

## BOOK REVIEWS

### Ioana Cristea Drăgulin

*Crearea statului italian în viziunea lui Antonio Gramsci* [*The Creation of the Italian State in the Vision of Antonio Gramsci*], Adenium Publishing House, Jassy, 2016, 295 pages<sup>1</sup>

In advance of *Antonio Gramsci's Writings (1914-1926)* [standard Edition by Guido Liguori and Sabin Drăgulin: translated by Ioana Cristea Drăgulin, foreword by Guido Liguori, afterword by Sabin Drăgulin and Ioana Cristea Drăgulin (Jassy, 2015)] and integrated into the "Biblioteca Gramsciana" collection by the Adenium Publishing House, Ioana Cristea Drăgulin's volume confirms three *incidental nodes* that any reader must currently take into account when consenting, in resonance with the author, to the existence of a necessary and correct punctual/dotted exploration of historiographical materials allowing the (fragmentary and detoured) fixation of the essence of Gramsci's thinking.

The first represents a *sinafic act* of retrospective analysis, carefully allowing periodization, broad, generous (con)texts and multiple connections [thus knowingly avoiding the trap of narrow-mindedness and enlisting the Sardinian author into the ranks of a "too-full analysis" defining a "Communist bracket" – a publicist effect of fake and unfulfilled interest – see, to that effect, the clarifications presented by the afterword to *Antonio Gramsci, Writings (1914-1926)*, pp. 264-265]; the second considers filling the gaps and correcting any delayed, sequential perception by relying upon a *cascading effect* (Ioana Cristea Drăgulin continues her research into Gramsci's work, doctoral, post – guided and begun under the competent handle of Professor Gheorghe Stoica, and proposes, in this volume, an endeavor able to both articulate – in relevant and pertinent manner – and approach any patterns of thinking non-dependent upon Gramsci's limited reasoning); and, last but not least, one should mention the *double* and *doubled* involvement of the two Drăgulin spouses in the rebuilding, reconnecting, restitution and fair receiving of the Gramscian work.

Reviewed in *revolutionary, rebel* strokes (Guido Liguori), or as a *re-forged musical score* (Angelo Chielli) accompanying the title of "Marxist voluntarism" who features "a model learned at hand" (V. Tismăneanu alluded, in this sense, to that 'proletarian layer' able to develop cultural features – useful for a version of *elevated revolution* – upon a *background* of social context and in the *form* of political-social subjectivity, the impossibility of adequate resolution, and uninvolved subordinate categories unable to find alternatives), Gramsci's *xerography* is complemented by Ioana Cristea Drăgulin with landmarks illustrated by an interest in its effect as a marginal(ized) representative of southern society, produced and involved in difficult moments during the First World War.

The author distributes the volume's approach by targeting double interpretations/lecture notes and Gramsci's readings (an innovation upon classical methods), focused upon the phenomenon of a nearly-missed *Risorgimento* (on the one hand, a decisive rift between the regions of North and South – a report not limited by Gramsci to any specific/national/ Italian locus, but becoming an European issue – p. 50; a major gap, not resolved by any moderately liberal governments throughout a century of modernization – p.17; an issue managed by the moderately conservative classes to the disadvantage of popular masses – p. 103; and, on the other hand, the failure of the liberal democrat modernization project, which has led to the emergence of Italian fascism – p. 17): "for Gramsci, the Italian Risorgimento has been a crucial moment in the history of the peninsula. It represents the *time zero* moment of occurrence for the Italian state and nation. Therefore, this issue has been the main subject dealt with during its work (...). All the arguments used by Gramsci

<sup>1</sup> A further elaborated form of the present book review, in Romanian, is accepted for publication in "Transilvania", Sibiu.

prove that the entire historical journey of the Risorgimento was a failure” (p. 115). Noting the necessary mention according to which concepts of Gramsci’s nationality and internationalism lose (by amending the notions of territory, state, or nation) any attribute of dialectical complexity, far exceeding the stage of rhetoric or abstract philosophical terminology, and become history.

The accent assigned to any historical dimension does not devalue any of Ioana Cristea Drăgulin’s references, comments, or observations relating to the positioning of Gramsci’s theory inside the ideatic flow of contact with the cultural idealist movement, via the neo – Hegelians Croce and Gentile; reaffirming Croce’s influence upon Gramsci “used to create a mirror, innovative theory which aims to solve the main themes of the reflection of time” (p. 226). Accepting in/by Machiavelli both a *prendere parte* and a *parteggiare* reflex, Gramsci conceives and releases, in fact, a philosophical practice project seen as potent force – fit to change the historical reality itself.

In a Hegelian – Marxist, triangulate(d) (Croce–Gramsci–Gentile) manner, but still enjoying a median location, Gramsci uses an array of concepts/tools/“interpretive categories” – p. 270 (*historical blocks, lack of an agrarian revolution, the southern issue, hegemony, transformism, passive revolution, revolution without revolution*) as ways (arguments that rely on an appeal to historical phases) not only to “identify and analyze the components of a political project dictated by democratic liberals” or to demonstrate that “the project for creating the Italian state and nation was dictated by the Piedmontese and subsequently Italian state structures, without accepting any alternative” (p. 18); but also to be seen as an “alternative *Risorgimento* model” (*Machiavellianism with revolutionary impregnation*, we note).

In Ioana Cristea Drăgulin’s volume, a laboratory of creation and research, Gramsci’s concepts are thus supported inside guiding nodes/directories of chapter structure, assuming the steering/targeting function, which will punctuate the theoretical aspects of Gramscian thought.

The author presents the curriculum of Gramscian schools, closely follows the destiny which sealed the translation of *The Prison Notebooks (1929-1935)*, while at the same time noting the signals of Gramsci’s influence through its two landmarks, easily reviewed in the Rush Limbaugh–Michele Filippini dialogue.

If one were, however, to assign a value rating to the present volume, confirmed “as absolute novelty in the Romanian cultural universe, given that until today a volume treating in an organic and exhaustive manner the topic of the Risorgimento in Gramsci’s thought has not been published in Romanian” (Angelo Chielli, p. 14) then one must deliberately conclude that any motivations for studying the “Biblioteca Gramsciana” meet and propose the reintroduction of the Sardinian author in Romanian political culture, by the double act of translation and [here] interpretation, both able to put to work/advance scientific and objective tools.

*Viorella Manolache*

### **Magdalena Hodalska**

Cătălin Ghiță and Izabela Dixon (eds.), *Strangers on Our Doorstep and Strangers in Our House*, Inter-Disciplinary Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, 2016, 174 pages

Result of a double founder substances (both as *space and as energy*) – filtered through the project *Strangers on our doorstep and Strangers in Our House: Inter-Disciplinary Approaches to Fears and anxieties* – and meeting oriented roadmaps – *Fears and Anxieties in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The European Context* (Mansfield College, Oxford, July the 29<sup>th</sup>, 2014), the volume anticipates, by the very title it proposes (with an insistence upon both the plural “aliens” and the possessive “our”) a doubly adopted position: *on* and *in* – both particles indicating both braking (stopping – and an advancement of space towards the inside. Preserving central meaning of the binomial *extra muros / intra muros*, this approach complements the effect of imaginary mental geographies, loaded with psychoanalyzing doses of contemporary fears, phobias and anxieties, while at the same time operating a validation of the way: *Fear of Foreigners and Neighbors – Fear Strangers on Our doorstep*, and *Fear of Strangers in Our House – a haunted process – Strangers in Our House*.

Had one tried positioning the stages and substance of this volume in the vicinity of a music guide (inside a folder dedicated to the theme, with a roadmap dotted at intervals, depending on the demands and changes of configuration that the concepts involved both feel and perceive), *Strangers on our doorstep and Strangers in Our House* can be considered – up to a point – Gauchetian in substance and Sartorian in form. Gauchetian because it insists upon both subjectively inhabited and inter-subjective differences, thus pinpointing the sliding transition between identity and identities (articulating that *l'âge des identités*) as part of the idiom of *nov*-democracy, an equivalent of simultaneity – to reside indoor and claim the outdoor. Movements, metamorphoses and changes are felt in equal doses both inside and outside. Sartorian, in the sense of diagnosing the requests of any good / open society (the *degree of openness of the Open*) against a “*concordia discors*, enriched by consensus and fed by dissension” in which *pluralism* and *multiculturalism* are both *atitetic* and *denying*, fueling fears already irrigated the preservation of records showing that “foreigners are people who are not like us”.

Engaging the ideatic soil of named ideas *only-until-a-point*, because starting with the response referred to Sartori’s question “where we put them?” [*foreigners*, we note], the volume splits in two directions: *on Our Doorstep* and *in Our House*; and it chooses precisely this moment in order to affirm its specific particularities and polyphonical views on the possible configurations of the collective imaginary of convulsive reality, investing fear with essentially-guiding attributes.

*On Our Doorstep* offers an accompanying process for the *fear of alterity*, as both formula and *interplay* of contradictory trends that seem to reunite – in the European space – opposable directions involved under the signs of “revival of fear, nationalism and xenophobia” and translated by the same hybrid response mode (*openness – fear-based rejection of alterity*) already offered by the European community when faced with migration. The lexicon of crisis gives the impression that it extensively outbids its own concepts, pushing the limits of apocalyptic rhetoric fed by *political fiction* and the *securitizing fiction* effect (Stefania Alina Cherata, *Invasions and Tidal Waves: Fictionalizing EU Migration*, p. 9).

From customizing the *fictionalization process*, the volume is oriented toward problems, tensions and loads that the Post-Soviet Area (“fears and anxieties connected with economic development, political stability and security has factors making the post-Soviet states lean Towards Participation in a variety of regional integration Agreements both inside and outside” – Katarzyna Czerewacz-Filipowicz, *Fears and Anxieties Resulting in regional Integration in the Post-Soviet Area*, p. 52) not only latently contains, but proves incapable to sharpen / resolve. Certifying the existence of a spreading contamination of fear – “context of Moldova anxieties about the time further integration with the EU, Gagauzia’s will for separatism, the Ukrainian fears of the eastern Regions’ separatism, Romanian anxieties about Romanian-speaking Minority in Moldova, the EU Concerns about instability in the post-Soviet area and the Eastern border of Europe” (Agnieszka Konopelko, *The Case of Transnistria in the Context of the Russian Eurasian Union Project*, p. 25); both the signs and signals of *geopoetical* concepts loom large in a concept that, via Brian Holmes, has in its turn all the attributes of movement, and accepts all the rules and laws of movement (of “disorientation maps”), alternately referred to as a clash of Huntingtonian and Tofflerian shock waves.

Careful when analyzing any doses of recessivity undergoing an alloy of concepts, Cătălin Ghiță (*Afraid of the Other: The Untimely Character of Patriotic Poetry*) loosens terms and matrices, lectures subtleties and examines the essential contexts inside which poetically revealed and exacerbated (dangerous, flammable) confrontations of meaning take place in the space between patriotism-nationalism or between *Otherness – Alterity* (with all its Levinasian insistence upon clarifying concepts), reviewing geographic locations without any complexity – as in the case of “Manipulation of Fear through Patriotic Discourse”, at a par in both Western and Eastern Europe: “because of the didactic function of literature, which is, after all, the cornerstone of general education in school and therefore a firm, if somewhat biased, depository of axiology”, the study “holds that the traditional teaching of patriotic values under the auspices of literary studies subverts the very foundations of the cosmopolitan world that post-WW2 humanistic ideals have continuously sought to establish and defend” (p. 67).

A quadruple relay of state, tension, positioning and response that involves staring from both outside and inside a terminal *doorstep*, is doubled by the act of entry – in an *in Our House* area, a space haunted not only by spectral, demonic reflexes, but also by the import of feminine sensitivity attached to the concept of “home-at home”, which unleashes the energies of a “generational and gender-specific cumulative fear”. While trying not to over-emphasize the positive historical foundation of the *home-homeland* relationship, and at the same time recharging the registry of filmosophy as a hint and translation framework of relevant issues, the clear perspective offered by Clara Pallejá-López (*Genetics, Fear and Home: Gender-Conditioned Construction of Meaning*) changes the roll of film, highlighting its recomposing relationship to “prioritize fear of the *Other* over the *house* itself”. Sartori’s answers the question “where do we put them?” seems to further complicate and coinvolves the matter, given that the very space / house is the haunted, tense, impossible to thoroughly possess place.

If Izabela Dixon and Magdalena Hodalska (*Commitment to Self: What Language Reveals About Male Fear of Commitment*) doubles (up to a *role reversing*) the feminine questioning “what occurs when male sensitivity and courage is put to the test by their partners in the context of relationships and commitment” (p. 103), the last two texts focus on offering solutions and archiving results with corrective effect regarding the problems of *Anxiety in Children with Dyslexia: A Cross-Cultural Study Between Indonesia and Germany* (Shally Novita and Evelin Witruk), while appealing to “their personal and emotional development” (p. 134) and *Scientific Explanations of Fear and Anxiety Relating to the Choice of Deity*, with Sukran Karatas “arguing that the methods of the existing four types of ‘energy wave end boundary behaviors’ between the different mediums can be used to assess the authenticity of the relationships between the chooser and the chosen deity, which is vital for human health, wealth, happiness and social relations” (p. 141).

Designed in a dynamic-flexible manner, and *distanced from* sense interviews tributary to *the rule of versus*, the *Strangers on Our Doorstep and Strangers in Our House* volume supports, under the sign and meaning of *and* an unlocked but also accommodating positioning which, beyond being a solution, serves to reopen the file of texts and contexts for *fears and anxieties in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*.

Viorella Manolache

**Viorella Manolache (coord.), Mihai Bârsan (co-editor)**

*Ultimul Om. Nostalgii, Filosofii, Post-Politici* [The Last Man. Nostalgias. Philosophies. Post-Politics], Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale “Ion I. C. Brătianu” al Academiei Române Publishing House, Bucharest, 2016, 240 p.

In the Summer School’s compendium which was made by renown researchers from the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations “Ion I. C. Brătianu”, under the guidance of Viorella Manolache, the main triadic subject is that of post-humanist nostalgia, post-historical philosophies, extra/anti/post-politics. The fundamental endeavor in this particular situation is to answer the question of what remains after the humane, both the crisis of philosophy and the philosophy of the crisis, endisms as illuminating apocalyptic devices.

Regarding postmodern thinking, the post-/re- prefix has a sense of overcoming something and it dictates the direction of the psychoanalytic labor (p. 81). Intertwined with the deconstructive thinking, postmodern cogitation cannot be defined without expressions such as the ends of man (Derrida), the end of history and of the last man, our post-human future (Fukuyama), all of which show history as a process of evolution in the defining of the post-humane: the end of history, the return to the origins of the last man who shall come, the endings (as limitations and not as death) of man in the eros-thymos process, “from Renaissance to antihumanism as an aggravated form of mysanthropism” (p. 94), the interdependence between the human-posthuman-inhuman, the last book – and here comes to mind Derrida’s famous deconstruction as a sort of self-reading, the post-fundamental rethinking of politics as proposed by Roberto Esposito, the balance between political

and unpolitical (where the latter represents the end of the political chapter), the balance between apolitic and antipolitic, the multiple endings of philosophy as an “Heideggerian place for the fulfilment of history in the sense that it shall become a means of dealing with politics” (pp. 82-87), the fallen land described by Patrick Flanery – a sort of society we can imagine no better (p. 114), the liberal democracies and the thymotic requirements of the soul (the need for self respect and the need to be respected by others, for Fukuyama the equality of recognition being synonymous with equality of rights).

Foucault describes Nietzsche, Freud and Marx as *maîtres du soupçon*, as initiators of a new philosophical anthropology, which reveals man as an ephemeral and transient reality, characterized by a fractured self (*cogito blesée*, p. 14). From Ion Dur’s own lines we discover a Cioran bearing the Nietzscheian mark when addressing matters such as the nihilism which has generated “anti-intellectualism, agnosticism, subjectivity, irrationality, aggression” (p. 36), the introduction of physiology in metaphysics and the anthropological conception of communism; indignant with himself, the creator no longer finds himself in *Schimbarea la fașă a României*, but not due to psychological reasons, but rather under the influence of ideological anxiety (p. 31). The vision on politics overwhelms history and becomes a means through which history can save itself (p. 28), the only eschatological solution predicted by Cioran for Romania being national collectivism. The fragmentation is illustrated by the imoral battle between the volition of language (which exposes the different faces of the same idea – p. 41, a sign of death expressed only in the mother tongue, an excess of overlucid expression: *I don’t believe that I don’t believe in Romania*) and the will to destroy presences/affects (*Ibidem*).

The same fragmentation will guide the Levantino-Oriental Man’s destiny, a survivor of the MENA (The Middle East and North Africa – thought of as a sanctuary of terrorist movements from which ISIS was born and as location for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium’s Exodus (p. 59). His destiny is shaped on the model proposed by His Excellency Gheorghe Dumitriu, the model of “Mantra One plus One equals Zero” centered on the desert as a generator of emotions with the purpose of “human psychic sanitation” (p. 68). Ana M. Negoiaș operates a deep incursion into the characterology of the Islamic urban environment (on philosophical and religious grounds), emphasizing Naghib Mahfuz’s novel, thus imposing at a symbolic level the image of the Islamic city. The emphasis on philosophical and theological sources such as The Koran, Sunna, Shari’ah, Fiqh have deeply shaped Islamic society, producing a new way of organizing the Islamic urban environment (the main concepts analysed here are that of intimacy, social equality and solidarity, public and private property), all of which are aspects that explain the difference between Islamic and Western societies.

The central theme of this Universal History is, for Fukuyama, the development of freedom – the final stage of the freedom development means the end of the History (p. 109). Liberal democracies represent the most auspicious means of ensuring freedom and offer a purpose to all three parts of the human psyche. Isaiah Berlin reveals two types of freedom: negative freedom as acting without any sort of intermingling (the state does not interfere in the individual’s life and a man does not interfere in the matter of another man’s life) and positive freedom (the freedom to practise one’s will without the influence of external factors, the freedom to be a subject and not an object, freedom which depends on wealth and power). The degree of negative freedom depends on the possibility of imposing one’s will on another and of not respecting another’s will imposed on himself. For Fukuyama, the State’s role should be limited in terms of regulation (“the absence of justice as an ideal society should aspire to achieve”) in order to give as much freedom as possible to the economic sphere. The theory developed by Nozick – *entitlement theory of justice* – according to which individuals have certain rights and no one can do certain things without breaking their rights (a sort of political activity shown as overindividual finality according to James M. Buchanan, the making of a good society) characterizes today’s liberal society through “irreducible constraints of economy, a political regime which constantly calls for our consent and a plural cultural universe” (pp. 76-79).

There is the premise that the novel *Noi* belonging to Russian author Evgheni Zamiatin constituted the essential source for the most representative dystopia of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Freedom and happiness (key concepts which reveal the dystopian flow) are dissected, fathomed and

compared with an emphasis on the profound disharmony between them, a disharmony which is deeply portrayed in Zamitian's works. Part of this vision is also made by the critical reflection on the visual reflexes of kakotopic universe through exposing and explaining the family of specific terms: multi-universe, the inexistence of time, the planetary village – all in the endeavour to amass knowledge about existing links between archetype, reality and art.

The philosophic postmodern dialogue between particular and universal histories (an advocacy of pedagogical and civic dimension of history – p. 132) emphasizes the spirit of history, the way in which – either public or private – she imprints herself in the actual mentalities and becomes conscience and condition. Historians Antoine Prost (about concepts), H.I. Marrou (the sense of living), Alexis Philonenko (the tragedy of limit), A. D. Momigliano (the repercussions of thinking), philosophers I. Kant (historical reason) or F. Hegel (rational course) are all landmarks on the map of historical reflection, the liaison between history and memory, the conscience of present, of particular histories (the episode of Romanian concentration camps is most enlightening in this case, pp. 140-142), all of these mark their advocacy of developing civics by using the role, spirit and educative dimension of history.

Without humanity there would not be history and without philosophy there would not be a human being as an individual and total part of humanity (metaphorically speaking, the stitch reveals the netting, much in the same way as an ideal human individual expresses humanity – p. 153). The comparison between the modern and postmodern perspective on the term based on two points of view (conceptual and juridical), appealing to philosophers (famous through their ever-living capacity to be surprised – p. 147) who have pounced on the concept, all of these form a descriptive stitch vigorously entwined around the live metaphor of “dialogical humane being” and the terms which accompany it: humanity, becoming, the other and so on.

The crisis of European legitimacy and the future of democracy, the causes and ambivalence of communitarian future dominate post-political visions (as found in Richard Youngs, Paul Ginsborg, Jurgen Habermas) and in fact represent a postmodern reflection on millennial fears, which have marked the historiography of the Middle Ages. Presenting viable solutions to overcome crisis and to abolish anti-establishment movements is a challenge for today's researchers, especially since the Brexit points towards a dark future, the end of common European history. Lucian Jora gets involved in this post-political theme and analyses (based on diplomatic relationships) the changes of paradigm in public diplomacy, clarifying the differentiation between propaganda and cultural diplomacy, reflecting on the cultural identity of Romania, referring to Claude Karnooh's study on the cultural character and belonging of Romanian culture and Sorin Antohi's concept of Geo-cultural Bovarism. An ample synthesis of non-statal actors' role as entities that act in the sphere of International relations with a more important role in the post-industrial era is included in this study, to amplify the concept of competitive identity (Simon Anholt, p. 182) in the sphere of international relations. The shifts of paradigm in the cultural diplomacy field, the un-diplomacy, the digital diplomacy, the cultural industries or the concept of *soft power*, the national brand are all marks of this inductive enterprise.

The impact of technological development in political philosophy imposes the idea that such a complex development has greatly influenced population and private groups, as well as the political philosophy. The references (Norberg, Rosenberg and Ozveren, Schumpeter, Acemoglu) are the fundament of communication. Disruptive technologies, even those of general use, technological development, the pace of innovation and the technological index are thematical marks which demonstrate the magnitude of the technological phenomenon in contemporaneous society.

The end of history as we know it, the end of capitalism, of international relations, the assertion of paradigms in everything that means nowadays human society, the idea that the man who looks at himself in the mirror no longer sees himself, but the other or a multitude of people among whom he does not recognize himself – these are the marks which influence and condition the new ways of post-contemporaneous cognition. Where are we now, where are we heading to? To post-modernism, to an ahistorical era, outside of history? These are some of the questions or the perspectives which we can think about based on the lectures dedicated to *Ultimul om. Nostalgii, filosofii, post-politici*, debates which can constitute challenges for a secondary conference dedicated to the theme.

Raluca Niță

**Alex Mihai Stoenescu**

*Țigani din Europa și România. Un studiu imagologic*, Bucharest, Editura RAO, 2014, 446 p. ISBN 978-606-609-659-1

The Romanian research entitled *The Gypsies from Europe and Romania* conducted by Alex Mihai Stoenescu, is a full-fledged imagological study and, as a consequence, it approaches mainly the causes and the functioning of the negative image projections associated to a specific European ethnic group – the gypsies – one with an ambiguous status in general, a-national, extremely fragmented and rather diverse, included in the European states and recognized either as minorities or due to the concentration on a territory (which is, accordingly to the case, temporary, or recent, for one cannot talk about a proper attachment to a territory), or administratively or politically, within a larger nationality.

Alex Mihai Stoenescu documented this book seriously and this is the reliable starting point of research. His interpretations lead the reader among the diverse images of the gypsies as they are “seen,” entertaining a variety of perspectives, through numerous means: 1. through the image efforts of the community, which describe their people as *Roma* (although the term *Rom* – from *Romani* language – in conformity with the dictionary, means *man*), just an equivalent for the term *tigani* conveyed by the *Romani* language which is the word for word translation for the expression “gypsy language” from Romanian; 2. via the Romanian documents and the historical facts, pre- and post- accession to the European Union, as minority integrated in the legal and institutional mechanisms of the country, but one-directionally – from the state to the minority and not the other way around – and which enjoys in this respect the same rights and opportunities as the rest of the population; and 3. from the perspective of European documents, which do not discriminate this population politically, but just indirectly and administratively, according to the possibilities, priorities and interests of the European destinations states of the emigration. The problems associated with this ethnic group are often explained through a specific behavior. The author states: “(...) in the past a certain behavior of gypsies became manifest, different from that of the Romanians, both perceived and represented negatively and which nowadays is allegedly changed. This (biological and ethnic generalizations) cannot be admitted within the norms of current life, by the sciences of Sociology and History.” (p. 10)

Is there a systematic racial and social discrimination of the gypsies? To discuss this central point of research the author approaches the necessary distinctions between what the term “racial” presupposes and what the term “racist” presupposes, which meanings are involved in the phrase “racial discrimination” and which in the term “racism”. The difficulties met in approaching the problem of the gypsies in Europe are generated also by the amount and ambiguity of the legislation dedicated by the EU to this problem, a legislation in conflict with the realities, practices, conveniences and mentalities of the nations called to implement this legislation. (pp. 17-18)

The phenomenon of the gypsy emigration is part of the multi-faced problem, often accompanied by measures that disguise discrimination, speculating to this end the spirit of the European legislation. Alex Mihai Stoenescu notices the continuity of the Western medieval negative image, typical for gypsies, who, for instance, distract people with the fortune telling or with circus tricks to steal money or food.

But the Romanian realities indicate that there are gypsy men and women elected mayors or national and European Parliament Members, contradicting the idea of a predominance of prejudice and extremism. Extremist manifestations in Romania are the exception from the rule. “The problem in itself is not one of the gypsy elites elected or proclaimed in an EU nation, but of the poor ethnic gypsy strata from a nation about which the EU legislation affirms that supports discriminatory appellatives and forms of behavior in current social life and discriminations of access to constitutional rights. This is a subject of controversy between the European legislation and historical research, because the effects of the mentality and the relations of the majority with the gypsy ethnic group are not changed, despite the EU efforts, and we have to remind here, taking again the concrete example of Romania, that the phenomenon reappeared with all its behavioral aspects after the fall of the communist regime, although it was ‘frozen for four decades and the communist political system, grounded in a strict ideology, functioned more effectively in the matter of fighting racial discrimination, on ethnic or economic criteria.’” (p. 22)

The legislation cannot correct mentality, though. The author shows: “‘EU Strategy’ to which we refer here (Resolution 92/2011) approaches the matters concerning the integration of the gypsy minority in the national majorities from the nations where these people have citizenship, as well as the integration of the gypsies, as ethnic minority, in what are nowadays the so-called host-countries and could be named at least theoretically by the phrase European Community. And we are bringing this clarification due to a series of concrete situations to which the EU Strategy attempts to answer, how it is, for instance, the practice of forced expulsion of the gypsies with Romanian citizenship from France to Romania, with the argument that the expulsion is made on juridical grounds (illegal stay, illegal station, the abusive occupation of public or private spaces, infractions), while the conviction of the gypsies in Romania for different infractions and their media attention are considered racial or social discriminations.” (p. 65)

In December 22, 1989, the writer Corneliu Vadim Tudor accounted the perception of the gypsies that Ceaușescu was a Romanian. A Romanian communist journalist of Jewish origin declared that in the same evening that Ceaușescu was in fact a Tartar-Gypsy and not a Romanian. “Post communist Romanian society was projected by the regime installed in the evening of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December 1989 on the ideology of political fracture, in which were defined phantasms and diversions instead of the fighters in the name of the good (revolutionaries, democrats, pro-Europeans, pro-capitalists, etc.) and enemies of democracy (neo-communists, anti-Europeans, anti-capitalists, intelligence agents, ‘informers’ etc.), with an opportunistic purpose. The problem of the gypsies in Romania cannot be understood unless one considers the real social context in Romania, as it was projected in December 1989 and as it continues to this day, with small occasional amendments, as a general image.” (p. 25)

The present research proves that the image of the gypsies has an increased complexity: it includes the heroism of the gypsy who does not steal although the opportunity presents itself, or the image of the likable gypsy, as that created by the Romanian actor Jean Constantin, a particularly popular actor, cast only as a golden heart gypsy, but who occasionally relates to tiny thefts and misdemeanors (see the movies “Haiducii”, “Brigada diverse”, “Comisarul”); or the image of the accepted gypsy, seen with understanding, for the gypsies “have to live, too” and it is necessary the stand up of many more people against xenophobia and social discrimination. This complex image stays in stark contrast with the image of the operative tolerance of the Romanian Police to the minor infractions of the gypsies, or that of the tolerance generated by the tactical collaboration among police officers and petty criminals, involving less or no sanctioning, with the purpose of control and ensuring rapid sources of direct from these social strata, in the cases of serious crime, arresting the attention and interest of the majority, whenever it is not quite a corruption situation or it is not a question of weakness from the part of the Romanian authorities.

In an interesting interpretative perspective, the author underlines a crucial idea: “(...) ‘the gypsy problem’ was treated as a problem of those states which wanted to adhere, not as a general-European problem, which the reunited nations should commonly know and resolve. What is going on at the moment – the recognition of the general-European character of the gypsies’ problem – is an attempt to resolve it post-factum by the returning to the principles and criteria that were to be placed at the foundation of the European Union in OSCE, but not separately. It tends to exclude the discrepancies between the principles of the European legislation and their approximate and tedious application in the ‘gypsy problem’, either by a lax approach in the East, or in the form of the restrictive approach in the West.” (p. 110)

The very human communion, and not just the quality of the human communion, depends on the alleviation of the prejudice concerning the races. Nonetheless the dare contrasts between the two ways of life – European (modern) and gypsy (traditional) – indicate an increased probability for the perpetuation of the shortcomings in the resolution of the gypsy problem and of the negative image of this ethnic group in the near future.

*Henrieta Anișoara Șerban*