Postmodern Openings
ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387
Covered in: Web of Sciences (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2018, Volume 9, Issue 1, pages: 4-6 | doi: https://doi.org/10.18662/po/01

Exodus on the Post Prefix of the Romanian Public Discourse

Tomiţă CIULEI[1]

[1] Associate Professor PhD, Faculty of Political Sciences, Letter and Communication, Valahia University from Targoviste, Romania, ciuleitibi@gmail.com

Abstract: As an editorial can not claim epistemic valences, but rather aims to be a avant la lettre radiograph of a clivage of history, I will submit to this publicistic rigor, without giving up the claim to issue valuable judgments which, upon rigor, may be assumed or, on the contrary, rejected.
The exodus that I am proposing, on a prefix so used today, was inspired by the history of a suffix, and I am thinking of logie (in Romanian and French), logia (in Italian) or logy (in English).

Keywords: exodus, post prefix, Romanian public discourse.

How to cite: Ciulei, T. (2018). Exodus on the Post Prefix of the Romanian Public Discourse. *Postmodern Openings, 9*(1), 4-6.
https://doi.org/10.18662/po/01

©2018 The Authors &
LUMEN Publishing House.

As an editorial can not claim epistemic valences, but rather aims to be a *avant la lettre* radiograph of a clivage of history, I will submit to this publicistic rigor, without giving up the claim to issue valuable judgments which, upon rigor, may be assumed or, on the contrary, rejected.

The exodus that I am proposing, on a prefix so used today, was inspired by the history of a suffix, and I am thinking of *logie* (in Romanian[1] and French), *logia* (in Italian) or *logy* (in English). Used to rigorously circumscribe a field of research, attempting to delimit it from a methodological or an objectual point of view, the history of science may still retain some barbarism, true linguistic elucubations stemming from the noncritical use of the term. For reasons of space, I will not concentrate on them, but I will only resume to drawing attention to the inconsistencies between the name and referential to which it refers, referential which is either non-existent as an epistemic object, or insufficiently circumscribed semantically.

A similar story seems to also have .... *post*. Used *ab initio* to delimit an attitude, a certain type of understanding, a different explication, other than the consecrated one, the *post* prefix is transfigured as a sign of a revolutionary attitude, opposable in the fundamentals, but especially in the finality. The post-modern world (with its art, culture or philosophy[2]) is a *something else*, totally redesigned to the modern world. Unfortunately, it is neither the place nor the time to debate the epistemic legitimacy of such an approach. But I want to use it in a wider context, that of the public discourse, and I mean what could be called *post-discourse*, the special case being the post-totalitarian Romanian public discourse. It is clear that the meaning of *post* in this context is not the classic one (sic!), but sends to two real and different historical moments.

[1] Although the Romanian language distinguishes between *lógie* (the outer gallery embedded in a building, the root being the Italian *loggia*) and *logíe* (a scholastic composition element with the meaning of scientific discipline, the root of which is the Greek *lógos* in its sense of speech and discourse)

[2] Even the Oxford Dictionary qualifies the *post-truth* as the term of 2016, even if Professor Timothy Williamson points out that: *Post-truth is a lack of respect for the truth*. The epistemological danger that such a direction exerts has also been debated during a meeting in the spring of 2017, between Professor Timothy Williamson and Professor Mircea Dumitru (https://pressone.ro/timothy-williamson-profesor-la-oxford-post-adevarul-este-lipsa-de-respect-fata-de-adevar/). Moreover, Mircea Dumitru showed that the use of such a term, but especially its use for explanatory purposes, is the sign of an irrational fear of knowledge (https://pressone.ro/mircea-dumitru-post-adevarul-este-ca-si-cum-ai-spune-ca-adevarul-poate-fi-supus-la-vot/).

The fall and dissolution of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the XXth century made the public discourse, in general, and the official discourse, in particular, face a dilemma: the qualified *enemy* disappearing, it had to chose between becoming a post-discourse where the enemy's construction was meaningless and objectless, or continuing to be a militant speech, qualifying another entity as an *enemy*.

From this point of view, Romania is an emblematic case. Most of the public actors, at least in the early years following the 1989 revolution, chose the latter, manifesting a certain inability to overcome a revanchial rhetoric, organized on finding, disclosing and *engraving the enemy*, kind of confirming Umberto Eco's thesis that *if there was none, the enemy will be invented*.

The Romanian post-totalitarian discourse has the same stake, resigning only to the methodological and conceptual patterns. Rhetorical reflexes are the same, *the other* being understood, presumed as an *enemy*. This very alethic, albeit negative, connotation places the Romanian post-totalitarian discourse into an unfortunate propagandistic continuity, in which the nuances and differences only consisted in the way the *enemy* was permanently (re)built. The basis of such a rhetoric is *hatred*, as Ana Pauker understood it when, reproaching the weak propagandist determination to the party, she was basically criticizing them for *not knowing how to hate*.

There is, however, a difference: the enemy of Communist rhetoric was either personal (the '50s) or dissimulated (the' 60s) or impersonal (the '70s-80s). He was the exponent of a social order that had to be overthrown, canceled in all its norms and values. The enemy of post-communist rhetoric is also an alterity, but it does not belong to an opposing social order, but to the construction of one. In other words, the *other* becomes the *enemy* as long as he does not share the new social ideals. The theses were changed, but the conclusion was the same: the other can not be a dialogue partner for as long as our positions are irreconcilable.

In conclusion, the post-totalitarian public discourse misses, at least in Romania, the chance of a profound change of paradigm and rhetoric, misses the chance of a post-discourse released by the censorship and the propaganda accents. It remains centered on the same march of the *enemy*, whatever that is, and any appearance will be taken. He remains the victim of the same Messianic vision in finding and revealing the guilty.