

BOOK REVIEWS

Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith (eds.)

Between Deleuze and Foucault, Edinburgh University Press, 2016, 304 p.

The present endeavour is designed as an assembly imbued with a positioning series and, in doing so, takes advantage of a dual method: the first resorts to a limiting stylistically-relational analysis, banking upon the registry of individual coordinating junctions (the conjunction *and*), indicating both a just report of interference, set between the two *topics* (of interest) in a parity-relationship – and also introducing a further addition, with explanatory value; the second exposes the effect rendered by the presence of a prepositional ratio (*between*) placed in proximity, suggesting as median the very interval of a reciprocity. Not at all incidentally, the volume is self-defined as an attempt to explore a particular type of relationship (not ignoring the foundation of a *rapport*), which, overtaking any philosophical or biographical connections, investigates the “critical shortage” correcting it by launching a *nov* context, a novel *locus* of renewed debate, of rigorous comparison between the works of the two philosophers.

Using as a starting pretext the Deleuzian way of referring to Foucault, the volume appeals to the construct of “between...” for a demonstration of a strong, but also revealing relationship (p. 3), characterized through a *decisive parallelism* (as reason and motivation), awarded to a set of open inquiries with respect to the manner in which the two philosophers refer to: desire and pleasure; structuring the conceptual insight, the ideation expression and the use of terminology; settlement of tensions created and maintained by the delivered fundament/form; semantic structural differences or distinctions; differences imposed by two essential concepts – *dispositif* and *agencement* – and an appeal to the conceptual structure of intersecting, overlapping or mutual exclusion – considered to be, either relevant strategic options, or ways of differentiation between philosophical homologies (p. 3).

What prevails, however, is the political difference-without-excluding-relevant-similarities, revealed either by the statistical controlling act of *biopower*, or by post-disciplinary forms of modular flexible control – *societies of control* – both being concepts with an alternate value. Convergences and alternate differences are entered in this way into the *corpus of a literature about* – Foucault *and* the reviewer-reaction-response in Deleuze, *and* Deleuze about Foucault – both, not only with a target of philosophical thought-reporting, but also with a desire to reassert the reflective nature of a friendship marked, towards the end of Foucault’s life, by a regretted, mutually accepted silence.

By evaluating its dosing formula, the volume does not omit the Judith-Revelian image of a game of mirrors, with shading reflexes of thematic similarity (at some point), of conceptual and relational reflection transfers, with a role in oblique exposure reporting, through a deliberate junction operating from different positions (François Dosse, pp. 23-24). But it settles only secondarily its mirroring game, through the *direct* involvement of a quadruple clarification regarding: the balance between the two parties in relationship – Foucault *about* Deleuze; Deleuze *about* Foucault; justification of the substance through analysis dedicated to methodology and critique; convergences and divergences reported at different levels, as deepening the concepts of *desire, power, resistance*. Chapters referred to shall be added the *appendix*, with the aim of revalorizing Deleuze’s interview, taken by Paul Rabinow after Foucault’s death, an initiative complemented by some introductory notes of the interview author with regard to the context and the analysis of dialogue (in the same sense of the *and...* rule – Foucault *and* Prison – Gilles Deleuze *and* Paul Rabinow, pp. 288-294).

What prevails as an order of *between* is precisely the manner in which the *intelligentsia* interacts with the designs of *power*, a coordinating relationship in its turn, *but also* tempting when it offers a perspective reporting to *understanding* – with a Foucault understood only partly, to a limit whose opening is obscured by the very valuing of its closure problem, with a totally misunderstood Deleuze who Foucault saw as clearly as possible – through the Deleuzian levying

of the act of differently living the relationship between theory and practice, of perceiving how the problem arises in a different way *for us*, detached from accepting similarity, and appealing to a different kind of discourse, by accepting multiplicity inside the person who is acting/speaking, germinating the relay/network ratio.

If, for Foucault, in the order of knowledge, of truth, of consciousness and of speech, the theory will not express, translate or apply as practice, being itself one in what, for Deleuze, is equivalent to a *box of tools*, with the practical difficulties which reside, for Foucault, in not knowing what is *real power* (who exercises it and where), and, in the words of Deleuze, from an explicit lack of interest of those who paradoxically support and claim it, but assume just a tiny weight parcelled out of it. Foucault certifies complicated desire-power-interest relationships, finding the unknown *median of the desire for power* – lying between power and interest – with the dull perception of desire; in Deleuze's view, pivotal are the networks, the transverse links between the active-discontinuous points of revolutionary movements. If, in Foucault's sense, the generality of the struggle cannot be expressed or reproduced in the form of theoretical syntheses (assimilated, in Deleuzian manner, to the truth), but is translated/manifested by the power system through all its forms of exertion and application, from Deleuze's filtering angle any confrontation with the above-mentioned diffuse ensemble cannot avoid the applicative touch of any point positioned on the axis of power/truth.

Foucault's approach in *Theatrum Philosophicum* (pp. 38-59) is complemented by the Deleuzian recourse to the central concepts of Foucault (pp. 59-72), calling for the *median act of reading* – Antonio Negri, in the translation of Kristopher Klotz (pp. 72-87) – of delivery of a three-operability transmitted by the convincing conclusion that *between Deleuze and Foucault* there operates a mutual, agreed-upon, tolerated *reciprocal imprinting relationship, but also a state of discord and disagreement, against the background of irreconcilable differences*.

Without being innovative as a way and a working formula (p. 6), the present volume is a tribute to the offer proposed by Paul Patton and John Protevi, in their work *Between Deleuze and Derrida* (Continuum, 2003), based on the existence of multiplicative points of contact and resonance, traceable both in the philosophical labour undertaken and in the primacy of a common generational depth inside a shared intellectual *medium*, which exists without emphasising, in the background, the placing of frontal dialogic situations, usually concise or reduced in time, featuring as stars the two philosophers already mentioned. *Between Deleuze and Derrida* creates a space of intersection conducive to the onslaught of frontal debates (standard approaches or interpretations of the history of philosophy being targeted here), appreciated by Giorgio Agamben from the perspective of different reactions triggered by Heidegger. In a differentiated, cultivated way, the purposeful selection and value hierarchy of thinkers of reference, to whom the philosophers are reported in the context of traditional philosophy which complements it and is proposed as finality, often sharing the same reaction explicitly oriented against an imposed/learned didacticism and a standard study of the history of philosophy. The stylistic, intellectual and political force of the space *between* is exposed and settled by the/through its degrees of critical-differentiated reception.

The unique/innovative appearance launched by the volume *Between Deleuze and Derrida* is deepened by a parallel settled in/through *Between Deleuze and Foucault*, in the idea of duplicating cross-sectional communication with a horizontality of inventoried co-linear-philosophical points/nodes which impart an equilibrium measure to *between* and its *and*.

But, more than that, the present approach can be accommodatingly placed in the structure of the Foucaultian formula, capable to operate with an act of reporting to Deleuze – to re-narrate Deleuze's book and resort to the re-invention of fables – by positioning Theseus in the right scene/scenario that allows him to stay in the space of *between* (although *going forward, limping, dancing and hopping*), whose coordinates are *asymmetrical, tortuous, irregular, mountainous and steep*.

Like a collage, the text of Deleuze “is something else”, which can be considered both a possible return to philosophy-theatre, an appeal to “character quotes” (“never in the same place and with the same identity”), and provided with ironically inserted inflections, the “tearing of the veil” – a picture that thinking had created about itself, by a transforming and decisive act –, generating the landmarks of beginning and of wandering – “which is the end of philosophy (that of representation). Incipit philosophia (that of difference)” –, rethinking the decisive intensities.

From here emerges a triple irrigating role of *between*, as shown by *Foucault on Deleuze*, and seen as a form of *work* by the present volume: *unable* to capture its full merits, the intensities and

critical reports of the philosophers (“I can, however, realize that my fable doesn’t fully recognize the merits of Deleuze’s book”), attached to *the possibility* of valorising a sequential interval look; the act of recovering a report guided by *and*, through reading and critical networking (“pushing the doors of a theatre when the limelight is on and the curtain rises”), through the circumvention of *reflexive appearance* and an invocation of the unique model...Thus, the interval created *between...and* delineates the space in which it can find, define, complement and play, in both Deleuzian and Foucaultian manner, with “the differences that we are, the differences that we do, the differences between which we wander”.

Viorella Manolache

William Green

Contraceptive Risk. The FDA, Depo-Provera, and the Politics of Experimental Medicine, New York University Press, New York, 2017, 322 p.

Everyone sometimes gets sick, visits a physician or takes medicines. We do these things because we have to, but also because we believe that they will help us. In other words, we trust modern medicine. For many people it is as simple as that. But, is it always actually that simple? Is using a medicine always 100% effective? When we think about it that way, we immediately reply no and we are ready to give at least several arguments why. Because someday we took a medicine and it did not work. Because we took it and it did work but only temporarily. Because we heard that some pharmaceutical company swindled and produced false medicines. Because we are aware that there is an instruction attached to every medicine, from which we can find out about its side effects. Nowadays, there is even a trend to look for the swindles of pharmaceutical companies and to expose them. Some people write books about them among which there is a fantastic position written by Ben Goldacre, entitled *Bad Science*, in which the author unmasks and denounces deceiving practices of contemporary pharmacy. After reading it, we can boldly add other arguments to the previous list, especially that companies, while informing clients about a drug, use imprecise or euphemistic data about experimentation results (if there even was any experimentation) or the expected effects of use. In the light of such information, I think we need to ask one question: what is taking medicines? Logically speaking, it is a probability. Every time we take one, we have some chances of success. In this sense, taking medicines, just like many others activities, is risk management. Exactly such an understanding was proposed by William Green, Professor of Government at Morehead State University in Kentucky, in his book entitled *Contraceptive Risk. The FDA, Depo-Provera, and the Politics of Experimental Medicine*.

For Professor Green the most interesting and also controversial drug was Depo-Provera, a hormonal contraceptive method used also as a part of menopausal hormone therapy. It may be taken by mouth or by muscle injection. Although it is a commonly available, cheap and often prescribed method of contraception, there are a lot of health risks connected with its use, among which the most dangerous are osteoporosis, breast cancer and the increased risk of HIV acquisition. Marketing and using Depo-Provera, hence, raises many controversies and is in fact one of the longest and major disputes about a drug in the history of the United States. The controversies are being raised not only by the possible negative consequences of Depo-Provera use, but also because it is often injected to patients without their full informed consent. Although the so-called Depo-Provera odyssey lasted about 50 years, during which medical standards unquestionably increased across the world, even nowadays there are cases of its application without patients’ informed consent¹. What are the social consequences of such situations? Based on his long-lasting studies, Green answered that there are three main areas in which Depo-Provera causes conflicts. The first is science court, and its practical field was Federal Drug Law. In the

¹ For instance, see some examples from Poland: <http://www.rodzinko.pl/antykoncepcja/3053-uwa-ajcie-antykoncepcja-metod-depo-provera.html>; https://forum.trojmiasto.pl/depo-provera-t69953,1,45.html?is_mobile=0; https://f.kafeteria.pl/temat/f9/depo-provera-p_803773/10.

author's book that part of the story was told by Dr. Judith Weisz, a reproductive biologist, who struggled against the legalization of Depo-Provera for many years. Second is State Civil Law, which serves mainly women whose health suffered from Depo-Provera's side effects. As Green demonstrated through the story of Anne MacMurdo, their efforts usually are endless and do not give any guarantees. This is especially because even if a woman receives a judgment in her favour, pharmaceutical companies may subject such demands to the appellate court. The last area presented by the author is State Criminal Law. To illustrate problems connected with it, he used the case of Roger Gauntlett, a sex offender who refused to be subjected to sterilization through the application of Depo-Provera. Based on these three different stories, the author tries to demonstrate how risk management appears from the state's perspective, although he tries not to repeat the basic mistake of separating values (e.g. moral) from facts. Instead, he demonstrates how do different values – such as population control, product reliability, dignity, human experimentation and reproductive health – compete. After five diligently elaborated chapters illustrating the intricacies of the Depo-Provera story, the author proposes solutions to the impasse, which – however simple and brilliant, such as prescribing the medicine only for women who meet a baseline bone mineral density requirement – do not find hearing until today.

The book structure is well developed. The author's intentions to thoroughly present and discuss the Depo-Provera odyssey were fully realized, but mainly due to exhaustive and multifaceted stories told by the aforementioned persons. That particular element reveals the biggest flaws of the book. First of all, it clearly lacks a conceptualization, by which I mean theoretical foundations. Despite the fact that the author touches a topic that perfectly illustrates relations between politics, law and science, it is not clear why he did not summon, e.g. Foucault's concept of power/knowledge that in major part explains how these kinds of relations are strengthening each other. Confronting them with the difficulties raised by the policy of risk management, especially with the author's examples of physicians who refuse to execute judges' sentences to sterilize sex offenders by the application of Depo-Provera, would show that the Foucauldian concept of power/knowledge may not always be valid. Respecting some moral values may cause a resistance that breaks the circle of incorporation into power relations. It should be admitted that the author tried to conceptualize his work by proposing a different approach towards risk management, but it has no theoretical grounding after all. Another major flaw of the reviewed book is that despite the fact that Green's work evidently aspires to be in a scientific position, it lacks methodology. It is a perfect case study but mainly descriptive, which means that it does not explain too well why the lobby supporting Depo-Provera is so strong despite the long history of objections and struggles against it. These downsides however do not exclude the book. It is rather contrary. Despite some flaws it is definitely a must read for any political scientist interested in biopolitics, especially if focused on institutional aspect of health law and policy, as well as the politics of measuring and managing risk. First of all, *Contraceptive Risk* is a book which shows the whole new dimension of biopolitics. In Green's book it is presented as a dynamic practice involving all political subjects which together create their environment, usually by contradictory struggles. As such, it is different from top-down policy making or governing populations in which the category of competing interests is not that much important. The reviewed book also points our attention in the direction of doctor-patient relations. Beside the tendencies described by Michael Sandel to commercialize them², there still is a maintained paternalistic way of thinking about patients, for which Green gives compelling empirical evidence. On the other hand, his study shows that medical failures encourage people to educate themselves and take sovereignty over their own bodies and health. In such manner, biopolitics today becomes more dispersed, dynamic and interrelated between various areas of social life.

Ultimately, Green's book is a story that reflects the complexity of the biopolitical dilemma. It is a great inspiration for all scientists interested in that topic, and literally provokes one to undertake more studies to further develop this sub-discipline. It has some flaws, but they do not change the fact that not many authors propose as refreshing an approach as Green did. Definitely a must read.

Bartosz Płotka

² See M. Sandel, *What Money Can't Buy. The Moral Limits of Markets*, Penguin Books, London, 2013.

Ioan Alexandru Tofan

Spiritual Experience and the everyday world. Michel de Certeau, Eikon Publishing House, Bucharest, 2017, 246 p.

The present, continuing approach (covered by folds and deployments revealing the urban world presented in/by *City Lights. About experience in Walter Benjamin*, 2014, and *Words, things, images. Critical theory in Walter Benjamin and Theodor W. Adorno*, 2015) advocates a privileged reading, based on a dual formulation (here, with the meaning of *modus lectionis* – see p. 220), which is explained by reference to the landmarks of a transverse doubled clarification. The first aspect of interest concerns the existence of the text-score, and specifies the voice (*voix du texte*) of a settling *fable*, a content about which the image-symbol revealing itself *speaks* to the reader-interpret and exegete. The second grouping has, in view of the answer given by the lecturer about that grid appropriate for textual scrolling which lays down the technique and the stages of research – *strategy/structure* and/or *tactics/practice* – by maintaining an un-syncopate dialogue: just *practice/tactics* applied to the act of reading thus initiated and settled, involving/attracting the reader into the world-universe of the text, giving it autonomy, personalizing it in relation to the meanings exposed, and *turning it into the Demiurge* (p. 223).

If we were to agree on the essence of the present volume's unity and of the substance which feeds, balanced, the two component parts (*apparently*) independent [religiosity is maintained and centrally placed, subsumed to rhythmicity (ontological – phenomenological – historical) which is three-phased-competitive] – *through a single concept* – we would opt for a particular, *intermediate* type of investigation, individualized just by its ability to receive critically, to filter and to restore the circuit of knowledge, with a *détente* exercised by the parting between experience and secondarity (see the category of the intermediary and creative receiving, the community of those *hommes du mixte*, pp. 102-104), by the very act of significant re-coding, of voluntarily-assumed filtering, of private re-contextualization and renewed re-communication.

Thus transfigured, the symbolic representations of the two *Demiurges/revelators*, present in poses to which *Michel de Certeau, through Ioan Alexandru Tofan*, attaches a possible response to the questioning – *how to create yourself?* (p. 83) – by an elucidation of the origin of the author's theoretical “presuppositions” and the manner of their operation, as filters of interpretation for the understanding of historical phenomena and everyday events (*Ibidem*). *Ioan Alexandru Tofan, speaking of Michel de Certeau*, is determined to overcome chronological errors, the presuppositions sought by clarifying his origin in the thematic sphere. This is overshadowed precisely by the temptation of the author himself to indicate and give meaning to the concept of the *pivotal spiritual role* and the *decisive place*, using the comprehensive method of the fingerprints/textual traces (in this case, with reference to the time of 1954 and to the influence Pierre Favre or Jean-Joseph Surin). But, continues the *voice* of Ioan Alexandru Tofan, who concludes that “every time Michel de Certeau pays attention to a new *object* of research, these assumptions are modulated in a manner that is original, fresh, without losing the coherence of the original” (p. 84).

Ioan Alexandru Tofan's *voice* impregnates with median-moderate inflections [*intermediating*] with sense/critical content a cartography of *the urban inhabited by the sacred*, in the idea of de Certeau's continuity, his present search for a lost place, a historiographic operation (equated to a space of re-conversion of time, the paradigmatic-epistemological detail that causes, initiates and maintains significant travels – pp. 28-29) that fix the correct coordinates of the [*place*] *from which we talk* (area of non-identity with itself for the present, or a limit for extracting a logic of determination, which adds that interpretative *sight* able to focus on the alliance between writing and history, intensified by the optical effect interplay between the real and the foreign *corpus* of the book – p. 26).

Hence the stakes of this publications: *to talk* “about a fascinating, subtle and labyrinthine author” (Jesuit, philosopher, historian, anthropologist, cultural critic, psychoanalyst-by-ricochet, in the sense of an impossibility of limiting-all-the-way the pathways of communication between history and psychoanalysis, or revolutionary symbolism – with contextual-university references to the May '68 moment) and *to see*, “at least in part, the paths of daily life through which the Other

sneaks into the world and to which Michel de Certeau discreetly hints". Affirming equidistant positioning, "somewhat in the middle", research values in equal measure *exultance desire/passion* (through a grid of assumed subjective readings) and the *itinerant formula of objective-sombre, ascetic exegeses* (pp. 5-6).

Reflection given to the religious is allotted (only formally) to *secularization* – with all the reluctance manifested by the French philosopher with regard to both the substance and the use of the concept of *secularization*. The resistance is connected, in Geffré-ian manner, to the decisive option formulated for investigating the singularity of the historical event, to the detriment of the Hegelian dialectic origin of the *sacred-profane* relationship – a term invested by Ioan Alexandru Tofan (without avoiding *the radical project of weak theology* – pp. 187-190), with generic offerings of modern structural changes engineered in a space of legitimization and institutionalization of religious discourse – p. 8). The structurally *weak* characteristics of the religious act lie, in the writings of Michel de Certeau, in the acceptance/disposal of *the everyday* to accommodate, indecisive and fragile, through the transversality of multiplicity and event, *the religious*, the *hard* reflexes of culture, science and politics, being assimilated to/equivalent to phantasmatic mechanisms (*spectral*, in a Derrida-rian sense – see the chapter *Meanings in the mirror: Hegel and Derrida*, pp. 225-233).

The Other intervenes and maintains, by determining the critical gesture, *the tension between the religious fact and the world* – ("the opening of the original language to otherness involves a de-structuring of the relationship between the signified and the signifier, of the *objective* rapport between language and reality. Without disappearing from the scene, the ruin of knowledge becomes, by the assertion of the mystical, a form of negativity and of the fragment, which shows the marks of its own damages" – p. 14) – *history* being subjected to a process of creation, re-discovery and re-definition, depends on the very mechanisms of the formation of the timeline, through the duality of the report with *Other* (p. 31).

This is a double act of reading, with clarifying-guiding valences: *the location of mysticism between the noun and the adjective* (p. 49) and *the manner of reading the fable*.

From the alternation of noun-adjective, de Certeau selects and supports the status of the adjectival, fluid, subversive and uncertain project which provides the location of the speculative discourse – *what remains of the ruin of the basilica is following the traces drawn by an angel in the snow*; the adjectival construct, re-charged by plurality, is re-delivered, semantically worked and apt to be placed in the subtext of epistemological scenarios of modernity (p. 57).

De Certeau's preference and insistence on *mystical fables* demonstrates just his Freudian – Lacanian infatuation, materialized as an intervention re-calibrated and subsumed to a process induced by the mystical literature of the 15th and 16th centuries, as a strict precaution: not to translate its *own* concepts into other disciplines, to keep the distance with respect to impregnation with encyclopaedic and seemingly interdisciplinary effects (p. 23). Preserved in the privacy of its *own* space, *the mystical fable* meets *the historical fable* only through a pretextual mediation which involves intersecting *the Other/Another* (p. 35), without blurring the status of indicator/textual identity assigned to the word *mystic*, and without missing the mechanisms, rules and devices of the space thus in-formed, and of the *locus* of the everyday world (p. 52): "a *division* between reason (*raison*) and fiction (*fabulation*) constitutes now the reference for integrating religiousness in this new *place* of enunciation" (p. 44). Infinitely mediated, *mystique* is (not the truth, but) the knowledge, capitalizing the excess of the Other, the foreign language and the presence of the fantastic character, the role reversal being "rather the setup of obedience than its recording" (p. 78).

The voice of Ioan Alexandru Tofan sets the place and comments on the significance of the contemporary religious phenomenon, extracting, from his reading of de Certeau, just the day-to-day symptoms of *the absence of the mystical fable which announces the Other* and of the *revelation* received in the act of gestural and discursive re-composition. But, equally, it does not give up on what (is) *seen* in/through *visibility*, fragmented-contaminated by characters, as a median way/mode of engaging in the act of re-identifying the *seen* – *trace* with the *heard* – *whisper*.

Viorella Manolache

Aurel Sasu, Liliana Burlacu and Doru George Burlacu (eds.)

Politică și cultură [Politics and Culture], Școala Ardeleană Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca, 2016, 794 p.

Edited with accuracy and precision by Aurel Sasu, Liliana Burlacu and Doru George Burlacu, the recent anthology *Politică și cultură* [Politics and Culture] gathers Romanian texts that illustrate, on a timeline spanning from early to late 20th century, a perennial love-hate relationship. Indeed, the two public spheres the title is pointing at – politics and culture – seem to reject and attract each other in the same degree, while both their agents and commenters are barely capable to explain this particular symptomatology. In most cases anthologized here, those called to have their say on this difficult matter are either distinguishing between the two spheres or simply overlapping them, sometimes with very similar arguments. Needless to say that all attitudes are polarized and fuelled by fierce passion and that, within this harsh controversy, disengaged and light-hearted people are a rare find. Unfortunately, as all texts indicate, not only politics, but also culture (and its particularizations in the field of literature) harden the hearts of all people who get involved in their labyrinthine business. Sometimes, to the edge of accepting impairing compromises and committing horrible scaffoldings. I would start by remarking that, although directed toward a specialized readership, this anthology has also a fine narrative character due to its judicious chapter design. Press articles, essays, correspondence, interrogatories, and various testimonies about the transition from democracy to dictatorship are organized in eleven chapters that tell the story of the two concepts, chiefly of the way in which they have been reflected by the public discourse all along the 20th century.

The first chapter (“Literature and politics”) gathers correspondence and articles signed by Romanian personalities before and after World War II, from I. G. Duca to, say, M. R. Paraschivescu and M. Beniuc. While reading these considerations regarding the legitimacy of political intrusions into the field of literature and vice-versa, one might feel that ideas are prone to touch a high degree of generality, which mines the most elevate critical style with common stock phrases. For instance, the texts bearing T. Arghezi’s signature (pp. 42-55) fall into a mannerism that completely obstructs the reader’s understanding of references.

The second chapter (“The Writers and Politics”) has obviously been framed up in order to enhance the distinction between the domain of literary life, on the one hand, and the writers/intellectuals’ personal commitments, on the other. In fact, the chapter gathers texts that ground on this demarcation, showing at the same time that while the debate upon the relationship between literature and politics (illustrated in chapter 1) usually generates common stock opinions, the relationship between writers/intellectuals and politics stands on a more personal level of commitment. Accordingly, commenters such as Paul Zarifopol, Sergiu Dan, Constantin Noica, Virgil Ierunca, or Camil Petrescu do their best to prove that the writers’ political opinions should be judged contextually and, why not?, taken with a pinch of salt. However, the fragments from Paul Zarifopol, C. Noica, Hortensia Papadat-Bengescu, and other consecrated names are rather dull and predictable. By far, my favorites have been Sergiu Dan and Camil Petrescu, the former for the fizzy humour of anecdotes regarding the involvement of writers into political business, the latter, for the modernity of his approach to intellectual labour. In point of fact, Camil Petrescu brings to the fore a particular, albeit pretty unperceived, issue concerning the writer’s unbalanced way of working. Reflecting its organic growth, its periods of conception and emergence, its climate, role, and function, “a statute of the intellectual labour” should be formulated not only philosophically, but also legally (pp. 151-158). Beyond its ideological context, the discussion about intellectual labour and particularly about the artists’ work-life balance sounds actual and worthwhile resuming now in the 21st century.

Entitled “Black Profiles”, the third chapter – which, together with the eighth, represents the most perplexing part of this book – contains texts showing how post-World War II “purging” happened and who, among the people of the new communist regime, acted and wrote in the most fanatic way. Put side by side, the articles published by Ion Caraion, M. R. Paraschivescu, P. P. Stănescu, Iorgu Iordan, N. D. Cocea, Marin Mihalcea and by other VIPs of the emerging Romanian

proletcultism make a patchwork of slander and violence. Public personalities consecrated before 1946 or suspected of having affinities with either the Nazi regime or the German culture in general – this is the case of Liviu Rebreanu, Nichifor Crainic, Sextil Pușcariu, Ionel Teodoreanu, Dimitrie Caracostea, Ion Al. Brătescu-Voinești, Ion Petrovici, Pamfil Țeicu, C. Rădulescu-Motru, D. Murărașu, Mihail Manoilescu, Stelian Popescu, Ion Sân-Georgiu, George Georgescu – become easy targets of newcomers who, posing as unrelenting executioners, are seeking in fact their own glory. Literary people, newspapermen, orchestra conductors, university professors, ex-political leaders fall victims of negative portraits, executed *en creux*, by deriding or belittling the past splendours of Romania’s intellectual life. There is little space for polemic (see, for instance, the unruly answer given by someone named Horia Liman to the liberal leader Mihail Fărcășanu, pp. 245-47) and the revolutionary armada hasn’t got time for such trifle work. Nevertheless, the columns of the new press allow enough space for publishing transcriptions of criminal trials whose main actors are the communist prosecutors and “the traitors”, that is, the publicists activating during the Nazi occupation (see Ilie Rădulescu’s case reflected in *Interogatoriul ziaristilor criminali de război*, pp. 271-274). The most impactful fragments – stirring compassion because they give the measure of forced compromise – are signed by the late Nichifor Crainic in 1962, himself a victim of public lampooning, sham-trials, and jail: “Gândindu-mă adânc, trebuie să recunosc măcar acum, la o vârstă înaintată, că am greșit în felurite chipuri față de propriul meu popor, alăturându-mă cu vorba și cu scrisul de acele forțe ale întunericului care au ținut în robie un popor ce de secole năzuia și lupta pentru libertate. Fie de la Catedră, fie din arena publică și, mai ales, ca ziarist și scriitor, am contribuit din plin la otrăvirea sufletelor tinere, îndemnându-le să vadă lumea și viața prin prisma acelor curente politice care nu urmăreau nimic altceva decât promovarea intereselor fascismului în țara noastră. Mai mult chiar, odată cu instaurarea regimului fascist în țara noastră, am acceptat conștient demnități și răspunderi ministeriale, devenind astfel un complice al antonescienilor și al clicii trădătoare care a târât apoi România într-un război criminal. Pentru toate aceste fapte, poporul român m-a pedepsit. Pedepsa lui a fost o pedeapsă dreaptă.” (p. 297)

The fourth, the fifth and the sixth chapters (“Propaganda and culture”, “Doctrinarian Directions”, “The New Press”) capture the propagandistic developments of the hostile attitudes sampled previously in “Black Profiles.” Now we can have a glance at the dramatic disfigurement of both critical style and critical imagination, at the desperate turnarounds of people who, after being chased, watched, blackmailed and menaced by the Security officers, cannot summon their forces to oppose the regime anymore. For instance, the graceful poet and translator Al. A. Philippide seems to be rather challenged by the communist newspeak when, trying to tame the Censure and Security monsters, he imitates its manner in tone and lexis: “Stat mic *rățoindu-se* și *buricându-se ca broasca din fabulă*”; “vorbăria a căpătat proporțiile colosale ale *unui fluviu de bale* [...] vremea în care se agita, *puhav, lălău și prolix, ministrașul Alexandru Marcu* [*emphasis added*]” (pp. 316-317). It is interesting that, while intellectuals such as Al. A. Philippide, G. Călinescu, L. Blaga are still able, despite sneaking strategies, to publish readable lines, the people of the Communist regime (M. Novicov, I. Vitner, Gr. Silvan, Tudor Teodorescu-Braniște, Ion Pas, Ștefan Voicu, and so forth) generate a myriad of copy-paste sequences, whose traces of individual style have been deleted on purpose.

The ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters (“The Soviet Model”, “The Journalist – Yesterday and Today”, “A Crisis of Romanian Culture”) assemble texts that show the quick conversion, in a few months’ time, of Romanian intellectuals in general and of Romanian press in particular. Desperate signals of “crisis” are launched by Virgil Ierunca in “Romania liberă”, but he is briskly corrected by M. R. Paraschivescu in “Scânteia” (pp. 764-769).

I will not dwell on the despicable industriousness of the “divine” G. Călinescu in producing articles about “the leading force”, “the principle of collective responsibility in literature”, “strengthening the bond between the press and the masses”, “the artist’s adaptation to new times” etc. (pp. 328-341, 396-398, 406-420). I will also skip over the regrettable attack of Paul Cornea against Vladimir Streinu (pp. 148-150).

Instead, I would rather end by quoting a few verses – equally funny and frightening – authored by Ioanichie Olteanu: “De-auzi că gem bancheerii peste mare/și urlă ca sub grindină de bice,/E c-a

răzbit din plin, fără cruțare./Tăișul greu al presei bolșevice./Tirani și zbiri! Se-apropie sfârșitul/ căci măștile-ncepură să vă pice/tăiate ca o pânză de cuțitul/necruțător al presei bolșevice.// [...] Ce mult ar vrea un Churchill să-l sugrume./și-n lanțuri și cătușe să-l zdrumice./dar nu poți sugruma o-ntreagă lume/ce ascultă-ndemnul presei bolșevice” (pp. 711-712). They can explain – though this development surely needs more proofs – why the nowadays Romanians spend so much time in front of news channels that do not deliver quality information but incense an irrational press awe. Indeed, as this anthology thoroughly proves, “the power of the press” usually triggers a collective emotion of fear, which is cultivated close to mysticism. It is not the fear of being publicly ridiculed or unmasked as it happens in established democracies, but the fear, inoculated during 50 years of communism, that press attacks can become the anteroom of prison.

Roxana Patraș

Viorella Manolache (coord.)

41 de Umbre ale Obiectelor în Filosofia Politică, Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale “Ion I. C. Brătianu” al Academiei Române Publishing House, Bucharest, 2018, 246 p.

41 SHADES OF OBJECTS IN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
REINTERPRETATIONS OF LIGHT
A LOOK INSIDE AND OUTSIDE PLATO’S CAVE

The volume *41 Shades of Objects in Political Philosophy* brings together, under the coordination of researcher Viorella Manolache, seven other authors in assembling a puzzle of interpretations marked by personal boundaries and philosophical inclinations, creating a postmodern conceptual and textual eclecticism. This lead, unequivocally, from the title, to the reflection upon the visible and the invisible in the science of political philosophy, suggesting predisposition to a hidden dimension, (partially) obscure.

Organized in three unequal parts, the book is built on the premise of gradual discovery of different objects of study. Each chapter marks a new center of interest in political philosophy, therefore each one starts with a short definition on the object, revealing the originality of the book – the image of an explicit guide, pulling you towards the revelation of both the physical, external component and also of the internal properties of the object.

The object, being a central concept, has been deeply avoided while considering the philosophical-political system, also mentioned by the volume coordinator in the starting chapter. Starting from this premise, the book brings a number of factors into discussion, with the approach of a vibrant, dynamic dimension, determined by the shadow which brings along new presence.

The volume becomes a guide for deciphering objects with which the philosophy of politics operates, by shaping and using an original language. Therefore, the emphasis is on filling in the gaps in the Romanian cultural and academic space by setting up the 41 objects of political philosophy, which the book captures through a vast decoding process. Hence, one of the main goals of the book is reached ever since the first chapter – that of launching an ideology and a philosophical policy of the object.

A fundamental merit of this volume is to bring together concepts or objects of daily use, which people of the fast-moving world that is today address simply, typical of this period of redefining the established realities – the chewing gum, the photograph, the pipe, the poster, the pill, and discloses their layers in the philosophy of politics with this metaphorical reinterpretation of light beams, which gradually reveals the dimensions of these philosophical and political constructs, thus deepening the relationship between subject and object.

Therefore, in the ongoing study, each particular analysis is reminiscent of a game of light, of the lens of a camera that builds and rebuilds the subject in the eyes of the reader, emphasizing the

small details in its layers. Ultimately, as the reader can observe, these small details are, in essence, keys to the interpretation of reality. This post-modern reality, rapidly transfigured by the socio-economic, political and technological world medium, brings with it the metamorphosis of objects and their shadows. Small changes, as well as those easily visible to the profane eye, are successfully captured, clarifying that the meaning of an object is not only determined by what it represents, but also by the manner in which that object is utilized.

Under its original creative vision, the volume brings back the issue of the game of shadows and also of the political object, coming with a bivalent perspective inside and outside Plato's Cave. Starting from the premise that the shadow, no matter how close it may be presented to the viewer in relation to the essence of the object, its physical form, is ultimately only a different sized transfigured reflection of undistorted reality. The allegory of Plato's Cave, relevant in the given context, remains not only a symbol of profound discovery of objects, but also a symbol of unequivocal awareness of the existence of a hidden, interpretative dimension in which light beams, even metaphorical, permanently build a dynamic "reality" of glow and shadows. The shadow of objects brings the pretext of discovering the premises with which people operate to the philosophy of politics, premises that are reflected in the current political spectrum.

Why a biased look?

Because the book does not hesitate to show interpretations, symbolically attributed to the shadows cast upon the background of the "modern cave wall", such as the television, which puts these reconstructions into circulation (see sub-chapter "spatial and informational reality, producing alterity" in this regard). At the same time, it does not depart from capturing the essence of the object, beyond the playful movement of light.

Moreover, beyond the process of clearing the subject-object matter, a merit of the present volume is to induce a new dimension of accessibility to political philosophy while maintaining the conceptual framework and bringing added value to specific terminology and bibliographic references, making objects of study much easier to understand to the reader. In this regard, one can look at examples such as Big Brother, Superman or Harry Potter. At the same time, using post-modern popular examples, the book manages to demonstrate its predisposition on fair and pertinent sorting of objects in the context of the 21st century because they accumulate social traits, naturally predisposed to metamorphosis.

Therefore, *41 Shades of Objects in Political Philosophy* becomes an encyclopedic manifest of objects invested with their own philosophy and also an urge towards the cultivation of the rigorosity of critical thinking, of sustained arguments and free thinking, but based on thorough study of established thinkers.

Andreea Ferenczi

Joseph S. Nye, Jr.

Is the American Century Over? (Global Futures Series), Cambridge and Massachusetts, Polity Press, 2015, 146 pp.

I am ecstatic that it is a felicitous happenstance for me to review this book authored by Joseph Nye, a distinguished service professor and former dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University who was ranked by his own institution's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs as the world's sixth most-influential international relations (IR) scholar and 'No. 1' with respect to his epoch-making works' implication on United States (US) foreign policymaking paradigm over many years. In fact, I have just completed one of my Japan-concentrated research projects by using a widely quoted and increasingly-popular (despite receiving some opprobrium) concept of 'soft power' for which Nye is actually the originator. Without any limitation, I can send my best wishes to Nye for this book with its timeliness and importance. Nevertheless, while a reviewer in an effort of the volume's commercial advertisement makes much of it "The future of American power is the great question of our century. No-one is

better equipped than Joe Nye to answer it”, this project neither met my scholarly inquest up to a pleasing level nor filled my enjoyment to the brim. Honestly, the research’s concluding findings made me disconsolate due to a number of reasons. As the sole founder and creator of the Dhaka (Bangladesh)-based Asia Pacific Institute for Global Studies (APIGS), which has already proved itself as the best knowledge base on current global studies by making a truly great difference in the academic world, I championed by numerous international recognition scholarly and research awards (including the two most illustrious prizes named differently after Japan’s former prime ministers Masayoshi Ohira and Yasuhiro Nakasone) wish to openly challenge Joseph Nye’s book in its each and every side.

First of all, coming across that the book’s two chapters out of its seven have interrogation marks, its main title (*Is the American Century Over?*) itself puts a question sign. But if it can adequately be answered by either ‘yes’ or ‘no’, why is there a necessity for realizing this book publication project? Anyway, when Nye (a US national) adopts the following ‘forceful argument’ made by another analyst in the concluding chapter “the United States is only at the beginning of its power. The twenty-first century will be the American century” (p. 113), it goes against his ‘hopeful forecast’ in a succeeding paragraph as follow “the American century is likely to continue for a number of decades at the very least” (p. 127). To be more specific, the two locutions (i.e., ‘the entire twenty-first century’ and ‘a number of decades’) read directly antithetical. Contrastingly also, voluminous publications on the ‘Asian century’ owing to Asia’s not only growing clouts but also shining values are nowadays being produced in which observant researchers feasibly envision that the 21st century will belong to Asia. By documenting the interrelated dimensions of American political, economic, social and cultural declining trends both locally and globally in ‘absolute’ terms, many US academics themselves have also reckoned that the American century together with ‘*Pax Americana*’ (Latin for ‘American Peace’) has already come to an end, although the US has been the world’s sole global superpower since the fall of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1991. Conjointly, Nye believes that they have yet entered a ‘post-American world’. In opposition to such a presumption, fairly good number of international thinkers (including Americans) arguably point to the fact that the world with the ‘rise of the rest’ has by this time turned to multipolarity from unipolarity. Moreover, as the book’s first paragraph of first chapter evidences: “In recent years, polls showed that in 15 of 22 countries surveyed, most respondents said that China either will replace or has already replaced the United States as the world’s leading power” (p. 1), this statement contrarily answers its only question, making Nye’s focal claim fallible. For Nye’s better knowledge, John Hay, US Secretary of State (from 1898 to 1905) more than a century as a period of 100 years ago prognosticated that the ‘21st century’ will be the ‘Pacific century’ as a whole in which the whole North America was included. This means that it will not merely be the ‘American century’.

Now, I like to confer my ‘counter arguments’ to Nye’s ‘cardinal arguments’ adduced in his (this) ‘so-called’ cogent thesis. First, Nye recaps that America’s three astounding capabilities (military muscle, economic affluence and soft power) will continue to subside any new challenger (such predominantly as China) to his country. But it would have been engrossing and meaningful for the most curious and highbrow readers if he had more factually answered the following three questions with respect to these three efficacies of his country: (1) Why have the American armed forces occupied or boomed so many countries throughout the world (particularly Muslim nations) during many decades when war crimes violently committed by them have gone against universal human rights, peace and humanity by and large? (2) How can the US get rid of such severe socioeconomic drawbacks as widening income inequality, poverty and unemployment in addition to its political stalemate that is negatively affecting on fulfilling ordinary people’s necessities and gratifications of Nye’s nation? (3) What is the true claim of Joseph Nye who himself has authored the article (titled “The Decline of America’s Soft Power: Why Washington Should Worry”, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2004), granted that his country has recently strived to revitalize its soft power as a core tool of public diplomacy?

With special emphasis on the third point, as Nye comments in the concluding chapter’s last paragraph “Now, with slightly less preponderance and a much complex world, the United States will need to make smart strategic choices both at home and abroad if it wishes to maintain its

position” (pp. 126-127), I am really in a puzzle over why and how he can offer such a suggestion concerning the concept of ‘smart power’ for which Nye is also the creator. More explicitly, as I have given a hint about it in my review’s beginning part, Nye, incompatible with his non-academic positions as an ex-assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs and chairman of the National Intelligence Council of the US, is not only the ‘acclaimed mastermind’ but also the ‘long promoter’ of the idea of ‘soft power’ (as against the brute forces of ‘hard power’) through which any state can win hearts and minds of foreign publics by communicating with them in today’s world of power struggles. But regretfully, his proposal on ‘smart power’, which is a tailored synthesis of both hard power and soft power and the precise mixture of the two depending on circumstances, with his judgment that it might be a mistake to rely on soft power alone. Anyway, such ‘smart power’ approach unusually undermines his standalone and lofty cultural ‘soft power’ notion. As we are informed, the Bush administration neglected the relevance of soft power and wasted its advantages in a foolish and reckless manner. As a matter of fact, its ostensible modern-day crusade against Islam and Muslims in Iraq has actually helped promote the ‘Bush hatred’ in other world regions when making America the most disliked nation on earth, though a few countries love America until now. Additionally, Washington allegedly exploits its smart power as a part of the Obama administration’s 2012 ‘Pivot to East Asia’ regional strategy simply for pursuing self-interests. In sum, the majority of the globe’s poor countries (mostly in Africa), which feel deprived of the opportunities of globalization indiscriminately managed by a club of a very few powerful nations, will of course not be interested at all in ‘military hegemony’, ‘economic selfishness’ and ‘cultural expansion’ pursued by any unipolar superpower or great power in the guise of its self-controlled centennial period. That is to ask: What will the self-proclaimed century (American or Chinese) make sense for the poorest of the poor in the world?

Sometimes, boastful and extravagant protestations or promises beyond an author’s capacity clearly misguide the common readers, leave a candid reviewer be. It is also the case for Nye. In any event, I do not desperately consider that it should be any of the following four questions posed by Nye: Whether China as a nimbly rising rival will replace America as the world’s leading nation; Whether the ‘American century’ will ultimately be eroded by the ‘Chinese century’; Whether these two monsters (both militarily and economically) will engage in a fight with each other for global supremacy; Whether Europe is doomed to fail understanding that the 19th century was the ‘British century’. In this connection, Nye completely overlooks some of his country’s think tanks’ prognosis about the ‘Indian century’. In any case, I see in my mind’s eye that the prime concern must be why, how and when we could create a more inclusive and empowered regimen of global governance for a decorative and harmonious world order amid an entangled interplay of political chicaneries and economic magnetisms. From this viewpoint, it should be stressed that while ‘the world without America’ is a fallacious perception, the world needs America and vice versa America needs the world, meaning that any country (including the US) alone cannot solve the globe’s most pressing human security issues, or address the internationally agreed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted by the United Nations (UN) in particular. In place of the volume’s long list of further readings, I expected some realistic solutions on such topical problems from this globally renowned scholar, especially because this book has come to light from Polity’s ‘Global Futures Series’. Whereas, Nye has developed his book’s introductory chapter with a lengthy story of when the American century began, how it was created and why their country has been able to keep possession of its leadership and dominance worldwide during the last half of the 20th century. It sounds a too historical narrative and much discussed subject on the myth of ‘American exceptionalism’. Therefore, this repetition might easily make this study’s readers (mainly those who have anti-American sentiment) lacklustre. More to the point, although a 24-page chapter titled “Absolute Decline: Is America like Rome?” (Chapter 5) has insanely been incorporated for this project, nothing is essentially contemplated about the ‘Asian century’ attributable to Asia’s growing socio-cultural values in addition to politico-economic powers even with strategic military rivalries that is title of burgeoning literatures on Asian/global studies, as I said before.

Similarly, many famous predictions were proven to be totally false. For example, as Nye himself remarks, Harvard professor Ezra Vogel published (in 1979) *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America* (later translated into Japanese), an all-time best-selling book that celebrated

Japan's manufacturing-fuelled rise to help Japan to become the world's 2nd largest economy. Though the country was advancing incrementally and a mood of sunny optimism prevailed at that time, there exists a common-sense among many Japanese in Japan that their country is crumbling and thus it would be unprepared for shouldering heavy duty at the world stage any longer. While Vogel's volume seems controversial, this Western author is still upbeat on Japan's future. Cheerfully, as per some surveys, Japan will still be in the list of 'Top 10 Superpowers' of the world in 2050 as well. Furthermore, while most Japanese manifestly view that America as their closest and prolonged ally in the framework of the US-Japan strategic alliance are in downturn and thus a far-reaching threat to the security of their nation, anxieties about non-assurance on military logistic services from America's unswervingly subservient partner as a reportedly long stagnant economy apart from Tokyo's security policy shift as a blare to forge ties with East Asia are at the same time being acutely felt in Washington. But Nye has pretty well forgotten this crucial aspect, condemning that he in this book gives only a 4-page coverage on Japan in contrast to a 25-page separate chapter on China, which mostly reads descriptive.

Relevantly also, there is probably none other than Nye himself who strongly criticized the deficit but push of Beijing's soft power at odds with this country's hard power consisting of both military strengths and economic incentives. But he seems overwhelmed with the prospect of a century to be ruled by China. Rather, he should have unfolded that this Japan's neighbouring country has for a long time been the 2nd biggest recipient of Tokyo's generous official development assistance (ODA). Beyond this massive contributory support for the Chinese industrialization (but unfortunately military modernization) process and even though China has surpassed Japan as the world's second-biggest economy in 2010, China remains lower-ranking than Japan in the matters of world famous multinational business conglomerates, technological innovations and its numerous more and more vibrant non-state actors. In fact, Nye dismissed Japan's soft power as negligible in the early 1990s. But he diverted himself later by providing his firmly-held opinion in 2012 that one should not doubt the persistence of Japan's cultural uniqueness. He continued that though Japan's story was still lousy, this nation because of its distinctive and proactive 'pacifist constitution' and 'non-nuclear principles' compared to his own country (the US) almost looks like a 'role model'. However, it has not become clear from Nye's book how China that is still a trivial donor and accordingly struggling to assume its leadership positions in both regional and multilateral organizations will soon exceed Japan's 'kudos' (i.e., praise and honour) this nation received for its already outstanding achievements for these domains. Although he traditionally foresees that China would automatically attain a superpower status and China's dramatic transformations (both internal and external) will ultimately impact the US and the American century insisted by him, he does not suppose that China might head toward Japanese-style 'lost decades' of financial sluggishness.

Nye finally declares that the American century due to the extraordinary period of his nation's pre-eminence in the arenas of both global geopolitics and international contribution is still not over, having an impression that the US is somehow an exceptional country in the world worthy of widespread admiration. But he avoids saying that his homeland is growingly and loathingly treated as the world's policemen as pointed out before. Also, its global public goods basically in the form of foreign aid to the developing countries aside from its billion-dollars trade in weapons to autocrats worldwide is seen from the perspective of America's own national gains. Moreover, when Nye is even now lucidly dreaming of a 'continual' American century, the most extreme reality is that several of its parallels and competitors are coming up. However, Nye rightly warns that the status of America as the only superpower in the post-Cold War international system might seriously be toughened by its own domestic weaknesses and uneasiness 'relative' to the belief that the 21st century in the command of a booming Asia as a world power or the potential of BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) as a group of rapidly emerging market economies will perilously take America out of the global scene. Hence, this American citizen recommends that the US should have some pragmatic ideas on how to exert its historically-elevated 'leadership' (unlike 'hegemony' or 'domination'), Washington must need to give practical responses to Beijing's proactive strategies as well as the country would have to listen for getting others to enlist in a multipolar world order with the spread of global geographical balance-of-power politics thanks to today's high-tech society.

On these grounds, it will not be excessive and irrelevant to raise a question whether President Barack Obama's 2008 'Change We Can Believe In' slogan in the final campaign pitch has eventually brought any amazing change to America domestically let alone internationally. In the same way, the political slogan 'Make America Great Again' of Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign, which was trademarked the Ronald Reagan's campaign of 1980, clearly illustrates that America has over the time lost its greatness. According to a Connecticut (US)-based Quinnipiac University National poll, there is a deep well of dissatisfaction and pessimism among American voters who say that the US has lost its identity, they are falling behind financially, their beliefs and values are under attack, and public officials do not care what they think. So, some of my blunt but logical questions to Nye and all Americans as follows: (1) Will the American leaders really be able to revitalize 'American exceptionalism' (i.e., their historical reputation, sociocultural morality, political decency as well as economic luxuriance) of which they are so proud always? (2) Will their nation be sincere and responsible enough to correct its image and revamp its stature in the global community and society so that it not only can consolidate its place in a new multipolar world but also can adaptively work with it? (3) Will the United States, as Joseph Nye has advocated over a long period of time, be destined and entitled in the genuine sensitivity to serve as a constructive and distinctive exemplar for our degrading humanity in the new centennial world? In essence, it will be wise and better for Nye and his nation to acknowledge the physical existence of a post-American world, and act in accordance with the changing multipolar global governance architecture.

To recapitulate, the book's core question (as its title stands) itself is quite contradictory, and Nye, who is regarded as an 'epitome' for other IR scholars in the US and overseas, seems less self-confident to persuasively prove his self-anticipated case. Rather, it is the book that will help more familiarize the term 'Chinese century' with the involved parties. Certainly, Nye's 'we versus they' schism or 'West versus East' chasm in the volume will also help contribute further to the fractions in midst of the global power shift. More outwardly, some ideal scholars might look upon Nye as a person who is America's one-sided 'propaganda prompter' and one who does not mind to distract his scholarly theories or noble visions only for the sake of his personal rewards or his nation's benefits. In other words, I am afraid whether some would unenthusiastically behave toward Nye's 'big talk' as his country's 'grandiose rhetoric'. To tell the truth, the volume suffers from its narrowly specified purpose with a substandard and tendentious title. In addition to Nye's contradictory standpoints, wrong predictions and inevitable omissions, it at the same time lacks methodical approaches, viable insights and unavoidable suggestions. Moreover, discovering that there are some imperfections in the contents and indispositions in the frame of references, the volume is bereft of reference works in the non-English (particularly Chinese and Japanese) languages. In short, this book is not an outcome of a so punctilious and excellent research with truly intellectual dissension, engaging style and exciting taste.

Regardless of all of my criticisms, I am quite sure that this close-packed but originally-written piece (compared to other books on this similar theme) accomplished by Joseph Nye might still be of seduction especially for US political leaders as well as this country's local policy makers and global strategic planners. As an independent but unprejudiced reviewer of this book with its need for our time, I take the scope to sketch my own constructive and indispensable foresight by reflecting the benevolent feelings of all ethically-minded and peace-loving people throughout the world as follows: "The 19th century experienced the birth of modern science. But the two world wars have turned the 20th century into the worst ever. By learning lessons from the past centuries, we all world citizens together in the 21st century should robustly and earnestly affirm the judgment in the sanctity and dignity of each and every human's life regardless of region, religion or race, and thus start our globally-networked actions right now for our ever-unstable and risk-prone humanity's prosperous and successful future". Indeed, I publish to create values needed distinctly for peace of insecure humankind, not generally for promotion of academic rank.

Monir Hossain Moni

Gabriela Goudenhooff, Ioan Horga (eds.)

Education, social values and European integration, Debrecen University Press, Ungaria, 2017, 377 p.

Bringing together some of the papers presented on 18-20 May 2017 at the International Conference *A social Europe for youth: education to employment*, organized by University of Oradea, Faculty of History, International Relations, Political Sciences, Communication Sciences and the Research Centre on Identity and Migration Issues (RCIMI), with the support of the European Commission, Jean Monnet Programme of the European Union, the volume published at the end of last year proposes a topical theme, worthy not only of the sociologist reflection or of the philosophers, but also of the political decision-makers.

The general premise of this book is that there are a number of common values that form the basis of the European social model and these include democracy and collective bargaining of individual rights, market economy, equal opportunities for all and social welfare and solidarity, and the volume reflects the real interest of coordinators and authors for the analysis of the social and moral values of the European Union in the context of the current debates on democratic institutions on which this very complex political construction is based.

The topics of the chapters in which the published studies are systematized are particularly relevant to the theme addressed in this volume.

But first, in the introductory study, Gabriela Goudenhooff has drawn attention from the very beginning that “Addressing European policies has never difficult than today, when social goals seem to be outweighed more and more by security reasons and measures” (p. 11). The observation is all the more justified, taking into account that “The European Social Model isn’t just a paradigm but a part of the EU construction and according to some voices, the soul of the European Union, issues on social dimensions being addressed and challenged by various tests: the financial crises, the refugee one, they all measured the European consensus on the social values” (p. 11). Because “social policy goes beyond employment” and “it affects people at work and in their family environment, their health and their old age and the entire educational system”, Gabriela Goudenhooff states that: “The idea of approaching values in education and to follow the way of affecting the process of integration at various levels in nowadays society is one of the valuable ideas of our project and this book, comprises several contributions of scholars from Romania and from abroad with respect to this topic, enriching the paradigm with kaleidoscopically points of view: from politics to psychology and from sociology to moral, an entire and large areas are involved in an attempt to explain and illustrate a generous idea: that there is no complete human profile without social abilities and values as the: equality, compassion, an equal chance and equal opportunities, social inclusion, tolerance, respect for individuality and human dignity, reject hate speech and discrimination” (p.12).

In this respect, within the first book’s section in which are analysed “Social policies and politics influencing the process of integration in the European Union”, we can read studies with captivating titles, as well: *Challenges for the current European welfare system: institutional and policy design for a limited reform* (Raju Carp); *The concept of national public policy and public order in European public law* (Albert Antoci); *Social and Political Intolerance in Europe: A Source of Support for Radical Parties* (Raluca Viman-Miller); *EU Multilevel Governance: National and Sub-National Mechanism for Influencing Social Policy* (Alina Carmen Brihan); *Migrants Integration In The Host Country’s Society: The European States’ Example* (Tatiana Daud); *Social policies in the EU–Case Study: The Republic of Moldova* (Natalia Ciobanu).

The second chapter is about “Labour, market dynamic and Youth unemployment” and it includes studies of real interest, signed by Adrian Netedu (*Higher education graduates and employability*); Dorin Vaculovschi (*Social Inequality in Moldova and its impact on development*); Mariana Iațco, Natalia Putină (*The Evolution of the Labour Market in Moldova under the Social-Economic Inequalities*); Ioan Laza (*The exodus of the “white coats” – a crisis in searching for solutions. Media reflections*); Mariana Buda (*Mastering language, the guarantee for a better job?*);

Svetlana Rusnac (*Professional satisfaction as a condition of well-being of academics*); Carolina Perjan, Sergiu Sănduleac, Victoria Plămădeală (*Loneliness in young adults: study finding*); Lyudmila Zmuncilă, Svetlana Rusnac (*Organizational culture – the condition of professional satisfaction of Academics*).

In Chapter III, entitled “Communication, youth and social culture”, we can read interesting studies about *Communication Policy and Mass Media as Fundamental Means of Access to the European Public Sphere* (Simona Fer); *The Transparency and Social Media. Case Study: The Bihor County Prefecture* (Claudia Simona Timofte); *Construction and Validation of a Questionnaire Assessment of Nonverbal Communication* (Lucia Bitca); *Violence, Seduction and the Virtual Space* (Florin Ardelean); *New media’s role in the social adaptation of Ukrainian youth in Poland* (Yevheniya Yuriychuk, Mykola Prokhorov); *The impact of social media news on the political socialization of youth* (Svetlana Rusnac, Boris Akulov (Mazur); *New Communication in Romania of 2017. Romanian Internet Ranking: first in our perceptions and last in the EU Statistics* (Irina Pop).

Chapter IV, centred on the theme “Morality versus modernity; social values in education, an indicator of integration” includes extensive studies such as: *The education in the spirit of moral values as a possible solution to social exclusion* (Lorena Valeria Stuparu); *MIME as a Creative Project* (Lia Pop); *Memory as a sublime state of modernity* (Otilia Sârbu); *The development of social intelligence in early adolescence* (Inga Platon); *The impact of active learning in building social and normative values* (Constantin Vasile Țoca, Bogdan Mihail Pocola, Luminița șoproni); *Students’ social identity formation* (Rodica Bunescu-Chilimciuc); *The Development of Social Abilities in Children with Special Educational Needs (CES)* (Angela Calancea).

Chapter V refers to “Social integration of vulnerable groups, social dialog”, and the appropriate contributions are signed by Lia Pop and Irina Pop (*The Refugees image in nowadays Europe*); Paul Kun (*Roma people between assimilation and marginalisation*); Dan Apăteanu and Marius Tătaru (*An introduction into the Civic dimension of Social Exclusion. The Case of Romanian Youth*); Katarzyna Balandynowicz-Panfil (*The role of the elderly in building the Europe of the future*); Cezara Dilevschi (*Essential guidelines in our coming domestic violence against woman in modern society*); Svetlana Hares, Aliona Melentieva (*Determining the cognitive, affective and behavioural components of the attitude towards the family caring for child/children with disabilities*).

From the multitude of this perspective treated with theoretical aplomb, we cannot refer to all the viewpoints in the space of a review. But we mention the study of Radu Carp (*Challenges for the current European welfare system: institutional and policy design for a limited reform*), where the author found that: “The wealth is redistributed in Europe by fiscal policies, labour market regulations, rules regarding the minimum wage of training programs. Such a mix of policies should be grounded on a more pronounced inequality of citizens towards taxation. In reality, this kind of inequality is bigger in the US”. That’s because “the different attitude towards the benefits of the welfare state is grounded on cultural differences”. While “Europeans believe that governments are responsible for getting auto people from poverty”, American citizens “believe that the poor shall themselves to get out of poverty by their own means”. That’s why, Radu Carp thinks “Americans consider that their society where they live is mobile, while Europeans think they are living in an immutable society, where little changes could be done on the labour market” (p. 24).

Svetlana Rusnac, in the article *Professional satisfaction as a condition of well-being of academics* reminds one thing that seems often forgotten: “The state of psychological well-being of the academic staff is a condition of professional involvement and success, which has a much wider area than the personal one”, for if “the academic staff is satisfied with life”, than “it shares positive signatures in relations to its events, presents a model for students, contributing to the training of specialists adapted to the contemporary professional and social requirements demanded by the national and international labour market” (pp.159-160).

In their study entitled *An introduction into the Civic dimension of Social Exclusion. The Case of Romanian Youth*, Dan Apăteanu and Marius Tătaru emphasizes the importance of education for social integration: “Not only material resources are important, but also social ones. There is an influence from the parents’ political view, as similar beliefs will lead to an increased

participation". Therefore, "another factor that increase the civic participation is the level of education, as we believe that better educated people understand the importance of actively involving in the community affairs. In the case when there is a political context that young people consider they should take attitude, and also when they take into consideration relevant issues for them, such as fight against the corruption, then it will be more probable that they will have a higher civic participation" (p. 346).

We also consider that in a civilized world as European society wants, the workforce needs to be educated not just for material gain. Without nurturing cultural and moral values, we relapse into barbarism, back in a time before the civilized world. The value is realized within a cultural tradition that the family, community, school are designed to transmit to children and to young people.

From history we know that moral progress is also reflected in progress in education. Well-educated citizens are those who provide the conditions of a society in which human dignity is respected, and the area of action of immorality is thus limited. Ultimately, people of good character regardless of socio-professional status ensure the social progress of the community, the moral development of society, its good.

For example, even if it is unacceptable to young people at the moment, we can cultivate the idea that moral, philosophical, aesthetic values help us to survive and live nicely, feeling "rich" in spite of a precarious material situation. Even though we do not know where they will work and how young people will work in the future, it is certain that for their psychic equilibrium and personal development, no matter what their work, they have to believe in values superior to those materials. And this even in the situation where (typical for Romania) people without generous principles and ideals are promoted.

Without considering moral and civic values, human nature will progressively degrade, and this does not predict an optimistic future of humanity. As long as school and education can contribute for those unfavorable to emancipation, and for all social categories to fulfillment their destiny and their life, moral education is necessary both for individual and collective welfare. That is why educational policies need to be subordinated to moral values and this is clearly seen at the intersection of philosophical, sociological, political and pedagogical levels.

The book presented here focuses on a topic of lively debate, able to reflect the responsibility for the future of Europe is worthy of experts in political science admiration, but also of readers eager to inform about the contemporary reflection on education for moral values and European social solidarity.

Lorena Stuparu