"1 December 1918 in the Exile Press" (pp. 354-362) is represented by the factors alerting Western Europe to the threat of Soviet expansionism. Mihaela Toader sustains that the identity profile of the post-war exile is determined by the characteristic of fighting communism and for liberation of countries under Soviet influence, describing the main figures of the Romanian post-war exile present either in groups from the old democratic formations, or in groups of nationalist orientation, playing the role of a European awake consciousness.

In the last part of the volume, "Bessarabia (1918)/Republic of Moldova (2018)" Dan Dungaciu proposes "Sociological Evaluations: Potential Unionism, Passive Unionism, Unionism of the Heart and Unionism of the Mind" (pp. 364-373) grounded on the complete and nuanced sociological quantitative research dedicated to the unionist issue in the Republic of Moldova, FUMN SURVEY on the theme of uniting Moldova with Romania (GRAPHS), 11.08.2016, http://fumn.eu/ sondaj-fumn-pe-tema-unirii-r-moldova-cu-romania-grafice. The investigation indicates and nuances the types of unionism from the left bank of the Prut: "(…) unionism is an area of sometimes pointless involvement, of deep emotions, of youth and hot blood, of ideas of urgency and the fact that everything must be done here and now, of a lack of patience and a sense of irrepressible historical mission. But also of massive conceitedness, generational vanities, resentment, and private idiosyncrasies. Let us not, therefore, expect unanimity ... Perhaps, just a little wisdom." (p. 372)

Petrișor Peiu approaches in the next and last but not least study in the volume the topic of "Balancing the Costs and Benefits of the Projected Reunification between Romania and Republic of Moldova" (pp. 374-). The investigation places the accent on the "big picture" and proposes two models to appreciate the reunification of the two countries, the German and the Korean one. In the German model the reunion implied the constitution of a bigger market which became an engine of growth. The important investments made very soon after reunification by West Germany in the East Germany, the accent placed on exports and the consistency in following the macroeconomic policies reduced the development gaps. The researcher concludes that if Romania begins the reduction of development gap today, by the end of the first quarter of 2019 it would have generated savings of up to 20% in the reunification budget in 2020.

Although economy cannot be predicted with great precision, from the lessons of reunion in Europe, many of those still to be understood, we find that reunion is rather beneficial not only in terms of politics, society, culture and symbolic history, but also in economic terms.

Henrieta Anișoara Șerban

Gheorghe Dănișor

Însingurare. O filosofie despre istoria eșuată a umanității, (*Estrangement. A Philosophy about the Failed History of Humanity*), Editura Universul Juridic și Editura Simbol, 2019, 302 p.

The relation of the human being to her inner universe and to others, to society and to the world has, generally, two aspects, which are, both relevant and contradictory: the first, in which the others and the society are a natural and valuable extension of the self, or, the second, through which the others and society appear to the individual as, demanding and, possibly, burdensome, but sometimes beneficial "foreign" realities.

The preoccupations regarding the understanding of the human being, through processes of analysis and self-analysis, and through recognizing the other and the self in the other are aiming to "capture the true value of the logos" (p. 7), that is, both as *ratio* and as

sermo, as they formulate the perspective of interpretation proposed by Gh. Dănișor, in the recent book entitled *Însingurare. O filosofie despre istoria eșuată a umanității* (*Estrangement. A Philosophy of the Failed History of Humanity*). The individualism of the present time brings the human being to the condition of estrangement both in relation to the others and to (her) self.

According to our perspective, however, the irreducible problem is that we must recognize, in Aesopian spirit (see his fable about language), that both *ratio* and *sermo* are potentially (even when they are taken together, without a scision) sources of inter-human connection, at times and sources of separation, another time; we cannot identify a single part of the logos (the reason or its expression in discourse) as the determinant factor for cohesion and solidarity, full of responsibility and recognition between people, but it is necessary to identify the social logos.

The book proposes a research organized diachronically focused on the coordinates of Antiquity, the Middle Ages as well as modernity and postmodernity. Starting from logic as the basis of politics, we reach the noetic, the ontological-noetic good and the meaning of the good. Also, the Ancient Platonic thinking highlights the role of education (*paideia*). Through philosophy and *paideia*, the opening to *theoreo* leads to the *agathon*. Through contemplation, we access the field of ideas and archetypes that underpin creation.

The philosophical path is potentially the path to consciousness. The philosophical path through life is also described by the old counsel "Know thyself!" But knowing in relation to what? How we contemplate and what we analyse, if we eliminate the relation to the great ideas and archetypes, many of them, with a pronounced principled characteristic. There may be an absolute knowledge, without reference and comparative terms, but this knowledge produces just a type of information, which is not necessarily also meaning (socio-human relevance). The individual consciousness, as well as the collective consciousness, are structured and oriented by interpretation: by reference to principles, that is, by the assumed meanings, by referring to coherent perspectives, to the corpora of ideas and archetypes composing human culture. And here also, the principle and the archetype are joined by similarity: the archetype is also interpreted as a model, with the "force" of ethical, political and teaching meaning, as we have recently interpreted things within a typology of representations and images, in the human society governed by image.

However, the teaching "Know thyself!" refers not only to the philosophical gaze within, but also to the social, gnoseological, axiological, and ethical gaze, directed to "outward" and towards the present, past and future, too. Knowledge comes with power and responsibility, as well as with the adequacy of the relationship with the other, to the other and to the context. Besides, even if we follow the main interpretative approach, according to Plato, through knowledge, we arrive only at the "gates of the Good and in the vestibule of Goodness' dwelling" (p. 29).

This benefit (to find oneself – at least – "at the gates of the Good") is not the exclusive privilege of the philosopher, but it belongs to any man endowed with the intellectual capacity to realize the benefits of the logos and not only those of the relating and relationships, this being the advantage of the individual with philosophical inclination and capacities. With the clear meanings we also have a high probability of openness toward the area of responsibility, accountability, a concern with the consequences and finalities, that is, an openness toward ethics. This high probability is not guaranteed. But without this philosophical enlightenment of rationality in society, the ethical approach becomes irrelevant, and human rationality is reduced to calculation. The renunciation of *agathon*, which is for philosophers the ontological-noetic guiding principle, has as a consequence the impossibility of relation and binding.. Without referring to the principle, the relations become superficial

and easy to be broken, and, the social solidarity is frail. Then we see that everything is fragmented: each with her truth, each with her interest are ingredients that further alter the politics and further remove it from the spirit of the *polis*. This separation is destructive, because the goal disappears, the purpose of the actions". (p. 65) In our opinion, the separation is really dangerous, but rather because in the individualistic multiplication of the goals and finalities, which do not disappear, a logic of the type "purpose excuses the means" is created, doubled by the appearance of a "space" of the goals and purposes, a true "market" governed by an economic logic of demand and supply, which, in turn, leads to an increase in the share of goals and purposes that involve *immediate* gain, with solely *individual relevance*, here and now.

On the path of the investigation conducted by Gh. Dănișor we find even in the history of the philosophy the sources of rampant individualism and of insecurity. The chapter entitled "The sophists or the moment of fragmentation of the logos" focuses on the separation of the *physis* from the *nomos*, which is equivalent to the separation of the political from the natural things (p. 54), so that the thought does not really trigger the logos. This, the logos, implies a *plural cogito* (as opposed to what we find in the sophists and in Descartes), a dialogue of thought with itself (see the Aristotelian principle of the thinking that thinks itself) – p. 58. "The vice of the sophist age of thinking is that of supporting the word sufficiently, having the arrogance to eliminate the principles, as being useless, because they cannot be proven. According to the logic, the principles are improvable, but they are known directly" (see p. 59). Consequently, the sophists also renounced the importance accorded to the paramount principle – the Good. The rather non-principled thinking implies the politics-negotiation and even the politics-trade, shows Gh. Dănișor, with negative, non-principled and thus unfair consequences, for the whole society. Philosophical thinking and speaking have the purpose of capturing whatever there is, the "genus of the real" (Plato), the grounds and the fundamentals (a specific essence, *ti esti,* of which Alexandru Surdu also talks about) and that is the reason why the philosophical stake is that the road that passes through both well-founded thought and speech, to lead to the Truth. The solution of the social contract, anchored in the *nomos* area, in the area of the conventional, where one encounter conventions relatively emancipated from the principles, because they only follow rules, and allow for advantages, persuasion and, eventually, manipulation.

Hellenism contributed to the "failed history" by separating the interiority from the human exteriority. The emphasis on the relationship, which stems from the separation, neglects the essence: the unity between the *polis* and the *politeia*, the fact that "the *polis* is only a passing way of expressing that being-together-with-others" (p. 67), whose quality (respect for human individuality in social cohesion) depends on the unitary logos and out from it. The work of Ion Banu, titled *The Philosophy of Hellenism as Ethics* (1980) is beautifully used in a discussion about philosophical units of meaning and consonant structure with the plea for unity between individual intuitions and the rational and discursive structure on which depends being-together-with-others, which it is precisely the expression of the plenary logos.

The author demonstrates that the Middle Ages deepened the separation between *ratio* and *sermo*, which also generated the emergence of individualism in philosophy and law, a dissociation of the logos expressed socio-politically by excessive fragmentation, resolved afterwards by absolutism. If "The universal is an ideal (pre-existing form) embodied in things. This is the existential-noetic as a foundation" (p. 98), and the human's relation to the logos, universality and ideal state "makes" history. But this is a theoretical grounding with ethical potential. It is the aspect by which in the logos we also

have the dimension of the connection, that is, *lego*. *The embedding of ontology in logos* implies a type of openness, freedom and liberation, whose understanding and capitalization starts from this urge, by which everything gains in meaning and clarity, the relating reason approaching people to *agathon*.

Descartes is emblematic both for the "clear ideas" and for a philosophy of certainty, as well as for modern philosophical individualism. Gh. Dănișor demonstrates, in Kant's footsteps, that "the specific Cartesian figure of truth will henceforth be certainty, the centre of which is the self-relation of the 'self' in 'I think'." (p. 107) In other words, the problem of Cartesianism is the self that triumphs over objectivity. I think therefore I am, is the maxim of modern individualism and the generator of the "closure of consciousness itself" and of a Leibnizian monadology, without any benefits for social cohesion. Kant, without cancelling the "I think therefore I am", approaches the rational-action man, who gives (himself) the law and who, based on the individualism in the law, opens it toward the others, through the responsibility with which he invests it. Hegel engages the individual in the dialectics of an absolute Spirit, in a universal becoming, in the pursuit of freedom, and the fulfilment of freedom and the becoming of the Idea are not the "merit" of the individual, but only involve the individual. (p. 113-125) As a result, "Descartes's man is an individual who isolates himself", while "Kant's and Hegel's men wander in an objectivity in which they are merely an instrument for an achievement to which they regard with astonishment and no longer understand", being both "far too subjected to the rational" and led astray from the *agathon*. The author notices that only Levinas specifies that "There is no freedom and, as a result, no understanding unless I consider the other as a form of an externalized self", using "understanding as an act of original goodwill", this being the chance of the complete man and not the conception of a "superman" (as a Nietzschean overating of individualism), nor any form of the new totalitarian human being.

The critique of the contractual logic is a critique of the conventional logic oriented in one way or another by an interest, whose moral founding value can never be raised to the level of the main logic oriented by the *agathon*. Kant himself, in his contractualism, identifying the concept of "good will" is much closer to a necessary ontological foundation of morality. Comparing the Aristotelian and Kantian models of thinking as Anton Dumitriu does, Gh. Dănișor points out that the Aristotelian model is based on the intuitive secession of the essences (while the Kantian model is merely formal). Thus, the model opens the way to capture reality, towards understanding and here for the possibility of belonging and participation (p. 163). These are the ingredients of the undistorted social existence. What significance a conception really like the Rawlsian we may achieve, what kind of justice as fairness we may have, if it is independent of any claim of objective truth, asks the author, valuing an observation made by R. Dworkin. After all, a more careful analysis points out to a (circular) argument of the type "if equity is, equity must be".

In postmodernism, the author's interpretation aims to overcome the deconstructivist vision through wholeness-comprehension-understanding. Philosopher Gh. Dănișor relays in this sense to an aesthetics of *uitării* which occasions in Romanian language a play in words between gazing and forgetting: to interpret holistically, to comprehend and to understand implies to look and forget the self (reminding us both of Levinas and of the question of knowledge in feminism and situated knowledge at Donna Haraway, where the gaze evaluates the distances and reduces them). As a consequence, the gaze brings relating "in plain sight" as an "elevating art of patience", a quasi-spontaneous and unifying tendency of the gaze, a return to the self by forgetting about the self. To be visible becomes a form of being for the other and a path toward ethical postmodernism. "The contemporary estrangement of the human being is the result of her inability to transpose into the rules

that inner disposition toward good deeds. This natural disposition must be realized and transposed into universal behaviour, highlighting the moral capacity of the human being. Rules must not be invented" (p. 193), because the Aristotelian feeling of the good as a natural thing will also involve reason, which, in collaboration with the feeling, will cause a certain vibration of the good and of the love (both active in *agathon*) to reach the other, to "touch" the other and to be specific to the human being, to the same extent, as if it started from her inner self. The individual consciousness remains an ethical-moral instance, in postmodernism, too, the author accepts it, but he thinks that this instance is weakened in postmodernism by the emphasis placed on *sermo*, on discursiveness. This results in a dispersion of norms in the contingency (p. 204), aspects discussed in the chapter entitled "Postmodern law".

"Being-together-with-others" represents the centre of interest for this philosophical endeavour; "the unifying structure of life in society" is a social unifying logos, bringing together reason and feeling, good-will and education and whose role is to bring into the visible field of recognition the care, the freedom, the fairness, the loyalty, the authority, the sacred. Through education, people recognize the true nature of righteous beings, of the Good, and become more able to manifest freely for Good, that is, to confirm this habit of being good (as a *hexis*). Volunteering is just a confirmation of this human habit of professing the good in a selfless way (pp. 287-297).

The society has been and it remains relatively distorted in comparison to the ideals formed by contemplation, which lead to logos ("social logos"), accountability and recognition, that is, to a desirable type of sociality and existence. Relationship for good is a philosophical inclination of the order of normality, which becomes an event, only in the existence led for survival, "within the immediate realm of things and for security" (Lucian Blaga).

Henrieta Anișoara Șerban

Cristian-Ion Popa
Liberalismul și adversarii săi (*Liberalism and Its Adversaries*), Bucharest, Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale "Ion I. C. Brătianu", 2019, 411 p.

The book is a research of liberalism understood as constitutional order and economic reality, with various forms and characteristics, further defined against its main political adversaries, namely socialism and conservatism, with their diverse versions, since the 18th century and until the present times.

Guided by the Rawlsian idea of justice, as primordial value for the social institutions and truth, as the paramount value for political philosophy, the investigation is structured in three parts and an epilogue. The first part captures the specific of liberalism against socialism and welfare state, conservatism, republicanism and (neo-)republicanism. The second part approaches the relations between state and market considering the constitutional political rights and freedoms of the citizens, the question of the economic constitution in nowadays liberal democracies, the de-centralized governance, the liberal and socialist meanings of the public debt and the "will of the people" in relation to the "common good" and the so-called "tragedy of the commons". The third part evaluates liberalism considering the challenges of globalization, the illiberal trends of populism and protectionism and the implications of the "post-national constellation" of states in the European Union. Finally, the epilogue discusses the crisis of the European values and the challenges of globalization.