

**REALITY AND MYTH. TECHNIQUES USED FOR THE AMBIGUOUS****Vlad-Ionuț SIBECHI**

”Ștefan cel Mare” University of Suceava

*Abstract: We can say that, when the political context has allowed it, it gave space for another network of myths to rise, a kind of counter-mythology made by an intellectual elite in the trenches of anonymity, however a test (most often illusory) to retrieve a balance. Aware of the retrograde status of literature, some literary critics, including those who tried a subtle retreat from underneath the boot of socialist realism, aim to rethink and change the rules of the game by establishing with the help of inertia, a new mythology.*

*Keywords: ideology, mythes, mythology, ambiguity, illusion.*

By going deep into the core issues of communist literature it is easy to see how far it has strayed from its mission, having to reassess its route using allusive and ambiguous techniques. The writer is feeling compelled to acquire „official mythology”, and thus becomes a mere instrument of popular political ideology disguised as a literary text, which confuses the new direction and doesn't recognize it as a fatal flaw. Thus, the myth, the very quality of being subversive, managed long enough to maintain the illusion of normality; writers trying to condemn, from the shelter of the ambiguous, the intrusion of politics - an officially regulated absurdity - and a strict control over literary props made by ideological critics.

What relevance has a literature that must mirror social and political „great achievements” in this context? To reflect these achievements where appropriate, or to come up with some if there are higher interests involved. The argument to make the literature official can be made based on the idea of „method of creation”, or the one that involves a one-way direction in which any deviations from the standardized pattern must be terminated immediately with serious consequences for that author.

The abnormality of a system such as this one is highlighted in one of Karl R. Popper's speeches: „Admittedly, disagreement may lead to strife, and even to violence. And this, I think, is very bad indeed, for I abhor violence. Yet disagreement may also lead to discussion, to argument, and to mutual criticism. And these, I think, are of paramount importance. I suggest that the greatest step towards a better and more peaceful world was taken when the war of swords was first supported, and later sometimes even replaced, by a war of words.” (Popper, 1998, 54-55)

Unfortunately, romanian communist literature was robbed this right, especially until 1964. Intellectual disputes have existed but only in theory and just to help highlight social realism in a sort of competition based on loud statements and vanity. Every single one of them were „staged to mask the same thing: that literature and thought are strictly prohibited.” (Goldiș, 2011, 17)

Karl Popper's affirmation, who took the position as defender of reason, „an almost orthodox supporter of unorthodoxy”, was not made randomly. The communist propaganda by itself, built its own mythos starting from the christian model, and by extent, from a need to cover personal interest. Eugen Negrici does an in-depth analysis of this issue by succeeding to organize and highlight this idea of mystification and mythification, placing the blame on fanaticism and utter defalcation.

The apostles are represented by Lenin, Stalin or Gheorghiu-Dej and the soviet soldier appears as a martir who sacrifices himself for a better future, a paradise that is nothing else but a society built by the new man. Judas appears as the enemy pertaining to another social class, etc.

Therefore, a mesianic revolution, which urges people to become united and employs their total involvement in making radical changes, only makes things worse by dividing and condemning them using a level of enfrontery that cannot be explained. It's interesting to see what Alex Goldiș has to say in regard of this issue: „The concept of socialist realism, the literary critic who exercises his profession in writing and in finite texts, however armed with ideologies and however faithful he remains to the party, he still is a semi-impostor who is tolerated by the regime.” (Goldiș, 2011, 12)

An argument could be made about the often auto-critique that is employed by the important servants of the new directions as a consequence of the attacks made by their fellow colleagues or about the changes made in the higher rankings of the party.

On this slippery ground, the literary critic (and not only) is a simple accessory. The party gives careful consideration to remind him of his limited status and a certain lack of legitimacy as their existence is conditioned by the constant guidance that is coming from the center. In such a situation occurs *Autonomia* aesthetic unrepeatability of the past. Powerful voices of critics such as Titu, G. Calinescu and E. Lovinescu, who imposed a canon whose rules strictly related to the aesthetic value of the work, are replaced by dilettantes such as Silviu Iosifescu, Ion Vitner, N. Moraru, etc.

We can say that, when the political context has allowed it, it gave space for another network of myths to rise, a kind of counter-mythology made by an intellectual elite in the trenches of anonymity, however a test (most often illusory) to retrieve a balance. Aware of the retrograde status of literature, some literary critics, including those who tried a subtle retreat from underneath the boot of socialist realism, aim to rethink and change the rules of the game by establishing with the help of inertia, a new mythology.

*Iluziile literaturii române* – such a controversial work of Eugen Negrici - aims to rethink and reevaluate the empty concepts, inertial interpretations, from a systemic perspective, by determining breaks and gaps and by using the idea of myth and mythology alternatively. In an effort to compensate, to withdraw comfortably in the shell of the axiom each time history's air becomes toxic the myths of the Besieged Fortress, Evil Conspiracy, the Myth of the Savior, the Providential Man, and the Golden Age get activated. At the same time mentalities, mythical, that will put pride above any aesthetic principle will get activated as well. These are the illusions which the author refers to, not of literature but of literary criticism, their reception in general.

Another issue could be that of a mythology emerging with the changing context of artistic mentality. In the literature about political servitude the favorite themes remain the same: the hero leader, party glory. However, the literary ceaucesc model appears to be in continuity and in an apparent contradiction to the socialist realist. The writer must refer to the past in laudatory manner, only mentioning „some minor shortcomings of socialism” (Negrici, 2003, 19).

We can say that Eugen Negrici does not limit the true sense of the word, but is interested in the militarization processes, impeding those who have made or will make literary history, showing how sterile are the indignant voice echoes of patriotism. We see a piqued, brave critic who shook many immobile value systems, stuck in their own illusion of permanence.

He does not want to outline an evolution, but chooses to deconstruct it on the basis that, necessarily, the creation of historiography is a product involving a chronological coherence and development. The Romanian land, the idea of a history of literature might

seem illusory because of out-of-faze historical accidents, developments and synchronization – all imposed by countervailing interests regarding the aesthetic factor. One such example is given by Monica Spiridon who said that postwar literature is very hard to digest in the context of literary history as it is assessed by two alternative systems: literary hierarchy and socialist canon.

Of course we can look at these phenomena separately, but taking into account only the symbiotic interactions between them. In reality however, the ideological thaw was not complete, coming from the writer's conscience of liberty and literature. It was controlled by the center or as a result of sabotage from within the tacit agreement of some censors who saw easy to decipher subversive messages, but chose not to do so instead.

The issue is discussed in Sanda Cordoș, *Literatura între revoluție și reacțiune*: „The autonomy of aesthetics worked when the power was granted. Although always supervised, hunted and harassed, as she was constantly a potential for subversion, in the communist regime, appeared, undeniably, a true literature and major literary works got published. They coexist with official literature, which circulates and theorizes political ideology.” (Cordoș, 2003, 183) It will make possible for a subversive speech to be made, if not by ways of myth and its power to rebrand and make ambiguous, then it will attempt to destabilize and recover the literary heritage of the past that was forged, in order to build the new state policy.

So this allusive speech by appealing to myth is the only viable option to camouflage a critical attitude. However, it would be interesting to note that the first who took a stand in rejecting, or at least minimizing the destructive effects of the intrusion of politics into literary life, were writers and critics in the province. A first attempt to redefine lyricism is the movement made by the people from Steaua (Star) magazine. Poets like A.E. Baconsky, Victor Felea, Aurel Rău, aim to rethink the essence of poetry, restoring ties with the great interwar tradition. In the magazine Aurel Rău signs a manifest that says: „We understand that we have to contribute to make things better and more beautiful, not only obscure work of sorting or processing of texts will see the light, but persistently, number by number, with the help of objectives that we will propose and the discussions we will initiate. We would love to promote and debunk critical right, bearing fertile suggestions to campaigns or values outside interests.” Is this a courageous attitude, a true overflow, but the realities are more troubled than anyone can anticipate. However, the big meeting, at least in the virtual plane of literature takes place as a consequence of achievements in order to see the importance of a magazine that represented a point of reference and support within a culture dominated by the ideology of the party.

However, in an era in which the propensity to act to the detriment of the periphery of contemplation and pushing the idea of internalization were seen as textual politics, poets managed to evade the official direction, developing a poem evoking the simple things. Poets from Steaua attempted to redefine poetry, remounting lyricism on its throne. This was in the detriment of anecdotal and rhetoric as the magazine mobilized all forces by using its critical notes and chronicles against it. They wanted to design poetry as natural speech, using Blaga's formula which stated that a poet such as Baconsky cannot be removed completely, even being charged at a time that under his influence „myths are too close to a nature full of signs (myths) busybodies” (Simion).

The generations of poets after 1960 profited enormously from the opening Baconsky announced in 1956. It is the first attempt he makes to abandon Romanian poetry canon of socialist realism and lyrical language to embrace modernization. In a speech at the First Congress of Writers of RPR, he wondered: „What are the limits of realism in prose?” stressing the danger in which the literature, especially poetry, can be slid under the realistic, in a superficial manner. This strategy is used by Vera Călin trying to reintroduce in the

vocabulary of critics some terms that were previously banned, accusing the austerity of such a specialized language.

Baconsky's speech is important because it addresses an issue of general interest for the evolution of Romanian poetry. On this occasion he condemns the refusal of „conquests modern poetic art” (Martin, 1990), made also in the name of realism. Nothing good would come of this. Poetry would suffer from a diminishing trend in means of expression, an anachronism of a black hole effect. The effect of this speech is a kind of self-denial that happened to poets who published in the '50s. They will be reviewing the productions of time, or will give up many of them. Even Baconsky's debut sits under proletcult. Some poems written before 1957 are obedient to the political regime, characterized by rhetorical devices and decorative slogans. This poem, that the poet denies writing it later in life, is only interesting in terms of drawing a trajectory of evolution. The real shift in the aesthetic plan occurs with the advent of *Cadavre în vid*, announcing a mature poet with lots to offer. Poetic vision is one of lucidity, recording a state of crisis that is both existential and moral, in order to convert naive reverie into nightmare, paradise into hell, in a dark prophecy of a future degradation, of incoherence and self-alienation.

It's easy to see how in Romanian literature, „passed through the customs of censorship and political willpower”(Cordoș, 2003, 187), is always a network of myths or mythological recurrence, as myth seems to lose its autonomy with contextual existence. Thus, it becomes a mythological network imposed by an external political power, unresolved when it comes to its identity. It finds imperative to regain itself through the practice of a speech that is subversive and rehabilitating.

*Lucrarea a beneficiat de suport financiar prin proiectul cu titlul “SOCERT. Societatea cunoașterii, dinamism prin cercetare”, număr de identificare contract POSDRU/159/1.5/S/132406. Proiectul este cofinanțat din Fondul Social European prin Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane 2007-2013. Investește în Oameni!”*

#### **Bibliography:**

Karl R. Popper, *Mitul contextului. În apărarea științei și a raționalității*, Editura Trei, 1998.

Alex Goldiș, *Critica în tranșee. De la realismul socialist la autonomia esteticului*, Editura Cartea Românească, București, 2011.

Eugen Negrici, *Literatura română sub comunism. Proza*, Editura Fundatiei PRO, București, 2003.

Sanda Cordoș, *Literatura între revoluție și reacțiune*, Biblioteca Apostrof, Cluj-Napoca, 2002.

Eugen Simion, *In ariergarda avangardei*, preluat de pe <http://revistacultura.ro/nou/2009/11/a-e-baconsky-i/>

Mircea Martin, *Extatica trecere a poetului în A. E. Baconski, Scrieri I – poezii*, Editura Cartea

Românească, București, 1990.

Corin Braga, *10 studii de arhetipologie*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.