

CURRENT PERFORMANCES IN CONSACRATED POLITICAL AND CIVIC STRATEGIES

Ştefania Bejan^[1]

Abstract

The concepts that can be turned operational in a double dilemma - a) on one hand we see, during the past months, on the local political scene, protest movements (in a purely legal sense) or, rather, an expression of the political will in severe forms, with whom we got accustomed from the Romanian political environment? b) on the other hand, they are totally divergent with the political partisanship and with the civic activism or, in precise contexts, we find the intersection area of the two? – this is not totally new for the investigators of the recent public space: **protest** represents merely only the right (recognized by the Constitution) to show your discontent in the public environment (without having the authorities intervene for this manifestation); **violence** is a characteristics of societies, and its symbolic “face” accompanies us during the entire history of mass-media (political violence presents itself as a species, discredited, now and then, due to the frequency, to the wear and tear of its generating mechanisms, to the repetitiveness of the players and the monotony of the speeches); **political partisanship**, quasi-tautological phrase, refers directly to the *parti-pris*, not leaving space for a certain inter-party-minded elegance (exception making the temporary alliances for obtaining power, the transfer of some politicians from a doctrinaire “area” to another, the support contracts made in the Parliament for some mutual beneficial laws, etc.); **civic activism**, another desideratum in its essence, for the fragile democracies of the post-totalitarian Eastern Europe (here and there, now and then, voluntary impulses, with modest success and inevitable mistakes, with committed people and opportunists, like in any field of activity...) Placed, contextually speaking, in relationships of logical or affective type, these “cardinal points” of the political fight tactics lead to interpretation alternatives that are fresh, particular, useful for the social post-December space who hopes for a deliberative democracy.

Key words: *politics, right to protest, parti-pris, opportunism, post-totalitarian space*

^[1] Romanian Academy, Scholar POSDRU/89/1.5/S/56815 *The society Based on Knowledge – reaserches, debates, perspectives*; stbejan@yahoo.fr

„The incredible” intuition of 20-th century societies researchers is “guilty”, we would dare to believe, for the “premonitions” of Erving Goffman, in 1959, when *The daily life as a show* was being published (in our opinion, the Romanian language version of the book’s title *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* is even better than the original, is more pictorial, is “rounder”, has special semantic meanings...). We have in view social behavior sequences (especially of the teams) where the consensus becalms in the bud the obvious discontents; where the polite opposition is replaced with “an efficient demonstration of unleashed rage”; not rarely, for the sake of own image, the social actors choose to place under doubt and compromise, an interaction^[1]. A certain marker in the field of public communication, a delicate analyst of “social meetings” drama, Goffman confesses the existence of a moral key where is rightly to read the expressiveness (that generates, also, images of the Self “thrown” to the others, but also replies of the partners given to us in the social game): in any social interaction, expressiveness plays the communication part, from which we understand that it is not of any interest “the view of the tension releaser function that it might have for its sender”^[2]. In other words, we talk about a first level of public cohabitation expressiveness, because the second operates with information about unknown “entities” and acts as a vehicle/guide of the receptors ready to translate, before their completion, the action of the players on the social scene...

The hermeneutics that any person casted in the everybody show uses is fully determined by ratiocination: you want to know clear facts about the close ones and the previous speakers: from traits to strategies and feelings; and because this is not really handy, you are satisfied with what the analyst calls *substitutes* – „indications, various proofs, hints, expressive gestures, symbols of the status”-, the visible, easy to apprehend part of the reality from the equation of the communicational interaction. According to the canonical scheme of human expressivity created by Alex Mucchielli, we deal with four levels of depth for the *expressive phenomena*. The unconsciousness area (level of depth) hosts

[1] Erving Goffman, *The daily life as a show*, Ed. Comunicare.ro, Bucharest, 2003, pp. 270-271

[2] *Ibidem*, p. 274

together, fundamental values, motivations, desires...It is considered the source of deep logics through which the “predisposition for the worldly things” function – able to trigger the apprehension of the elements of existence (including social ones)–, this „area” is followed in the acts of the social interveners instigated by their attitudes; finally, in the “territory” of opinions (translations of the positioning towards the persons, ideas, fields of activity, etc.) exceeding in number the desires and the values, judges the societal activity in its whole^[1].

Amongst the conclusion of the Goffmanian work discussed, it appears an emphasis on the contribution of expressivity in transmitting the image of the self. How does the individual manage to interpret the *impression* made on him by the social partners? Under the form of pleadings and requests, petitions that are directly restricted to each cultural model of cohabitation, wearing the ethical seal of the sincerity of performances, because bearing the social behavior of any type generates and maintains the inter-individual and inter-group relationships. In certain circumstances it refers to the idea of exploitation, in the sense that the social player folds on the behavioral speech of the other person – giving the feed-back requested by the proposals/expectations met in the relational game - the communicational actions are kept in the “net with moral limits of judgments”.

The naturalness of many on the social scene creates images in accordance with the truth of the issuer’s personality. The presence of the behavioral honesty, at the same time with the absence of faking gesture and actions, “throws out in the world” valid projections. Even if the lack of interest regarding the type of perceived images about the self is only faked, this strategy brings a common welfare. Not only once, individuals or groups of public importance present themselves as being very preoccupied by the diagnostic that was established in accordance with their own performances in the social environment.

This desire to obtain a good note from the action partners/evaluators, is not in any way condemnable, being conditioned on one hand by *the self control* of the sender, and on the other hand, by the *trust* in the “receptivity and the justness of the individual that observes

[1] Alex Mucchielli, *The art of communication. Methods, forms and the psychology of the communication situations*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2005, pp. 18-19

them”^[1]. The influence exerted in a legitimate way on the perceptive registry of the partners gets, more and more often, notes of promotion by any means, although, in accordance with the evolution trends of the communication sciences, the tendency we described appears as fully justified: between the projected image, the perceived image within the external environment and the lived image, there are some disturbing incompatibilities^[2]. The narcissist is left with only one path to follow, even if it is tainted by unrighteousness, by a coercion of the performance environment – to leave the *impression* that some own objectives are reached through a natural, legal, accepted mediation, although at a close analysis, we can see manipulation in the states classified by the speech of A. Mucchielli in the *Art of influence*: manipulation of people, of situations, of objects, etc. In a great haste and rush, we could decide that politeness and the delicacy, in other words, the decent influence is no longer “in fashion”. The direct, harsh, handy manipulation of the impressions, says Goffman, shares in a dramatic way the arena of public communication: the people that are being evaluated feel the duty to apply, demonstrate, while the evaluators-observers are formed within the audience. The transfer of actions takes place from the objects towards the audience^[3], in the condition of building and sending an adequate and efficient message: conveyed to a well-known and attentive audience, a message that is coherent, accepted, contained and especially ready to trigger the action (by convincing the receiver to adopt exactly the behavior that was planned by the source)^[4]. The phrase “merchants of morality” invented by the magister of the *Stigmat* brings into the discussion the double measure of the ethical imperative: in theory, the fulfillment of the behavioral standards weighs a great deal in the statements of the social actors, but in practice, the moral problem of abiding the requisitions from the social “market” is not taken seriously. “Sending” a convincing image on the “retina” of the evaluator exceeds the requirements of moral behavior. The “trade” with self images shall not remain indifferent to the tendency towards prag-

[1] *Ibidem*, p. 275

[2] Bernard Dagenais, *The profession of a relationniste*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2002, p. 63

[3] E. Goffman, *op.cit.*, p. 276

[4] Bernard Dagenais, *Public relations campaign*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2003, pp. 296-297

matism for the disadvantage of morality: the buyer (the consumer, the judge), skilled in “impressions” and social truths shall stand by compromising offerings. The alternative is expressed in a frustrated manner: “the same obligation and advantage of appearing always in a favorable moral image and of being a socialized character shall force the person to become a sophisticated actor”. The social *performer* regarded as a *character* (model) proposes to him roles that recommend a “once more!” and this cultivates his self love leading even to confusion in the framings with himself^[1].

The fusion of the self with the character (it also goes the other way around) has as consequence an image that is ready to obtain the credit of the people involved, regardless of the cause that the performer works for. The better the framing is, the more entitled to credit is the image created and transmitted. Drama especially means a mixture of needs, abilities and “drama” strategies, actors-performers, failed gestures, successful actions... The acting potential of the show from the audience (the public) gives to the performers a plus of credibility. Being mainly a psychoanalytical act, the interpretation (the meaning of words, of behaviors, etc.) applies known relationships (that also became rules) to the verifiable information. In the sphere of motivation (especially the extrinsic ones), Mucchielli identifies the same *pattern*: “interior certainties” that motivates the human mind to leave indelible marks on the communicational acts^[2].

By exploiting the reversibility of the messages and by involving the construction of *meaning*, communication inter-relates with perceptions and imagination, memory and vocabulary. The objectives, the roles and the self-censorship of the participants denounce, in the spirit of Bourdieu, „the natural elasticity of significance”, lacing the receptivity and the expression from the interpersonal registry. We have the proof *The dynamics of groups* that relaxing constraints give birth to social anomie (emotional slips, insecurity in the relationships between individuals, difficulty of interpersonal communication). Uncertainty becomes contagious; lack of social norms announces chaos; unpredictability of expression, motivation, the ascendant of individual/collective

[1] E. Goffman, *op. cit.*, p. 277

[2] A. Mucchielli, *op. cit.*, p. 21

imagination is trouble for everybody, from theoreticians to the subjects of treadmill performances^[1]. Of projection and cleavage, of introjections - censorship, in other words, of exteriorization and interiorization, the constraints are constituted as part of the “securing basis” and “relationship pronunciation” (A. de Peretti & alii) around the social actor; the interaction triggers the need to put together (due to the projection) the performances of the perception modes at the same level, unifier in the group, so that the fragmentation or the isolation do no longer appear as hazards. What the psychologists call “we distinctive” is the fruit of a common, group subculture, with a cohesive mission, strictly restricted to the cultural level of the society in general. The influence of habitual *values* and *norms* (s.a.), together with the predisposition of individual (on their way to become a social group) to refresh common “echoes” within the unique, own behaviors show a strengthening of the “distinctive identity” (at the limit of pleonasm, this phrase, in our opinion, except group, collective identity), especially that the effort to deal with the internalization of the “situation inequalities” (W.J.H. Sprott) is not to be neglected...^[2]. The communicational experiences of interpersonal type help to *locate differences* and the originality elements of the new group entity, explains Sprott in *Psychologie sociale*.

The projection of a convenient image in the social environment engages to adopt some “complementary” roles amongst the members of the group, performances established on the introjection of the behavioral models needed for reaching the objectives for which the group was formed and works for. Protected by these performances accepted in the actional - competitive environment, we can differentiate within the group statutes, hierarchies, currencies, decisional advantages etc., so that there is established a “floating equilibrium of inequalities and differences in situations or characteristics...” The stake of this complex relational mechanism is the structure of the “moral” level of the group. Such a conclusion has a complicated and heavy *background*: forming a selective *network* of communication, whose DNA does not lack *censorship*, with its known subsequences – screening of messages,

^[1] André de Peretti, Jean-André Legrand, Jean Boniface, *Communication techniques*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2001, pp. 8-12

^[2] *Ibidem*, pp. 13-14

distribution of tasks, assignment of resources, application of sanctions – all towards guaranteeing an “equilibrated dynamics of exchanges and contributions”. The final touch means, on one hand, the objectives received by the external environment and on the other hand, the intersection point of the individual impulses, so that, the deviations that could de-structure the group conserve their latency state^[1].

The communication experts warn that using tools and techniques in the universe of human inter-relating has become indispensable for our times. A handy theoretical proof, such as *The sphere of interactions and structures* promoted in the French area since 1991, shows that the meeting of meridians (of relationships and rules; of assistance and support points; of motivations and differences; of instructions and devices; of productions and results) with parallels (of behavior and appreciations) and the Equator of social behavior highlights the particular dispositions “located” between poles (of forms and efficiencies; of significance and meaning), vehicles favorable energetic exchanges (even of cause) to the forms of desired relational equilibrium. Therefore, it shall be in the benefit of the group to identify the people adequate for certain actional requirements, to analyze specific situations that are difficult to detect in a general overview. The examples given by Peretti, Legrand and Boniface have the gift to convince any reader interested in “theoretical” solutions. (We believe that this explanatory model would have the same profitability, or even in certain case it would be life saving, for the social actors that are in the performer status). From the increase of the group’s cohesion and the avoidance of the “wooden language” to the removal of the risk of speech trivialization and assigning unprecedented roles to certain surprise-characters within the reference group; also, from initiating some selective networks of communication and re-structure per sub-groups, to the setting up of some unprecedented methods of evaluation and promotion, all indicate the inspired “game” of the meridians called in the partnership with the three essential parallels.

The countries that declare to belong to the democratic regime, also the ones that dream to wear such a mark, put in the situation to choose

^[1] *Ibidem*, p. 14

between majoritarian democracy and consensual democracy, would prefer the latter, for good reasons: in the economical management and in the control of violence, and also in the relationship government-political parties, the consensual form has better results; in equal measure, the democratic representation, the generosity and the tolerance of the public politics, persuade especially in the regimes of consensual type.^[1] Where the first democratic Constitutions are structured, the recommendations, without any doubt, to adopt democratic reformations, in conditions of major cultural-ethnic differences, have a good success rate in a social-political life that is strictly consensual.

It is ideal to combine consensual democracies with cultures that are as consensual, but this does not happen everywhere (the examples of Switzerland, Austria, Israel, India, Belgium, etc. strengthen this concept...)

The discussion of these two democratic “formulas” has its core in the quality of democracy, the studies showed that things are much more “tangled” and have many more aspects than it is estimated. Having an enviable “start”: “to represent the minority groups and the interests of minorities, to represent in a more accurate way each of them and to represent the people in a more comprehensive manner”, the consensual people seem to honor the quality indicators of the democracy in a way that is superior to the majoritarian “trend”. An enumeration that belongs to Lijphart says, „they have better results regarding the environmental protection; they send to jail less people (...), and the consensual democracies from the developed world are more generous in giving aid to the developing countries”^[2]. Having a reputation in political science, A. Lijphart suggests to analyze the regression of the bi-varied effects of the consensual democracy on eight set of democracy quality indicators during the period 1971-1996, continuing somehow the analytical model of Robert A. Dahl (1969). For different intervals (or more specific years), there were taken into consideration: the representation in Parliament of the women, the politics regarding family, the relationship between the wealthy and the poor, the indicator of the power resour-

^[1] Arend Lijphart, *Models of democracy. Forms of government and operation in thirty six countries*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2006, p. 274

^[2]*Ibidem*, p. 252

ces, the satisfaction regarding democracy, the distance of the Government, of the electors, the corruption indicator, the people's support, etc. If we would consider only one indicator – the representation of women in politics and the protection of their interest – we would not be surprised to find out that the maximum representation (30,4%) is found in Sweden, while in New Guinea is of 0,9%! As it was expected, the consensual democracies are much more open to this indicator applicable in general to minorities, whoever they might be, exceeding with over 6 percent the degree of “female” representation in the Parliament of majoritarian democracies. As an exotic aspect, in the presidential systems, it would not be enough to have women present in the Assembly, but it would be just to elect them for the supreme position...(we remind that the real chances of the candidates to the presidency of USA and France – Hilary Clinton and Segolene Royal – both wasted, on top of all, because of the exaggerated male impulses from the final phase of the election campaign. If we add that, always, between a man and a woman with equal potential, the electors prefer the representative of masculinity, the conclusions are totally legit regarding the resonant mentioned failures). Without any doubts, the level of economical development (and probably cultural) contributes significantly to the improvement of this given state, inadequate for the millennium of equal opportunities and of sexist mitigation!

The temptation to introduce in the equation with too many unknowns (of democracy) also other indicators is not dissimulated; disappointments are not strange for the researchers, especially if his subconscious sends him to a country such as Romania (we specify that, the local political regime has not been the object of “tables” in the mentioned study, *Models of democracy...*). We let fall that only knowledge leads to many resources of economical power distributed between „n” social groups; participating in great number at the electoral “moments” means political equality and according desire to be represented (although it sounds like a rape on democracy, it has been proved that the compulsoriness of the vote stimulates the participation of the electors to exert this right); between the satisfaction of the operation of consensual democracies and the majoritarian ones, it was calculated a 17% “step” (here comes the psychological element of associating satis-

faction with the own preference for the recent elected person); finally, the dash is brought in the favor of the majoritarian democracy by the “responsibility and corruption” indicator: governments show an increased responsibility toward the electorate in order to “renew the mandate of the current government” or to “cast away the bastards”^[1].

With the warning that, often, “the bastards” repeatedly accede to power, with the hope that J.S. Mill was right to consider the governing of the majority as the fundamental condition of democracy, we remember the point of view expressed by Lijphart: the generosity and the tolerance of consensual people has its outlet in social politics, in the protection of environment, in the field of justice and in the external aid given to the petitioners. As seductive as the *pattern* of consensual democracy might appear, he is justly afraid of the cultural-institutional traditions that would show resistance, but also of the absence, as supporter, of the political culture with a consensual profile. The opportunities are being felt, but, in the sense that, as everything is learned, the consensual behavior may be also picked up, in time. The political context rather conflictual and divided (on historical, ethnical, linguistic criteria etc.) delays or entertains a consensual culture, depending on the case. The parallel between the prolonged deliberations amongst the African traditional tribes and the debates of the political coalitions of the contemporary democracies (Arthur Lewis) suggests small (but sure) steps for establishing a consensual culture.

The sociology dictionaries avoid in a diplomatic manner to make references to terms such as: protest, demonstration, conflict and violence (with the specification that the last two refer exclusively to the industrial environment and respectively to the family). From the studies that view communication science and cultural studies, there is the explicit result that violence represents the enacting of aggression (a constitutive element of personality, in the opinion of psychologists), “that involves a direct and intense action against an object or a person”^[2]. The status and the form of the violence varies: legit or invalid,

[1] Bigham G. Powell Jr., „Constitutional Design and Citizen Electoral Control”, in *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1, no. 2 (April), 1989, p. 119, apud A. Lijphart, *op. cit.*, p. 264

[2] Tim O’Sullivan, John Hartley, Danny Saunders, Martin Montgomery, John Fiske, *Fundamental concepts from communication science and cultural studies*, Ed. Polirom, Iași, 2001, p. 353

with the possibility to transform one into the other – depending on the context and the moment; from a classic, brutal manifestation of the physical act, to the *soft* performances (exchange of responses, withdrawal, silence), and the studies on the mass-media speech classified as symbolist, violence (or heavier, its reflection in the social speech) is the object of the association with the political area. Analyzed with the purpose to illustrate conceptual tools restricted to mass communication (the theory of agenda, the permanent staging of the press in conceiving the programs/summary, the “moral panic”, political debate), the phenomena of violence – based on fear and chaos – played a magistral role, showing itself, in certain political circumstances, as being a motive for “distraction” accepted by the audience and liked (in a convenient way) by them^[1]. D. Saunders gives the example of the London riots characterized, in the media process, as “anarchies”, “threats to civilization”, sufficient for the journalists to stage TV debates talking about the efficiency of the police, the vigilance of the government, etc.; in this way, the dialogues on the causes of the protests, the immediate and long term consequences, the strategies to diminish poverty amongst disadvantaged population, etc. fall into oblivion.

According to this reasoning, we could analyze the problem of the political protest of Romania in the last few months, as the media channels considered to bring into the attention of the audience: because it was the latest news, because the protests ensured the agenda of the citizen – and the rating, of course -, as they meant major social interest subjects because they were diluting (in a symbolist way) the conflictual potential of the press consumer, because the payers of advertising messages had benefits from the broadcast of explosive political subjects, etc.

The debut of the announced “dissection” can be represented by the gathering, on the 21st of August 2012, of hundreds of Bucharest people in two hot points on the Romanian protests map: a) University Square (joining those that had dissatisfactions regarding the decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania to invalidate the Referendum concerning the dismissal of President Traian Băsescu), where they were

^[1]*Ibidem*, p. 354

shouting "Go to the Szecklers/So we get rid of you!" and b) Victory Square (the place where the opponents of Victor Ponta were declaring: "I love Traian Băsescu", „T. Băsescu is a hero", „Respect for C.C.R."). By season of the right to protest, some participants have asked J.M.D. Barosso, in a rhetoric way, "Is this democracy?"; others, possibly stimulated by the microphones of the journalists and by the filming cameras, expressed in a harsh language the pain of the president Băsescu comeback the Cotroceni Palace („We don't want him anymore!"; „Our vote cannot be mocked by communist trainers in red robes", "We are not represented by this T. Băsescu"; „For eight years he has been humiliating us, he finished us, he made us poor, he must leave!"; „He must leave, leave us alone"; "He should go and be president in Hungary!").

The sociological methodology, for this case, would insist on circumstances, actors, causes, images, language...The speech analysis could not avoid elements such as: a) Crin Antonescu (temporary president) considers the decision of CCR as being unjust, neglects to collaborate with the president reverted with USL stating that "The problem is how Traian Băsescu will cohabitate with the 7.400.000 Romanian people that dismissed him", announcing in a ritual manner – „Traian Băsescu does not exist for us. He was dismissed by the electors"; b) Victor Ponta declares that the alliance, whose co-president he is, shall respect the CCR decision that proves to be "political, immoral and illegal"; c) the PDL president (the main opposition party, Vasile Blaga, says on television that there is a possibility to discuss and collaborate with all the political forces, given that, following the referendum from the 29th of July 2012 "There is no victory. Nobody has won"; d) the president rehabilitated by the CCR decision Traian Băsescu, is being silent!

In the vision of some officials, this protest was unauthorized, fences were broken, and the traffic on Magheru Boulevard was blocked for a short while. The prime minister contradicts him: "I am glad that the protest participants proceeded in a peaceful manner and there haven't been any incidents". The journalists ask why the law enforcement agents (the Gendarmerie) did not intervene like in February 2012, and the Internal Affairs Minister (M. Duşa) either responds indirectly ("Those who did not apply the law should answer this!"), either blames the communication department of the Romanian Gendarmerie for the

content of the press release... (the minister of PSD origin notifies the mass-media that he ordered an investigation to find out “those gentleman who make press releases that don't present reality”).

In the next days (for example the 23rd of August), some remonstrators from Timișoara and Maramureș add up, reaching a high level of fear and suspicion, so that it is requested to mark with individual names the uniforms of the gendarmes that go on the streets (to be able to submit, if necessary, felony complaints on real, verifiable persons, if they committed abuses in the relationship with the remonstrators; it remained in the collective memory the order of the “unknown” gendarme: “Put the culture web site in the van!”).

The day of 24th of August brings a challenging balance sheet: 100 protestors from the University Square are being investigated; 50 criminal case files are made for those who blocked the traffic on

Magheru Boulevard?^[1] Under the loop of the public opinion (or only the loop of the journalists claiming to have professional objectivity), the Romanian Gendarmerie releases to the press, on the 25th of August, a note specifying that they were identified, with the help of the surveillance cameras, 106 people that disturbed the public order in the center of the Capital, fact that “translated” to seven criminal case files for destruction, 49 files for disturbing the peace and 50 fines. One day later, 60 protestors are being filmed in the Izvor Park, against the comeback of Traian Băsescu in the highest position of the Romanian state. They declare that they are for one week in opposition with the one they call, within a slogan, “The man without God”.

After serious negotiations (the 27th of August), the members of the Parliament from PNL, PSD, PC decide to “witness the carrying of water”, which means to participate in the special meeting where the CCR representative publicly and officially communicates, the right of

Traian Băsescu to take back his appointment (some people revealed the urgencies of the prime-minister Ponta, via phone from South Africa, for the meeting quorum in the law making process...). In contrary case, the press would have had another subject, more precisely the breaking

[1] Surveys given to the public on the 24th of August 2012 announced 62% pro USL for the voting intentions, the level of trust in the politicians of nowadays varies between 48% - V. Ponta, 43% - C. Antonescu, 19% - V. Blaga and 16% - T. Băsescu.

of the USL, fact that is unconceivable" (V. Hrebenciuc – PSD). In a way, the 950.000 supporters of the president in his last mandate could enjoy the victory! Also on Monday, the Internal Affairs Minister, M.Dușa, accounts the Romanian Gendarmerie for the criminal case files of the protestors, and its managements "restructures" the communication department, giving right, implicitly, to the PSD governor! Because on Tuesday he would have come back to the office in Cotroceni Palace the president dismissed 87% of the electors, a member of the Parliament from PNL (Ioan Ghișe) „was taking a walk" on the sideway in front of the symbolic building, in his way to the Botanic Garden. The gendarmes from the spot warned him that protest is not allowed; Ghișe denied that he is publicly manifesting any discontent regarding the president, but he was wearing a sign that said explicitly: "The people decided / Băsescu is dismissed".

The following period has the same protest "face", regardless we are talking about the intellectual type opposition of the writer Herta Müller („It is shameless what USL is doing in Bucharest. They are the remainings of the communists and they don't care") or of the Romanian Secular-Cultural Association, an accuser of the Ministry of Education for the content of some religion and history text books, in the pre-university school system (they make obsessive references to sin, hell and demons, eternal punishment). The speech interventions have clear political "targets": the owner of the Nobel prize for literature has hard feelings regarding the left doctrine, and E. Andronescu – the PSD Minister of the Romanian school again-, representatives of the Romanian Patriarchy and of the NGOs (the Secular-Cultural Association) politically approaches the subjects regarding the population in the education system, the professors, the editors of the suspected text books.

Also in a political key we can read the street protest of the employees of „Oltchim" Râmnicu Vâlcea, once the "pearl of Romanian industry", the remonstrators state that they didn't receive their salaries since July (nor the meal tickets), that the union leaders don't represent them as they would desire, that the director of the factory doesn't support the cause of the second generation of employees, that the government (whoever it was), for the last years, doesn't take into consideration the desperate situation of the Vâlcea area. The tip of the iceberg is the

champion of feminine handball, the famous team „Oltchim”, that is almost excluded from the international competitions because it doesn't have financial support anymore.

Using as a “flag” for the quasi-generalized discontents a national symbol of sport, the protests in the Olt Valley rapidly won a priority in the media, but put the political actors to work: parties, ministers, members of the Parliament, local leaders, councilmen, hired media (even discreetly). The target of many clubs and teams – Champions League – exalted the interest of a numerous public, abiding the rule greatly verified within the media industries: politics and sports always sell... All the interveners expressed the fear that a private investor would not finance the handball team (that would fall apart), the disappointment that the budget of the competent ministry would never be able to cover the support of the sports values (neither the mass sports, as we all know!), that the Government does not seem to become the governor of a national brand, as „Oltchim” proved to be. The political opponents of the executives (Sever Cotoi Voinescu – PDL) skillfully speculate, saying that “the Ponta Governments shall find a solution, but only because it is an election year and no prime-minister would miss such an opportunity”.

On the national mourning day of USA (the 11th of September), the Mihăiță Calimente deputy (PNL) protests, by exiting the plenum meeting of the Parliament, in the moment of the vote that send Sergiu Andon beyond the doors of the Assembly, on incompatibility grounds (as a lawyer, S. Andon – PC – was not allowed to represent someone in the court of law). The defense took place, of course, in TV shows, where the experienced lawyer-journalist pleaded in the favor of the need for jurists in the Parliament: “We can't have district attorneys, we can't have judges, we can't have policemen...”

On the 12th of September, it is the turn of the Roma people to protest in Bucharest. A few hours before the visit in our country, the French Minister of Internal Affairs Manuel Valls, said in an interview given to the audio-visual from the Hexagon that “France can't afford to take in «all the trash of the world»”, that is why the banish of the Roma people to their origin countries (Bulgaria and Romania) shall continue. The leaders of our co-nationals of Roma ethnicity say that the attitude of our

government became intolerable, totally indifferent to the need for minority integration. “We don’t want to be used only once every 4 years for elections, as a mass play”, the remonstrators shout, decided to go to Cotroceni to discuss two issues: on one hand, the rule saying that every time any member of the Roma community announces the candidature for a position on the Parliament he must have governmental acceptance – which is inadmissible-, and on the other hand, to ask help from the president (the Civic Democratic Alliance of the Roma people reminds Traian Băsescu that they gave him their vote during the two mandates: “We helped him when he needed. The same way we made him president, we can bring him down!”). In an emergency pick-up, the minister announces to have approved the funds for the integration of the Roma people. Their leaders shout (so that the French minister and the EU can hear?!) that there was no need for the western mission to come in order to say that, in Romania, the Roma people are being discriminated regarding work places and education. The *breaking news* day closes with the request of the „Oltchim” union for the resignation of the person that didn’t stand by them (the union leader), at the same time with seven workers going on hunger strike (“as long as we will be able physically, as much as it is needed to resolve the situation”).

The 13th of September gains attention because of two major elements: a) at „Oltchim” the number of people who choose to go on hunger strike reaches 30; the delegated minister Liviu Pop is welcomed in the factory with hooting (“Because he lied to us”); Bogdan Hossu – leader of a union – talks about the premeditation of the „Oltchim” bankruptcy; b) the president re-installed by the CCR has his first appearance to the Romanian people, announcing a trip to Bruxelles, with “zero degree meetings”: Jose M.D. Barosso, Viviane Reding, Herman von Rompuy. May this be a reply to the inland “exile”? Or the response to the message of millions of Romanian people that do not want him anymore as president, officially, through voting? Or an impulse of power with the formal recognition of EU? Or, maybe, is a sign of thanks for the huge support given by the leaders and the European institutions..

The current approach of the protests “season” with a clear political stake should close not on the 13, in order to not feed “astrological” sensitivities, becoming the interest of some of the science lecturers. We

shall claim, therefore, the “mute protest” of some tens of Bucharest people who lighted up candles at the SRTV headquarters in the memory of *TVR Cultural* (recently closed by the new management team led by the liberal Claudiu Săftoiu), but also by the opposition’s attack in the Parliament regarding the policy of the Ponta Government to “destabilize the national education system”, by transferring, starting with the next school year, the zero class in the pre-school spaces and by accepting the professional baccalaureate, in fact an alternative for those who do not dare to go through the classic, theoretical baccalaureate...

Acknowledgement

This study was made within the project POSDRU/89/1.5/S/56815 The Society Based on Knowledge – researches, debates, perspectives, co-financed by the European Union and the Romanian Government from the Social European Fund through the Operational Sector Programme for the Development of Human Resources 2007-2013.

References

1. Dagenais, B. (2003). *Campania de relații publice*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
2. Dagenais, B. (2002) *Profesia de relaționist*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
3. Goffman, E. (2003). *Viața cotidiană ca spectacol*, Ed. Comunicare.ro, București.
4. Lijphart, A. (2006). *Modele ale democrației. Forme de guvernare și funcționare în treizeci și șase de țări*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
5. Mucchielli, A. (2005). *Arta de a comunica. Metode, forme și psihologia situațiilor de comunicare*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
6. O’Sullivan, T., John Hartley, Danny Saunders, Martin Montgomery, John Fiske (2001) *Concepte fundamentale din științele comunicării și studiile culturale*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
7. de Peretti, A., Jean-André Legrand, Jean Boniface (2001). *Tehnici de comunicare*, Ed. Polirom, Iași.
8. Powell, B. Jr. (1989). Constitutional Design and Citizen Electoral Control, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1 (2) (April).