

STÉPHANE OLIVESI (dir.) (2013). *Sciences de l'information et de la communication. Objets, savoirs, discipline*, ediția a 2-a, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 304 p.

Unul dintre cei mai apreciați profesori în domeniul științei politice și al comunicării din Franța, actualmente director al revistei științifice „Politiques de communication” (<http://www.revuepolitiquesdecom.uvsq.fr/>), editată la Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, este Stéphane Olivesi, care a desfășurat în paralel cu cariera sa din învățământul universitar și profesia de consultant în comunicare pentru diferite organizații. Astfel au luat naștere numeroase articole de specialitate, precum și șase volume de autor, dintre care amintim *Histoire politique de la télévision* (Paris: l'Harmattan, 1998), care reprezintă versiunea pentru publicare a tezei sale de doctorat, *Questions de méthode. Une critique de la connaissance pour les sciences de la communication* (Grenoble: PUG, 2004) și *La communication au travail. Une critique des nouvelles formes de pouvoir dans les entreprises* (Grenoble: PUG, 2002) – publicată și în ediție românească sub titlul *Comunicarea managerială. O critică a noilor forme de putere în organizații* (București: Editura Tritonic, 2005).

Lucrarea pe care o prezentăm aici, ajunsă la a doua ediție, este coordonată de S. Olivesi și reunește studiile a douăzeci de coautori, între care și coordonatorul, fiind organizată în trei părți, conform indicatorilor din subtitlu: *objets, savoirs, discipline*, fără a se dori un „manual” de științele comunicării, ci mai degrabă o creștomajie de actualitate a tuturor disciplinelor obligatorii în programele universitare de specialitate în acest domeniu, din Franța, precum și abordărilor teoretico-metodologice promovate în spațiul francez în domeniul comunicării. În plus, spre deosebire de un manual, volumul propune o abordare critică asupra tematicilor selecționate, în sensul unei analize a rezultatelor studiilor și cercetărilor care se concentrează pe implicațiile sociale ale diverselor forme de comunicare.

Partea I, cea mai extinsă din volum, aduce în discuție următoarele tematici prioritare: publicurile mass-media (Jean-Pierre Esquenazi), practicile culturale și medierea (Michèle Gellereau), informare și documentare (Jean-Paul Metzger), raportul jurnaliștilor cu sursele (Roselyne Ringoot și Denis Ruellan), comunicarea politică (Jacques Le Bohec), comunicarea publică (Caroline Ollivier-Yaniv), comunicarea teritorială (Isabelle Pailliart), comunicarea organizațională (Nicole D'Almeida și Yanita Andonova) și extinderea domeniului comunicării prin *Web* (Christine Barats).

Dintre acestea, conceptul de *mediere* este insuficient explorat de literatura română de specialitate, motiv pentru care am ales o rapidă trecere în revistă a implicațiilor acestuia. Atât procesul de mediere (fr. *médiation*), cât și cel de mediatizare (fr. *médiatisation*) presupun intervenția unui intermediar pentru facilitarea comunicării și, deci, a accesului la informații, cu diferența că mediatizarea implică și instrumente de ordin tehnic specifice sistemului mass-media (dispozitive). Spre deosebire de accețiunea curentă asupra medierii – care poate fi interpretată atât din perspectiva raportului cu un sistem, generând mediere socială, cât și din perspectiva construirii de sens *via* unui proces interpretativ –, în domeniul științelor comunicării și în accețiunea propusă de volumul prezentat aici, medierea „are la bază faptul că sensul nu este imanent obiectelor, ci se construiește prin intermediul subiecților care interpretează [*sujets interprétants*] în cadrul unor procese, grație limbajelor și dispozitivelor”, articol de M. Gellereau, p. 27. Studiul proceselor de mediere în relație cu practicile culturale actuale este recomandat de aceeași cercetătoare, Michèle Gellereau, în sensul în care „noțiunea de mediere permite reflectarea asupra articulațiilor și concepțiilor diversificate ale culturii”, p. 40, generând mediere culturală, care nu poate fi redusă la simpla mediere instituțională a culturii.

„Revista română de sociologie”, serie nouă, anul XXV, nr. 3–4, p. 365–371, București, 2014

Partea a II-a a volumului propune cinci incursiuni teoretico-metodologice riguroase care dau seama de caracterul interdisciplinar al științelor comunicării: o abordare socio-economică a industriilor culturale și mediatice (Bernard Miège), un studiu asupra „antropologiilor comunicării” (Stéphane Olivesi), o istorie a mijloacelor de comunicare în spațiul public (Roger Bautier), analiza de discurs în științele informării și comunicării (Simone Bonnafous și Alice Krieg-Planque), semiotica și analiza comunicării mediatice (Guy Lochard și Jean-Claude Soulages).

Partea a III-a, dedicată disciplinei științelor comunicării în Franța, cuprinde două capitole, primul dedicat unei abordări istorice privind instituționalizarea disciplinei (Robert Bouré), iar cel de-al doilea unei cartografii a domeniului (Pascal Froissart), realizată pornind de la statisticile oficiale franceze privitoare la specializările universitare și profesiile din domeniul comunicării. Din acest ultim capitol, reținem, în special, statistica referitoare la tematicile privilegiate ale celor 900 de articole publicate de cercetătorii francezi în *Anuarul cercetării în informare și comunicare* (SFSIC, 2002): noile tehnologii ale informării și comunicării (35%), analiza de discurs (22%) și studii teoretice în domeniul informare-comunicare (13%), urmate de comunicarea organizațională și abordări socio-politice ale comunicării (*cf.* Froissart, p. 285–286).

Volumul rămâne unul de referință în domeniul de specialitate, reunind contribuții ale unor nume mari din Franța în cercetarea contemporană a comunicării. Cartea surprinde astfel o istorie în curs de desfășurare a câmpului disciplinar al științelor comunicării și a profesilor corespunzătoare acestuia, într-o abordare eminent franceză, care se înscrie în aceeași istorie națională a domeniului.

*Valentina Pricopie*

THANASIS APOSTOLOU (editor), *Drug Policy and Drug Legislation in South East Europe*, Nomiki Bibliothiki Group, Greece, 2013.

The book edited by Thanasis Apostolou is a collection of studies based on the cooperation between the Diogenis Association (Greece), NGOs participating in the Drug Policy Network in South East Europe and the researchers affiliated with research institutes and universities in the countries in South East Europe. The countries covered in the volume are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Greece, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia. The structure of the volume is a simple and somehow didactical one – the summary of the findings is presented at the beginning of the book and, after that, each country is presented in a separate chapter, while each chapter follows the same internal structure of information.

One can notice the vast academic and empirical effort to set up such a substantial book. In the case of each country analyzed the authors compared the relevant national strategies on drugs, national substantive criminal legislations, national drug laws and institutions, as well as drug law enforcement in practice, sentencing levels, and the prison situations.

As it is stressed in the book, the criminal justice systems in the countries of South East Europe have different legal traditions and there is great diversity in all countries in the typology of the penalties imposed according to the legislation. In all countries, the criminal legislation contains provisions concerning cultivation, production and trade of drugs (trafficking) and, for some of them, or even for the majority of the countries, there is no legally established difference between small and big dealers of drugs. As all the authors reported in their chapter, cannabis production and use is dominant in all countries of the region in the period of time analyzed.

In each chapter the problem of drug-use in prisons is clearly defined and presented. At the level of all South East European countries the reader can see that there is a great diversity in the provision of treatment programs for drug dependent prisoners.

As regards the social reintegration programs for drug dependent prisoners, the situation is worse. As the native authors notice, the social reintegration programs for drug dependent prisoners could be characterized as incoherent for most countries in the region. The lack of official data in this respect (with the exception of Croatia) makes more difficult the planning of adequate programs in this domain.

All countries covered by the volume have adopted a National Strategy regarding Drugs after 2000. The majority of them have also adopted Action Plans for the implementation of the above-mentioned strategy. Nevertheless, only some countries have evaluated their strategies and action plans and, additionally, only few of them have formal evaluation mechanisms. This situation leads to a gap which exists in practice between the strategy and the practice concerning drugs, and in this respect, all the authors agreed, the role of NGOs and civil society is vital for the future development in the region. Despite that, the relevant national authorities and the state recognized agencies and service providers are cautious in their reactions concerning proposals for change which are considered to be contrary to the international conventions and here they enter in a formal contradiction with the NGOs and civil society from each country.

The remarks of various authors of the volume stressed the fact that in many countries from South Eastern Europe NGOs have dual positions in drug issue: On the one hand, the NGOs wish for reform in several areas, but, on the other, they are concerned about the general feeling of the public concerning decriminalization of drugs.

At the same time, the relevant national authorities in all countries and the relevant agencies in the region are careful in their reactions concerning proposals for changes to the law which are considered to be contrary to the international agreements the countries had signed.

There are several issues which need to be regulated further due to the fact that the present situation in each case is unclear. The authors referred to the decriminalization of drug possession for personal use, the help for the drugs users and avoiding imprisonment, and the introduction of supervised consumption rooms. There are no unique directions for practically solving those issues, as the authors of the chapters showed in the volume. In each case it is important to consider both the changes in legislative system and the active involvement of the NGOs, which is different in each country.

At this point we find the most critical aspect of the state's and NGOs activity related to drugs – that is, the available resources for drug supply reduction and drug demand reduction in South Eastern Europe. There is another practical contradiction between, on the one hand, the balanced national strategies on the reducing the drug demand and supply of drugs and, on the other hand, the imbalance which exists between supply reduction and demand reduction (prevention, treatment and rehabilitation). Here again the role of the civil society and NGOs seems to be a vital one but, as the authors of chapters from the volume stressed, there cannot be recorded an improvement of NGOs activities in this domain.

Unfortunately, a final chapter (with concluding remarks and future directions of development for action) is missing from the book. In the *Preface* (p. VII) the volume's coordinator announces a new volume devoted to supraregional comparisons meant to explain the reasons underlying the NGOs role in identifying the factors necessary for effective reforms in the domain. We hope that the new book will provide the necessary information from a comparative point of view.

To conclude, the volume offers first-hand information on a domain of great importance for the good functioning of a society – the drug problems. As such, it fills an existing gap in the scientific literature and offers not only interesting comparative elements about the issue at stake but also some practical guidelines for future development. We reiterate our hope that the second volume, centered on the supraregional comparisons will be soon published and made available to the public.

*Valentina Marinescu*

DIMITRIE GUSTI and contributors – *Cornova 1931*. Edited by Marin Diaconu, Zoltán Rostás, Vasile Șoimaru, Chișinău, Quant Publishing, 2011, 852 pages.

The volume *Cornova 1931*, the title page of which lists Dimitrie Gusti and his contributors as authors, was edited by Marin Diaconu, Zoltán Rostás and Vasile Șoimaru, and appeared in the second half of the year 2011 at Quant Publishing, Chișinău. By taking a quick look at the contents, we note that these contributors have deliberately chosen from different fields and time intervals. Thus, the studies of Ernest Bernea, Xenia Costa-Foru, Ștefania Cristescu, D. C. Georgescu, Anton Golopenția, Traian Herseni, Ion Ionică, Domnica Păun, Mihai Pop, Henri H. Stahl, D. Șandru and Petre Ștefănuță are alongside the immediate reports of events dedicated to the monographic campaign at Cornova and alongside its contemporary reception written by Grigore Botezatu, Lina Codreanu, Iordan Datcu, Marin Diaconu, Sanda Golopenția, Iulia Mărgărit, Dora Mezdrea, Zamfira Mihail, Zoltán Rostás and Vasile Șoimaru.

At present, the canons of academic research are rather governed by the principle of deconstruction and *restitutio* gestures are rare, readers in the social sphere cannot but admire the efforts of editors Marin Diaconu, Zoltán Rostás and Vasile Șoimaru to carry out one of the intellectual projects of the Gustian School. The volume *Cornova 1931* represents, from this perspective, the terminus point of an editorial path that has had at least three more major episodes over eight decades. The first one dates from the fourth decade of the twentieth century, when, in a letter dated June 21, 1931, addressed to Ștefan Ciobanu, Dimitrie Gusti asked for a contest to choose:

“a village in Bessarabia suitable for our monographic research that will take place there this year. We are looking for an old village of free peasants, who call each other Captains, and that is situated next to a monastery”. [p. 584]

That is why, between June 25 and August 13, 1931, the seventh monograph campaign, organized in the framework of what posterity would call the Sociological School of Bucharest, was held under the leadership of Dimitrie Gusti and with the participation of fifty-five people at Cornova. Campaign results were the subject of monograph lectures and conferences, which were held in Bucharest, under the aegis of the Romanian Social Institute, on Wednesdays in the months from January to April 1932. Posters and reports of these lectures and conferences are included in the reviewed volume between pages 411 and 462, revealing to the reader that the idea of a future monograph of the Bessarabian village was announced by Gusti on January 16, 1932, in the discussions that followed the projection of sociological documentaries about Drăguș and Cornova:

“A filmed Romanian sociology of villages would stand beside the series of publications: the monographic sociology of Romania that will inaugurate its publication with the three-volume monograph of the Bessarabian village of Cornova, thanks to the generosity of the American Rockefeller foundation (a monograph which we hope will provide the deciding argument to those who still do not know how old Romanian Bessarabia is)” [p. 417].

The conferences resulted in studies, printed in 1932, comprised in the tenth volume of the *Arhiva pentru Știința și Reforma Socială* [*Archive for Science and Social Reform*] and, in the coming years, in *Sociologie românească* [*Romanian Sociology*] and other specialized publications or even in books.

The second episode in the attempt of writing the monograph of the village of Cornova occurs only six decades later, when, under the auspices of the Dimitrie Gusti Foundation and in the coordination of Ovidiu Bădina, the resumption of research in the Bessarabian village was attempted and the volume *Cornova. Un sat de mazili* [*Cornova. A village of the deposed*] was published in 1997. A third episode of the same monographic project took place in 2000, when the Museum Publishing

House in Chișinău printed a book under the coordination of Professor Vasile Șoimaru, *Cornova*, written by a group of authors: Ion Dron, Alexandru Furtună, Iurie Colesnic, Zamfira Mihail, Elena Ploșniță, Petre V. Ștefănuță, Vlad Pohlă, Grigore Botezatu, Anton Golopenția, Sanda Golopenția-Eretescu, Henri H. Stahl, Emil Turdeanu, Ernest Bernea, Pompilu Gâlmeanu, Paul Bran, Ion and Tatiana Varta.

Representing in a way the fulfilment of the interwar intellectual project, the volume *Cornova 1931* constitutes an improvement in comparison with the works of 1997 and 2000, not only because of its size (852 pages, of which 815 represent actual text and 35 are visual speech – the landscape seen by the photographer Berman, and a few contemporary looks), but especially because of the editorial formula adopted, that structures the text into four distinct parts.

The first part, from pages 7 to 400, called *Studies*, opens with a text written by Dimitrie Gusti – *Sociologie românească [Romanian Sociology]* – in which he explains the theoretical concept of the School, and which is followed by the articles of the monographers, published originally in 1932 in the *Archive for Science and Social Reform*. These articles were put in the order of the Gustian system of contexts: biological (D.C. Georgescu – *Evoluția demografică a satului Cornova [The Demographic Evolution of the Village of Cornova]*), historical (H.H. Stahl – *Vatra satului Cornova [The Hearth of the Village of Cornova]*), psychological (H.H. Stahl – *Despre Inochentie și inochentism [About Inochentie and Inochentism]*; P. Ștefănuță – *Scrisori de război [War Letters]*; E. Bernea – *Contribuții la problema calendarului în satul Cornova [Contributions to the Problem of the Calendar in the Village of Cornova]*), and of spiritual manifestations (Ștefania Cristescu – *Practica magică a descântatului de “strâns” în satul Cornova [The Magical Practice of the “Ingathering” Incantation in the Village of Cornova]*; Emil Turdeanu – *Un manuscris miscelaneu necunoscut [An Unknown Miscellaneous Manuscript]*; Mihai Pop – *Contribuții la studiul limbilor speciale din Cornova: păsăreasca [Contributions to the Study of Special Languages in Cornova: “Păsăreasca” Language]*), of units (Domnica I. Păun – *Țigani în viața satului Cornova [Gypsies in the Village Life of Cornova]*), of relations (Traian Herseni – *Categoriile sociale cornovene [Cornovan Social Categories]*) and of social processes (Anton Golopenția – *Aspecte ale desfășurării procesului de orașenizare a satului Cornova [Urbanization Process Development Aspects of the village of Cornova]*).

Without insisting on the contents of these texts, we only point out that we are dealing with some of the best works of the monographers: these are texts containing *in nuce* topics that they will further develop in their later work and which will provide the grounds for their theoretical or methodological reflection. For instance, the research of the issues of the Cornova calendar carried out by Ernest Bernea will underpin his later works *Timpul la țăranul român [Time for the Romanian Peasant]* (1941), *Cadre ale gândirii populare românești [Contexts of Romanian Folk Thought]* (1985), *Spațiu, timp și cauzalitate la poporul român [Space, Time and Causality for the Romanian People]* (1997). Henri H. Stahl studies the techniques of geodesy, developing his “social archaeology” project, which he will later elaborate in the three volumes of *Contribuții la studiul satelor devălmașe românești* (1958–1965). Anton Golopenția, being at his first monographic research in Cornova, is the first Romanian to study urbanization, a socio-economic and cultural process, to which he will later dedicate interesting notes in the *Marginals* of the issues of *Romanian Sociology* between the years 1937–1939 (Cf. Anton Golopenția, *Opere complete. Vol. I: Sociologie*. Edited by Prof. Sanda Golopenția, Ph. D., introductory study by Prof. Ștefan Costea, Ph. D., Bucharest, Editura Enciclopedică, 2002, p. 420–438). The three case studies by Ștefania Cristescu discuss, very technically, different aspects of the phenomenon of incantations in the village of Cornova: the social construct of the magical agent, the frequency of magic formulas and, respectively, the type of the “ingathering” incantation. Giving a glimpse of a theoretical and methodological concept of sociological origin, without neglecting, however, especially regarding incantations, the acquisitions of the Philological School of Ovid Densusianu, the articles, together with subsequent research plans, with the texts of communications and five hundred observation sheets, will form the body of the volume *Descântatul în Cornova-Basarabia [Incantation in Cornova-Bessarabia]*, edited by Sanda Golopenția in 1984, and, in a revised edition, in 2003.

We consider the following three big sections of the book to be of a very special value, namely *Despre a VII-a campanie monografică [About the Seventh Monographic Campaign]* (pp. 403–590), *Portrete sociologice [Sociological Portraits]* (p. 593–748) and *Monografiștii. Fișe de dicționar*

[*Monographers. Dictionary Files*] (p. 749–722), because they reconstruct the context of research and bring together not only textualized, finished ideas, but also a bit of the work that was put into them; not only the finished work, but also its editorial aspect, or work in progress, and the process of its reception in different times, too; not only the fulfilments of the Sociological School of Bucharest, but also its stumblings and failures.

The second section of the book, – *About the Seventh Monographic Campaign* – represents an attempt to reconstruct the intellectual effervescence raised by research in Cornova by grouping texts edited on other occasions, and many of them unique, into various generic categories: announcements of conducting conferences or their brief reports, reviews of publications, obituaries, log files, observation sheets, letters identified on the field by monographers or letters exchanged between each other. Especially these epistolary exchanges will be, from this time on, unavoidable documents in any social history approaches of the Sociological School of Bucharest. For instance, in a letter addressed to Dimitrie Gusti, quoted from pages 400–406, Henri H. Stahl questions even the monographic method, as it was conceived by the mentor, showing him the practical limitations:

“A reclassification is needed, and for the upcoming campaign we will have to greatly reduce the number of monographers. In fact, it was your opinion, too: twenty monographers working efficiently are more than enough. The large number of participants brings an administrative strain that is not rewarded by the labor input accordingly. When there is more than one person working on a single issue, everyone hopes that the others will do the work. When there are few, each works in all areas, to the maximum. At least I, unhindered by administrative concerns, can now work not only on my problem, but on those of the others, in a completely different way and more prolifically than before”.

Furthermore, reading the same letters allows the reader to approximate the researcher-subject relationship during monograph campaigns, and the impact of this kind of research on the investigated community or daily fieldwork. I quote again, in this sense, a larger fragment for its novelty and savour:

“Nevertheless, Professor, I am doing quite well, although a bit alone. And if I happen to sprain a leg, then I enrich the folder of magic with files, because I get healed by dirt taken from the roots of a plum tree, boiled with flax oakum, and I am taken to all the women who enchant (by age and social status). I get along extremely well with the villagers. The knights of the first class, from the whole region, won’t organize a dance without me. They call me, and I am forced to do demonstrative dances, like we dance in Bucharest, in boots, with damsels who are barefoot. You know that in the village there is a fashion of the monograph: with buttoned-down shirts, rolled up sleeves and cut brims, *i.e.* hats in the forms of berets. This is a costume worn by elite knights of the first class. Vineyards haven’t started yet. But people are already preparing wine in small barrels, so that they have some by the harvest. The drunkenness in the village is generalized and appalling. At night, the whole village yells: monographist songs. They gather to pluck feathers, to spin, where I take part. Sometimes, lads cut themselves and come to me to whine. I put iodine on their cuts and complete files on morality. Thus, the village is completely different now, in autumn. Pathetic, but interesting”.

The *Conversations* section in the same part contains clippings, focused exclusively on the monographic campaign at Cornova, of the interviews that were conducted by Zoltán Rostás with the monographists of the Sociological School, starting from the 1980s. The importance of the selected fragments lies not only in the fact that they motivate, criticize, evaluate the results of the research from several, often contradictory, perspectives. The motivation of the choice of the Bessarabian village as the space for research is briefly exposed by Henri H. Stahl:

“Cornova was, without a doubt, interesting. It was a completely new thing, because here we have to deal with the problems of a village that suffered because of the strong, cultural and administrative Russian influence. There you had a number of issues that were non-existent in other regions” [p. 493].

Furthermore, the interviews show how the land of Cornova was by how it was received by such or such monographist. Thus, for Stahl, Cornova was “without a doubt, interesting” [p. 493], as it was for Mihai Pop and Roman Cressin, who thought of it as a “very interesting village of free peasants, purely Romanian” [p. 504], for Ernest Bernea it also marks the beginning of his scientific career:

“Cornova was very interesting; it launched me as a scientist” [p. 501].

Gheorghe Focșa highlights the major differences of Cornova as compared to other investigated villages, noting that “there was another environment at Cornova. A completely different environment” [p. 504], while, for this same reason, it was a disappointment for Paula Stahl:

“It was something completely different. The village was a village, because it was not paved, there was no sewerage, the houses were small, but for me, especially, it was desolation. I had nothing... not much to do around there, they were dressed just as people dress in the cities, with skirts and blouses or complete dresses made of linen purchased and tailored there...” [p. 503].

On the contrary, Marcela Focșa, who studied almost the same segment, remembers something else:

“Cornova was very funny (...) The atmosphere was relaxed, friendly, cheerful” [p. 498–499].

The *Conversations* show how monographists actually worked and had fun, where they stumbled in the implementation of the monographic method, and also how they theoretized the various aspects of social reality and what was the impact of their works in time. Regarding the latter, criticizing the comments of Panaitescu and Giurăscu on the forms of joint property, Stahl notes:

“What is a Romanian village? There is not only one Romanian village, but there are multiple forms of Romanian villages. And then you have to know which these forms are. For this, you need to do research; you have to be a sociologist, not a historian. The documents don’t always clear up things sufficiently. You must have in mind the living image of the extraordinary differences between villages in the Romanian countryside today. There is no comparison” [p. 495].

I also call attention to the section of *Sociological Portraits*, masterfully compiled by Zoltán Rostás for Dimitrie Gusti, Mihai Pop, Henri H. Stahl and Octavian Neamțu, by Sanda Golopenția for Ștefania Cristescu, by Dora Mezdrea for Dumitru Cristian Amzăr and by Lina Codreanu for Gheorghe Focșa. We dare say that, beside these seven portraits, the work also contains another two, depicted in a less precise manner: one of the priest Ion Zamă – a figure that obsessively follows the reader a long time after reading the book; the second is that of Petre Ștefănuță, a portrait that is emphasized through the eleven texts that belong to it, which are included in the pages of the book.

All these above mentioned aspects, as well as many others that can be discovered by reading the book, demonstrate that the editors of *Cornova 1931* found the best formula for achieving what Gusti called, at the same conference of January 16, 1932, [p. 416], a *sociological monograph*, i.e. “a synthesis in time and space of a part of a country”.

*Cosmina Timocea-Mocanu*

