian, egalitarian and fraternal society meets with a society in which *Authority* has been substituted to *Liberty*, in order to guarantee it better; *Hierarchy* to *Equality*, setting, however, the most righteous conditions for equal development of life and *Solidarity* cannot be founded without leaders, rulers, i.e. without elite"<sup>17</sup>. He does not see society as a whole, but considers that each *area of national activity* has elite and the elite have a leader, elected sometimes based in fluctuant criteria.

Gusti does not say anything new, but allows the correct construal of his system as a whole. The times we live – D. Gusti notices – require a new type of man, *a new man*. And it may be fully illustrated in the *social personality* of the leader animated and dominated by a tenacious will to be what he is, to be ferment of the social life, to create social and cultural values for the Nation and, finally, to commit to achieving, where appropriate, the social and national goals. The new man is, for D. Gusti, the perfect man to be followed, especially since the social crisis of the moment required him acutely.

Nichifor Crainic, sociologist, ideologist, professor of theology and intellectual of Christian origin, trained in the circle of the magazine "Gândirea", elevates this perfect man to superior level. In his opinion, this man should aspire to become the *heroic man* for whom the social criteria should gain the endorsement of the *social criterion* of Christian origin and essence. The features of *heroism* derive, mainly from undertaking the destiny of others so that the heroic spirit could

---

<sup>17</sup> *Annals of the Romanian Academy. Memories of the historical section*, series III, tom XXIII, Imprimeria Națională, Bucharest, 1941, p. 8.

“become a common good of a generation or of an entire people”. Without ignoring that each area of manifestation offers opportunities of heroic manifestation, he believes that politics is the lever to achieve good: "If politics is nothing but the action of a man or a group to raise the nation, with all means offered by the state power, then politics cannot be removed from the *moral* environment, because it is, *the art of the superior man to be in the service of the crowd*. Nowhere as in politics is the man given the opportunity to exercise their selfishness or altruism. The widest moral field, that opens for man to do good, is politics”<sup>18</sup>. Not long after expressing this idea, Nichifor Crainic would have to realize that politics offered vast immoral opportunities to do evil... Until then, he would have the time to develop a complex project of the ethnic state where the circulation of elites was to be carried out only within the dominant ethnicity, considered the only one entitled to manage the country’s interests.

In another project of greater fame and resonance related to the corporate state, Mihail Manoilescu emphasizes, from a corporate perspective, of course, that "the elite achieves social values through its *functions*, economic values through its *wealth*, political values through its *power*, and military values through its *courage and ability to command*, moral values through its virtues and cultural values through its *science*, esthetic values through its *literature and arts*." The elite must achieve an organic unity of power and purpose, to which the Romanian bourgeoisie is very poor: "Only the military function - which is one aspect of the political function - was met exclusively by the Romanian bourgeoisie. The political and cultural functions were penetrated and colored by Hebrew elements, which played an extraordinarily high role in the political and literary journalism. As regards the

---

<sup>18</sup> Nichifor Crainic „Despre demofilie”, in *Gândirea*, an XX, no. 1, January 1941, p. 2.

economic life, only a small part of it is held by Romanian hands”<sup>19</sup> . Just like Nichifor Crainic, Mihail Manoilescu says that the Romanians, as ethnicity, have the *right* and *duty* to undertake the project of the elite.

What was called by Traian Brăileanu and Pareto as *circulation of elites* is called by Mihail Manoilescu *selection of elites* and he also assigns a fundamental criterion: “We will not have elites until we have enough people able to support their beliefs, to suffer for them and to become famous in the public life through their nature”. However, his diagnosis is grim: “The Romanian bourgeoisie has to wait until the day it will become elite”<sup>20</sup>.

The theory of the *greater man* of Traian Brăileanu is very complex, but it also has different determinations. It attempts to keep the rhetoric of discipline (philosophy, sociology, history, political theory, etc.), but the immediate reality, the living history cause unrest, forcing him to make observations whose theoretical foundations and logical substantiation are not always in agreement with what he had previously thought. Hence, a conceptual *splicing* given that some ideas are for the use of the immediate and others to confirm previous theories.

If we refer only to his extensively developed writings, his fundamental works, his theory of the *greater man*, especially some of its elements, we may notice some lack of coherence, some dissolution of the essential in too frequent accolades. We will have therefore to identify it, where possible, in his general ideas about the *social man*.

Philosophy offers a clarification of the issue and a disappointment, as seen, in the wording of the “abstract man of philosophers”. And of philosophies, we might add... That, when speaking of the human being (about their spiritual powers, knowledge, personality, freedom, solipsism and objectivity), philosophers “talk

---

<sup>19</sup> Mihail Manoilescu: *Rostul și destinul burgheziei românești*, Cugetarea Georgescu-Delafras Publishing House, Bucharest, p. 277.

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem, p. 289

only about themselves, as they are at the moment of such philosophy”<sup>21</sup>, we can understand at *human level* and, most times, we except things to be accordingly. We can also understand why philosophers are unconditionally assigned, in some theories (considered utopian) the throne of kings and the ministry portfolios. But, built in the image and likeness of philosophers, in such constructions the man is not providential or reformer, the type of the Kantian man, for instance, “being the Prussian clerk in morals thought to do his duty and thus guaranteeing a perfect order”<sup>22</sup>. Perfect, of course, in the standards system of the Prussian clerk... Thus, this man will not reform anything ever because the man must tend to transform the external world into a world of objects “subject to their domination”, but, at the same extent, or even greater, to transform themselves, namely *to advance towards undertaken subjectivity*.

Leaving the abstract model, Traian Brăileanu reaches, in other ways, what he calls the subject of history, stating that it depends on the decisions and spiritual profile of the great personalities ("Napoleon made history") that may affect even the accounts of those who would then write the history. In other words, their personality does not deplete the natural resources even after the physical disappearance, an idea that he will repeat and reassess sometimes obstinately, as in this sentence: "Napoleon could decide to not leave for Russia; he could have died before this plan, etc. It would be said: but then the whole history of Europe would have been differently; no doubt, as the history of the Romanian literature would have taken another course, if Eminescu had not been born or had died of scarlet fever at the age of eight. It is the same with the history of physical and chemical sciences. Any new discovery is contingent. If Newton had died of pneumonia in childhood, the history of science would have taken another course; just as in the case of Descartes and Leibniz as regards mathematics, and if Immanuel Kant had become cobbler instead of a professor of philosophy, the relation of physical sciences and the moral sciences would have been different. And the same in the

---

<sup>21</sup> Traian Brăileanu: *Teoria comunității omenеști*, Albatros and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000, p. 66.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*, 315

case of Auguste Comte, Durkheim, etc., in sociology and moral or Adam Smith, Marx and Sombart in political economy”<sup>23</sup>.

Anticipating, we can say that the new man and greater man represent different instances of the same theoretical approach. The original idea from which Traian Brăileanu starts is how we evaluate the natural history and history, the first governed by laws, by the dictates of causality, and the second by self-sufficient and random events. The role of history would be only to establish the chain of events in time. And the dynamics of such chains is triggered by the exceptional personalities that change or reconfirm firmly the course of events, history, and it can be neither anticipated nor hurried, but, at the most, desired or rejected.

Leaving aside the political component of the theory of Traian Brăileanu about the new man, we will say that his destiny is to understand and follow the paths indicated by the greater man.

In periods of social calm, the metabolism of the elites' circulation is slowed. The new order in which the individual enters is not however tailored in advance. He inherits what he is given. But the metabolism is accelerated by upheavals that occur regularly, skepticism is one that erodes the current constructions, it also justifies "the individual's claims to be considered sovereign and autonomous, free from any obligation"<sup>24</sup>. In modern times, social and spiritual crises are more frequent, philosophical ideas penetrating in the masses and "unleashing ideas of theoretical subjectivism accompanied by practical individualism (selfishness)"<sup>25</sup>. In these conditions, the *social collapse* and the dissolution of spiritual communities become imminent. The reinstatement in terms of creative coexistence can only come from the *revival of Christianity* - Traian Brăileanu believes. To understand from this that the greater man will have the aura of a saint? Hard to believe, as long as, in modern society, he is shown, not once, with horns and hooves. It is true however that Traian Brăileanu does not climb this side of the theory and remains to demonstrate the need for affirmation of spiritual order. Any exit from crisis with

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 247-248

<sup>24</sup> Ibidem, p. 316

<sup>25</sup> Ibidem, 530

the help of people dedicated to other people, with the help of the communities' *educators*: "Every nation, every age has its great educators who, through their struggle against evil, profess their belief in goodness. They are martyrs that arise when people forget God and cannot be awakened to love and obey His commandments but through the supreme sacrifice of the best of them."<sup>26</sup>.

The relation between the greater man, charismatic leader and the elites is not unequivocal, although Traian Brăileanu says in his "Sociologia și arta guvernării" (Sociology and art of government) that, for developing the elite, "a leader must emerge and select it from the concrete social substrate". The greater man's appearance is not prepared carefully and thoroughly, with programs developed and tested in social practice, with complex experiments, but determined, required imperatively and unexpectedly by moments of crisis. Only after this decision, *regeneration* starts, the personality of the man of genius showing the way forward, as he is, at the same time, the guarantee of good choices.

While Traian Brăileanu develops his theory, sometimes correcting it, the general atmosphere of Europe reverberates, especially in the political discourse of the *leaders*, with ideas about the need to return history from its stumbled walk. The greater man of genius, the providential, charismatic man is the social and political product of large search and audience. Such a type of man, Traian Brăileanu considers, cannot be produced and promoted by Western democracies. Moreover, they cannot tolerate such man in their rigid social forms. The elites' circulation gains in these conditions, new meanings, because they have the vocation to meet the greater human, who will operate a rigorous and inspired selection.

The issue of the leader in "Politics" is approached more smoothly: "He who masters an art, namely it is master of the means to achieve a given goal, is a leader. Because he forges the path for the actions of the other individuals who aim at the same goal or for whom the achievement of this goal is connected to the fulfillment of needs which depend, more or less directly, on its achievement. The series of

---

<sup>26</sup> Traian Brăileanu: *Politica*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003, p. 263

actions leading to the individual goal is connected on a distance, differently from individual to individual, to the series of the leaders' actions"<sup>27</sup>.

To avoid making the charismatic man seem like a hypocrite, a charlatan who takes advantage of his characteristics to fool the crowd and drag after him docile elite, Traian Brăileanu leaves in the care of Max Weber to explain how things are. But the German cannot place the irrational in a rationally explanatory scheme and is content to just distinguish between *prestige* and *charisma*, seeing the latter only as an a priori form to make believable the *absolute superiority* of the leader.

What Traian Brăileanu says about the a priori and a posteriori grace of the leaders of the European spiritual revolutions, finally transformed into the princes of good will, of totalitarianism, is not justified by any of his really reasonable and inspired theses.

The entire work of Traian Brăileanu, though composed of relatively delimited sections and disciplines, is of unusual complexity. Without digressing, he manages to make the most unexpected connections, to give interferences unusual meanings. In chapters like "man and woman", "woman and philosophy", "cosmic crises and history of philosophy" or "the flat beings of Bergson", and in others, he opens unusual accolades which, under a more careful analysis, can be in the attention of the human sciences and sociology.

**KEY WORDS:** social system ,political regime, religion, tension, challenge, philosophic analysis, doctrine, ideology, philosophical issue

---

<sup>27</sup> Traian Brăileanu: *Teoria comunității omenеști*, Albatros and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000, p. 263.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Romanian Academy: *Studii de istoria filosofiei românești*, vol. II,
2. *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile secțiunii istorice*, series III, tom XXIII, Imprimeria Națională, Bucharest, 1941
3. Petre Andrei: *Sociologie generală*, Scrisul Românesc Publishing House, Craiova, 1936, p. V.
4. National Archives of Romania: *Stenogramele ședințelor Consiliului de Miniștri. Guvernarea Ion Antonescu*, vol. II, January - March 1941, Bucharest, 1998,
5. National Archives of Romania: *Stenograma ședințelor Consiliului de Miniștri. Guvernarea Ion Antonescu*, vol. I, September - December 1940, edition of documents prepared by Marcel-Dumitru Ciucă, Aurelian Teodorescu, Bogdan Florin Popovici, Bucharest, 1997
6. Nicolae Bagdasar: *Pro domo*, in the National Archives – Department of Central Historical National Archives, Fond N. Bagdasar, file 534, p. 4. Apud C. Schifirneț
7. Ion Banea: *Căpitanul*, Totul pentru Țară Publishing House, Sibiu, 1936
8. Daniel Barbu: „From the Politics of Science to Politics: the Difficult Make Up of the Romanian Political Science”, in *Studia Politica*, vol. II, no. 1, 2002
9. Ilie Bădescu: *Istoria sociologiei. Perioada marilor sisteme*, Porto Franco Publishing House, 1994
10. Ilie Bădescu: „*Teoria comunității omenești – un sistem de sociologie noologică*”
11. Helmut Braun: „Czernowitz. Die Geschichte iener untergegangenen Kulturmetropole”, Berlin, 2005
12. Traian Brăileanu: „Problema muncitorească în lumina doctrinei naționaliste. Schițarea problemei”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I., no. 3,
13. Traian Brăileanu: „Dezvoltarea elitei legionare”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 9, 1936
14. Traian Brăileanu: *Politica*, Prepared edition, study and notes by Constantin Schifirneț, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003
15. Traian Brăileanu: *Teoria comunității omenești*, Albatros and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000
16. Traian Brăileanu: „Sociologia și filosofia istoriei”, in *Studii de istoria filosofiei românești*, vol. II
17. Traian Brăileanu: *Elemente de sociologie. Introducere în sociologie*, Ostașul Român – Anton Roșca Publishing House, 1923

18. Traian Brăileanu: „Sociologia în învățământul universitar și secundar”, in *Revista de pedagogie*, year IV, 1934. References will be made in the following according to the excerpt appeared at the Mitropolitul Silvestru Publishing House, Cernăuți, 1934
19. Traian Brăileanu: „Ce vom însemna”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year 5, no. 1, April 1935,
20. Traian Brăileanu: *Sociologie generală*, Mitropolitul Silvestru Publishing House, Cernăuți, 1926
21. Traian Brăileanu: [Crezul proletar], in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 4, 1935.
22. Traian Brăileanu: „Idea comunității românesști”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 5, August 1935,
23. Traian Brăileanu: „Etica generală”, in *Revista de filosofie*, tom. LII, 2005
24. Traian Brăileanu: „Etica ascetică”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 6, 1935.
25. Traian Brăileanu: *Etica pentru clasa a VIII-a secundară*, National Publishing House -Ciornei S. A., Bucharest, 1935
26. Traian Brăileanu: „Problema economică în statul național”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 7.
27. Traian Brăileanu: „Circulația elitelor și Democrația”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 9, December 1935
28. Traian Brăileanu: „Studentii”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 9, December 1935, p. 12.
29. Traian Brăileanu: „Artiști și artizani”, în *Însemnări sociologice*, an. II, nr. 1, apr. 1936, p. 11.
30. Traian Brăileanu: „Formula statului țărănesc”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 2, May 1936,
31. Traian Brăileanu: „Marea neînțelegere internă și mica înțelegere externă”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 3, June 1936,
32. Traian Brăileanu: „Problema identității statului”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 4, June 1936.
33. Traian Brăileanu: „Puterea celor bogați și bogăția celor puternici”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 5, August 1936.
34. Traian Brăileanu: „Funcționarism și birocratism”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 7, October 1936,
35. Traian Brăileanu: „Martiriul Bucovinei”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 8. November 1936.
36. Traian Brăileanu: „Dezvoltarea elitei legionare”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 9, 1936,

37. Traian Brăileanu: „În fãgașul istoriei”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 10, January 1937, Traian Brăileanu: „Dictatură și libertate”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 12, March 1937.
38. Traian Brăileanu: „Tehnica politicei legionare”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year III, no. 4, July 1937
39. Traian Brăileanu: „Organizațiile paralegionare”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year III, no. 4, August 1937.
40. Traian Brăileanu: „Uneltiri criminale”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year III, no. 5, August 1937.
41. Traian Brăileanu: [Nu acuzăm...], in *Însemnări sociologice*, year III, no. 10, January 1938,
42. Traian Brăileanu: „Primatul ordinii morale”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year III, no. 11, February 1938
43. Traian Brăileanu: „Principiul ordinii sociale”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year IV, no. 1, September 1940.
44. Traian Brăileanu: „Singurătatea geniului”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year IV, no. 2, September 15, 1940.
45. Traian Brăileanu: „Națiunea și puterile sociale”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year IV, no. 3, October 1940.
46. Traian Brăileanu: „Doctrina legionară și știința”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year IV, no. 8, December 15, 1940,
47. Traian Brăileanu: *Introducere în sociologie*, Cernăuți, 1923
48. Traian Brăileanu: *Politica*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003.
49. Traian Brăileanu: *Teoria comunității omenești*, edition by Nicolae Mocanu, foreword by Sebastian Mocanu, introductory study by Achim Mihu and Ilie Bădescu, Albatros and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000
50. Traian Brăileanu: „Sociologia în învățământul universitar și secundar”, in *Revista de pedagogie*, year IV, 1934. References will be made in the following as per the excerpt appeared at Mitropolitul Silvestru Publishing House, Cernăuți, 1934.
51. Traian Brăileanu: „Statul și comunitatea morală”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, Cernăuți, 1937
52. Gh. Buzatu, Corneliu Ciucanu, Cristian Sandache: *Radiografia dreptei românești (1927-1941)*, FF Press Publishing House, Bucharest 1996
53. Ioan Cojanu: „Naționalism fără națiune”, Eurasia Publishing House, Bucharest
54. Miron Constantinescu, Ovidiu Bădina, Erno Gall: *Gândirea sociologică din România*, Didactică și Pedagogică Publishing House, Bucharest, 1974
55. Nichifor Crainic: „Despre demofilie”, in *Gândirea*, year XX, no. 1, January 1941

56. Nichifor Crainic: *Zile albe zile negre. Memorii I*, Gândirea Publishing House, Bucharest, 1991
57. *Critica puterii de judecare*, translation and foreword by Traian Brăileanu, Romanian Academy, 1940
58. Dan Dungaciu: „Traian Brăileanu și teoria elitelor (II). Reconstrucția paradigmei. Conflictul elitelor – Sociologia elitelor. Teorii contemporane (I)”, in Ilie Bădescu, Dan Dungaciu, Radu Baltasiu, *Istoria sociologiei – teorii contemporane (I)*, Eminescu Publishing House, Bucharest, 1996
59. D. Gusti: [Articol-program], in *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*, year I, no. 1, April 1919
60. Dimitrie Gusti: „Problema națiunii”, in *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*, year I, 1919
61. **Dimitrie Gusti: *Arhiva pentru Științe Sociale, Sociologie, Politică și Etică***
62. Traian Herseni: *Sociologie Românească*, Universitar Publishing House, Bucharest, 1936
63. Traian Herseni: „Sociologia”, in *Istoria filosofiei moderne*
64. Traian Herseni: „Concepția socială a Legiunii”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year IV, no. 5, 1940.
65. Traian Herseni: „Un sistem de sociologie etică și politică”, in *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*, year XI, no. 1-4, 1933
66. Institute of Philosophy: *Istoria filosofiei românești*, vol. II (1900-1944), part I, coordinators Dumitru Ghișe, Nicolae Gogoneață, Publishing House of Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1980.
67. Nicolae Iorga: „Principiul național. Originea și dezvoltarea sa”, in *Neamul românesc*, February 1917
68. Nicolae Iorga: „*Istoria românilor*”, vol. X, Bucharest, 1939
69. Immanuel Kant: *Întemeierea metafizicii moravurilor*, translation by Traian Brăileanu, accompanied by a biography and an introduction into the moral philosophy, Publishing House of Casei Școalelor, Bucharest, 1929
70. Titu Maiorescu: *Însemnări zilnice*, vol. II
71. Mihail Manoilescu: *Rostul și destinul burgheziei românești*, Cugetarea Georgescu-Delafras Publishing House, Bucharest
72. Gordon Marshal: *Dicționar de sociologie*, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, 2003.
73. Achim Mihu: „Traian Brăileanu, teoreticianul comunității omenești”, in Traian Brăileanu, *Teoria comunității omenești*, Albatross and Clusium Publishing Houses, 2000
74. Șerban Milcoveanu: *Învierea*, no. 3, 1996
75. P. P. Negulescu: *Istoria filosofiei contemporane*

76. P. P. Negulescu: *Partidele politice*, Garamond Publishing House, Bucharest, f. a
77. Z. Ornea: *Anii treizeci. Extrema dreaptă românească*, Publishing House of Fundației Culturale Române, Bucharest, 1996
78. M. Ostrogorski, known to us especially by his *La Democratie et l'organisation politiques* (1903).
79. *Doctorul Nicolae Paulescu sau știința mărturisitoare*, Bucharest, 2002
80. Grigore Traian Pop: „*Titu Maiorescu: Prelegeri de filosofie*”, Scrisul Românesc Publishing House, 1980
81. Grigore Traian Pop: „Neotroțkism și antiromânism”, in *Gulagul lui Socrate*, Niculescu Publishing House, 2011.
82. Grigore Traian Pop: *Reviste de filosofie și sociologie*, vol. II, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 1983
83. Grigore Traian Pop: *Revista de filosofie și sociologie*, vol. I, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 1979
84. Grigore Traian Pop: *Mișcarea legionară. Idealul izbăvirii și realitatea dezastrului*, second edition, Cullusys Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007
85. Grigore Traian Pop: *Gulagul lui Socrate*, Niculescu Publishing House, Bucharest, 2011
86. Sextil Pușcariu: *Memorii*, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest, 1978
87. C. Rădulescu-Motru: „Rasa, cultura și naționalitatea în filosofia istoriei”, in *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială*, year IV, no. 1, 1923
88. C. Rădulescu-Motru: „Cultura română și politicianismul”, in *Personalsimul energetic și alte scrieri*, Eminescu Publishing House, Bucharest, 1984
89. *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, no. 1-2, 1925
90. Etienne Rabaud: *Phenomene social et societates animales*, Alcan, Paris, 1937
91. Gaston Richard: [„Însemnări sociologice”], in „*Revue Internationale de Sociologie*”, no. VII-VIII, 1936
92. Constantin Schifirneț: *Sociologie românească modernă*, Criterion Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009,
93. Constantin Schifirneț: „Prima lucrare românească de teorie politică”, in Traian Brăileanu, *Politica*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003.
94. C. Schifirneț: „Studiu introductiv”, in *Politica*, Albatros Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003, VII.
95. Ion Scurtu: *Istoria României în anii 1918-1940*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, R. A., Bucharest, 1996
96. Constantin Stroe: „Etica și relațiile ei interdisciplinare la Traian Brăileanu”, in *Studii de istorie a filosofiei românești*, vol II
97. Vladimir Trebici: „Profesorul Traian Brăileanu. Viața și opera”, in *Sociologie românească*, new series, year IV, no. 4, 1993

98. Leon Țopa: [Corrado Gini...], in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 4, 1935.
99. Leon Țopa: [Libertățile democratice...], in *Însemnări sociologice*, year II, no. 8, 1937
100. Leon Țopa: „Legionarism și naționalism”, in *Însemnări sociologice*, year I, no. 4, 1935
101. Leon Țopa: „Misiunea Legiunii”, in „*Iconar*”, year III, no. 1, Cernăuți, 1937.
102. Corneliu Zelea Codreanu: „Cărticica șefului de cuib”, Collection: *Omul nou*,
103. Corneliu Zelea Codreanu: „Pentru legionari”, vol. I, the seventh edition, *Collection: Omul Nou*, 1990
104. Ștefan Zeletin: *Burghezia română. Originea și rolul ei istoric*, Bucharest, 1925

\*\*\* „Act de constituire a Ligii Poporului – 3 aprilie 1918”, in *Îndreptarea*, April 14, 1918.

\*\*\* „*Almanahul Cuvântul*”, 1941

\*\*\* *Din luptele tineretului român. 1919 – 1939. Culegere de texte*, Bucharest, Fundația Buna Vestire Publishing House, 1993