Bulletin of the *Transilvania* University of Braşov
Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies • Vol. 9 (58) No. 2 – 2016

When you no longer have a sense of humour and supporters leave you (Romanian Presidential Discourses 1965-2004)

Eugen ISTODOR[1]

The paper will reconstruct identity and classification clues to place humor within the restrictive limits of a social group and a historic moment. The result will be, according to Bourdieu (1982, 1991), "a systematic reconstitution of the area. The used domains will be: pragmatic linguistics, the dynamics of the social groups, and the sociology of the means of communication. The present study tries to find answers regarding the social process by which public statements become inadequate, even more hilarious. The identification characteristics of hegemonic politic groups will be analyzed as well as their evolution within the community patterns like: open/ closed society, community of practice/ community of interest (Lave, Wenger, 1991), community of practice/ mobile community of practice(Kietzmann, 2013). The present analyses intends to describe the inadequacies between the individual habitus of those at the top of the political hierarchy (Bourdieu, 1982, 1991) and the " community of practice/ of interest", namely the initial core of supporters multiplied with the number of the electorate.

Keywords: *presidential discourse, the sociology of humour, community of practice, ascent/decline*

1. Introduction

The present study aims at providing answers concerning the social process through which public declarations become inadequate and even hilarious. We shall analyze the characteristics of identity belonging to hegemonic political entities and their evolution within the community models such as: the open/closed society, community of practice/community of interest (Love and Wenger, 1991), community of practice/mobile community of practice (Kietzmann, 2013). The analysis sets out to describe the inadequacies between the individual habitus of those at the top of the

[1] University of Bucharest and National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania, istodor.eugen@gmail.com

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

political hierarchy (Bourdieu, 1982, 1991) and "the community of practice/of interest", i.e. the initial nucleus of supporters, multiplied by the nucleus of voters.
The objectives of the present paper include retracing the markers of identity and of the classification of humour within the restrictive limits of a given social group at a given historical moment, as well as the "systematic reconstruction of the field" (Bourdieu, 1982, 1991).

Essential to the present analysis is the corpus of public discourses which are considered (by studies pertaining to contemporary history) to have marked the decline/deadlock of Romanian presidents, from 1989 until 2016. More specifically, the texts considered are the following: Nicolae Ceaușescu's speeches of May 19th 1965, August 21st 1968, July 1971 and December 21st 1989, Ion Iliescu's discourses of December 1989, June 15th 1990, January 30th 2003 and December 18th 2004, Emil Constantinescu's speeches of November 11th 1996, February 25th 2000, July 17th 2000, as well as some of Traian Băsescu's political uses of language.

Therefore, the analysis will consider the dynamics of hegemonic groups, individual ascent/personal decline, community of interest/ community of practice, the series of public gestures by the presidents that have given identity to their community of supporters, the changes occurring at the level of means of communication analyzing the new characteristics imposed on the active social groups, identifying both the sender – audience relation and the characteristics of the political message, as well as the inclusion/exclusion of "humour" within the presidential speech.

The predicted result of the present study would be: the identification of identity markers by which the public discourse of the political leader no longer presupposes the active public from the public sphere, the moment of separation of the political leader from the three dimensions of the community – "mutual engagement", "joint enterprise" and "shared repertoire" (Wenger, 1983) – which are equally capable of bringing about expressions of hilarity.

2. Methodology

The methodology used in this paper is based primarily on the sociology of humour, while the conceptual tools are borrowed from various fields of study, among which: pragmatic linguistics, political management, the dynamics of social groups, the sociology of means of communication.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3. Analysis

3.1. NICOLAE CEAUŞESCU 1965 – 1989

May 19th 1965. **A meeting with writers, journalists, academics and artists.**

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Este mai sigur să apelezi la lucrurile naturale decât la acelea care imită cu multe scăderi acest natural şi să dobândeşti deprinderi mărunte şi neînsemnate, căci acela care poate merge la izvor nu trebuie să meargă la ulcior".	"It is safer to use natural elements rather than make use of those which poorly imitate the natural aspect and thus acquire petty, unimportant habits, because he who is able to reach water from the spring needn't use a pot."
"Dintotdeauna arta s-a dezvoltat în lupta dintre nou şi vechi, îndeosebi în lupta dintre realism şi diferite alte curente opuse"	"Art has always sprung from the battle between the new and the old, especially from the battle between realism and many other opposing trends."

3.1.1. Context

A short while before Ceauşescu delivered this speech, Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej had died on March 19th 1965. That incident provoked a moment of national mourning described by Tudor Arghezi in his article entitled "Adieu" published in "Scânteia": "You, my pen of strokes, of consolation, of reveries, be it human, be land, be nation, carry the bag of thorns and go to shed tears under the gates of the world. The strongest of us has passed through them to reach the unknown place where chaos originates, with a mute gate closed by heavy locks […]. Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej, whom I used to address now and then by Dear Comrade Dej, has passed away." Thus ended the era of Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej, a period of social and political compression-decompression, which was first marked by the forced Soviet system of ideological pressure and Soviet army intervention, as well as the imprisonment of the political and cultural interbellum elite. His period was followed by the separation from the Soviet Union and the freeing of the political prisoners.

On March 22nd 1965, the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Workers' Party brought onto the political scene a less known figure: "Subsequent to the proposal of the Political Bureau, the plenary session has elected as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Worker's Romanian Party, comrade Nicolae Ceauşescu".

A number of statements by A. Burakowski (2011), Tom Gallagher (2004), as well as Gheorghe Apostol, Stefan Andrei, Ion Ioniță, equally support our view also

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

adding the fact that this had been preceded by Nicolae Ceauşescu's insinuating scheme. He offered the supreme position to all those deemed able to take it being followed by each and everyone's refusal as a consequence of their declared biographical limits. As a consequence, Nicolae Ceauşescu runs as candidate. The speech which was chosen as example is part of a number of accreditations from social groups. We shall see that recognition by intellectuals would become one of the main obsessions of the Ceauşescu period.

3.1.2. Support group: the main group of activists

According to biographies and documents, Nicolae Ceauşescu was not a political personality of the first rank, nevertheless his nomination followed by the election by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the RWP (Romanian Worker's Party) was considered within a totalitarian regime and received popular consent. In the RWP, there were more than 1.350.000 million members and candidates that had undergone a growth of 50% in only 5 years, including 22% intellectuals. For a better understanding of the numbers, in 1965, Gheorghiu Dej declared that 90% of the party members graduated some form of party-approved ideological education programme (schools, universities).

3.1.3. Interpretation

1. The chosen fragments are part of one of the meetings of the new leader with a group of intellectuals having as scope the former's accreditation. The linguistic proofs as well as the ideas of the text mimetically refer to concepts/concerns of the creators; the source of inspiration, the integration and scope of the artistic act.
2. The original text from which the fragments were extracted, although seemingly colloquial, still belongs to the category of controlled texts, characterized by "wooden language" (Thom, 1993).
3. The first fragment is a combination of oral/reading, a form of "word of spirit" based on a concept taken from the popular wisdom.
4. The second text indirectly forces upon the others a form of "self-censorship" based on upside-down logic. The keywords would be "fight", "art", and "realism". Although it looks like an invitation to meditation, to a debate, in fact there is an imposition.
5. Both the text and the context are often brought into discussion when the July 1971 theses were mentioned. The same authors, already mentioned, show that the youngest communist leader in the East European camp had done nothing but to be consistent in the 1965-1971 period, with his ideas concerning the purpose of art and culture.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

6. We do not possess any document, official or unofficial, concerning any feedback from the audience. The censorship apparatus only allowed the word "applauding" as a sign of the audience's participation.
7. Another historical detail worth mentioning is the fact that artistic creation in 1965 is marked by a new generation of writers such as Nichita Stănescu and Marin Sorescu. Their creative discourse was not sufficiently present in the public sphere so as to make a difference. The former generation of writers known as "Proletcult" who had made compromises, such as Tudor Arghezi. They aligned with the party and they were hailed as models. New editions of the works of Lucian Blaga or Constantin Noica were not yet published. Actually, the hall where Ceauşescu spoke was full of "aligned" intellectuals.
8. Considering the characteristics of the communist regime and mainly the public and textual censorship we can speculate upon the fact that Nicolae Ceauşescu did not expose himself to ridicule before the audience in 1965 in spite of the mimetic wording or the logical anacoluthon. That applies only now, in an open society that incites to ironic smiles caused by inadequate language.

3.2. NICOLAE CEAUŞESCU
August 21st 1968. Public speech against the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Dragi tovarăşi, Plenara Comitetului Central al Partidului, Consiliul de Stat, Guvernul, reprezentanţii conducerilor organizaţiilor obşteşti, sindicate, tineret, femei, uniunile de creatori, au hotărît în unanimitate să-şi exprime deplina solidaritate cu poporul cehoslovac, cu partidul comunist cehoslovac (aplauze, urale)!	"Dear comrades, Our Party's Central Committee Plenary, the State Council, the Government, the representatives of non-governmental organizations, of youth unions, women unions and art and culture unions have unanimously decided to express their full solidarity with the Czech people, with the Czech communist party (applause, ovations)!
Dragi tovarăşi, Cetăţeni ai Ţării Româneşti. Pătrunderea trupelor celor cinci ţări socialiste în Cehoslovacia constituie o mare greşeală şi o primejdie gravă pentru pacea în Europa, pentru soarta socialismului în lume!"	Dear comrades, Citizens of the Romanian Country. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by the five socialist countries represents a major mistake and a grave peril for European peace and for the fate of socialism worldwide!"

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.2.1. Context

Nicolae Ceauşescu's decision as a leader supporting Czechoslovakia constitutes another way by which he demonstrates hostility towards the Soviet model, a political gesture inaugurated by his predecessor Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej. Vladimir Tismaneanu comments that we are confronted with a discursive reaction aimed at destalinization, a process began by Khrushchev, therefore an attempt to conserve political power based on concepts such as patriotism, nation and autonomy. Gheorghiu Dej permanently made sure that his political actions did not contradict USSR leaders.

Burakowski highlights (2011: 117) the strict limits of the speech at the Piața Palatului (The Palace Square). First of all, discourse and action are not against the communist system and Bucharest did not support Prague otherwise than through words. Secondly, Romania was in a period of seeming isolation in the socialist bloc. Soviet Russia and the Allies from the Warsaw Treaty did not plan to include the Romanian Army in the Czechoslovakian offensive. Nevertheless, Soviet Russia used, up to the last moment, the emissary Ceauşescu to obtain insider information about the Prague Spring and had promoted to the West Romania's position as being a common act of democracy in the Socialist bloc. Either way, there was confusion about concrete solutions. This is proven by Ion Gheorghe Maurer's discourse, the second ranked man in the hierarchy of the communist state, in the conference dedicated to the celebration of August 23rd at the Romanian Academy. Maurer praises Ceauşescu's initiative, criticizes the invasion of Prague, but also mentions the traditional friendly relations with The Soviet Union. Also, the whole campaign against the occupation lasted a few days. Burakowski notices (2011:121) the fact that after the visit of the USSR ambassador on August 25th and his meeting with Ceauşescu, the mediatic campaign against the occupation took a softer tone. The term intervention would be replaced by difference of opinion among brotherly parties.

3.2.2. Support group

The discourse started a boom of adhesions, declarations of trust, popularity and furthermore the influence of the leader heightened (more and more people enrolled in the Communist Romanian Party). The period between 1968 and 1971 is publicly known as having reached the highest amount of popularity and intellectual liberty. Moreover, the Patriotic Guard – a civic superstructure – was set up as a practical measure to defend Romania (while the Soviet army was massed at the country's borders), which, at least in a first stage, met the volunteers' enrollment.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.2.3. Interpretation

1. The discourse is oral, "wooden language" is predominant although this time it expresses "the deviation" from the political norms of the socialist bloc.
2. Emotion is expressed by the enumeration at the beginning, a mix of social categories and groups, by exclamation marks at the end of the fragment.
3. One remark ought to be made: the most liberal speech of the communist period, on being read neutrally, does not communicate by its referents, be they emotional or linguistic, that we are dealing with a moment of historical importance. The ossification of language "minimizes" the excitement of the moment. Nicolae Ceauşescu's orality was ideologically controlled. The cultural ideological model prevailed and functioned in the conditions of spontaneity.
4. Today, the above mentioned instance may make us smile, but in 1968 it sparked popular enthusiasm. Considering Nicolae Ceauşescu's declaration from a distance, it remained a mere declaration. The gain was, according to the system of propaganda, an opening of the West towards Romania. We can actually speak about a social imaginary concept, of a collective mythological construct (in L. Boia's terms) in the conditions of a "frozen system", a social game of imagination which sparked great popularity, an answer nurtured by opposition, but mainly grafted upon another mythological construct "democracy within the communist system".

3.3. NICOLAE CEAUŞESCU
Meeting with the writers, July 1971

Romanian (original)

"Auzim uneori că poezia patriotică ar fi demodată, că ea ar fi corespuns epocii lui Vasile Alecsandri, a lui Bolintineanu sau - hai să zic - perioadei de după 23 August, cînd, printre alţii, scriau Frunză, Beniuc, Deşliu. Oare aşa să fie, tovarăşi? Oare Vasile Alecsandri este, într-adevăr, demodat? Oare sînt demodaţi scriitorii şi artiştii patrioţi care prin arta lor au militat pentru dezvoltarea naţiunii noastre. Sursa principală de creaţie [...] trebuie să fie viaţa şi munca eroică a poporului nostru, [...] sarcina artei este de a face educaţia patriotică. Desigur au apărut noi generaţii de artişti şi scriitori,

English (translation)

"We sometimes hear that patriotic poetry might be outdated, that it might belong to the time of Vasile Alecsandri, of Bolintineanu or – let's say to the period after August 23rd, when among others Frunza, Beniuc, Desliu wrote poetry. Is that so, comrades? Could Vasile Alecsandri be indeed outdated? Could those patriotic writers and artists who have used their work to fight for the development of our nation be outdated? The main source of creation […] must be the life and heroic work of our people […] the goal of art is to make education patriotic. Of course, new generations of

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

dar tineretul trebuie să înțeleagă că tot ceea ce îi oferă astăzi societatea noastră nu a căzut din cer. [...] Sîntem pentru o largă libertate de creație, dorim să avem o literatură şi o artă diversificate din punct de vedere al formei, al stilului, ne pronunțăm hotărît împotriva uniformizării şi şablonismului, a rigidității şi dogmatismului. A le accepta înseamnă a sărăci viața spirituală a poporului nostru. [...] În acelaşi timp, trebuie să spun răspicat că sîntem adversarii neîmpăcați ai concepțiilor reacționare, retrograde, [...] mistice, concepțiilor perimate..."

artists and writers have emerged, but the young must understand that what society offers them today has not come out of the blue. […] We promote great liberty of creation, we want to have a formally and stylistically diverse literature and art. We declare ourselves firmly against uniformity and standardization, against rigidity and dogmatism. Accepting them implies the impoverishment of the spiritual life of our people […]. At the same time, I must clearly state that we are unflinching adversaries of reactionary, retrograde, […], mystical, obsolete conceptions..."

3.3.1. Context

The moment may be defined as "the end of looking for a cultural model". After a number of visits across Communist Asia and the dedicated return visits, the Romanian communist leader had gone for the Chinese-Korean model which praised the personality of the leader. That marks personal dictatorship and the cult of personality. The presidential scepter is allowed to heighten the image of leadership. The comic aspect was caught by Dali but not by the censorship which is said to have published in "Scanteia" the telegram of the artist saying "I personally appreciate your historic gesture whereby you initiate the presidential scepter".

Silviu Curticeanu, Ceauşescu's private secretary before 1989, mentions having noticed the incongruity, the fraction of meanings. In spite of that, neither he, nor the others stopped the decisions of the leader;" Ceauşescu received the position together with the signs of his new power" the three coloured band and the scepter. The letter was so to say odd in the context of a republican regime, reminding of images of Kings and monarchies. The moment should have been festive and solemn, for me it was rather hilarious because of the funny scepter which made me think of a scene of crowning a king in disguise in a badly directed historical film."

3.3.2. Support group

The text, as such, was given to members and activists from the cultural area. The system being as it was there followed no debate, no contradictory statement. Nevertheless, the bibliography dedicated to the moment indicates a number of "dissidences" that were eliminated; they were the supporters of Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej (as well as Gheorghe Apostol and Ion Iliescu). In such cases, the decision

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

makers from the proximity of the leader were immediately moved out to lower positions. The discontent escalated and culminated only in 1977 with the group represented by Goma and the miners from Valea Jiului, none of them wanting the change of the system, they asked for reforms within the system. Instead, the year 1971 is marked by a large group of supporters. The visits of the American and the French presidents, the commercial exchanges, the cultural opening represent public images capable of covering the dissatisfactions. V. Tismăneanu and A. Burakowski show that the year 1971 was the first major sign of the system, when a number of restrictions were imposed for fear of losing social control.

3.3.3. Interpretation

1. If we eliminated the details, we could say that, during that epoch, Nicolae Ceauşescu argued against Eugen Lovinescu, the one who made the analysis of The Mutation of Aesthetic values and Synchronism. As a reductionist, we find that Nicolae Ceauşescu spoke about the universality of patriotic poetry, while E. Lovinescu made a plea for aesthetics as expression of a variable, namely individual pleasure. Nicolae Ceauşescu identifies poetry with the triangle, similar to all times. Lovinescu equates beauty with an aesthetic formula specific to the individual who perceives it. Aesthetics for Ceauşescu is a science like mathematics, while for Lovinescu it is the study of individual tastes.
2. This text also seems to offer a firm answer to Tudor Vianu's "Aesthetics". In a reductionist manner by using the stated theory, art retains the essential and corrects the irrationality of the ideal. It promotes reality to its required form and heightens it to an ideal realm. All this process requires the existence of a criterion, the idea of referential value to select and order aspects of the real. If Vianu identifies the individual hierarchy, Nicolae Ceauşescu works out the whole system. The argument is the patriotic one. It becomes tradition and a value judgment: patriotic poetry does not fade in time. And an imperative: patriotism is creation's source of inspiration.
3. Indeed, we do not believe that such a dialogue with Lovinescu or Vianu could have unfolded in reality. The written discourse, assumedly written by those entitled to, took the colour of the artistic and intellectual environment, but this time the obvious questioning tone is a form of command. He does not imitate the group, but gives direction as to what the task of artistic creation should be.
4. Again, we cannot mention any debate or contradictory statement. The system would progressively reproduce the 1971 Theses by reducing everything to them. Even more, creation and tradition would be instrumental in reflecting the only personality, that of the leader.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.4. NICOLAE CEAUŞESCU
December 21st 1989 – Declaration

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Dragi tovarăşi şi pretini, cetăţeni ai capitalii României socialiste. Doresc, în primu' rând, să vă adresez dumneavoastră, participanţilor la acestă mare adunare populară, tutulol locuitorilor mun'cipului Bucureşti, un salut călduros, rev'loţionar, împreună cu cele mai bune urări de succes în toate domenilii de activitate. (urale) Doresc, de asemenea, s'adresez mulţumiri iniţiatorilor şi organizatorilor acestei mare manifestări populare din Bucureşti… (vuiet în piaţă)…considerând acesta…(vuietul creşte)… ca o…"	"Dear comrades and friends, citizens of the Capital of Socialist Romania. Firstly, I would like to address you, the participants to this Great Popular Assembly, all the inhabitants of the City of Bucharest and give you a warm, revolutionary salute, together with the warmest wishes of success in all the fields of work (cheers). I also wish to give thanks to the initiators and organizers of this great popular manifestation in Bucharest (uproar in the square) … considering all of this… (the uproar increases) …. as a….
Elena Ceauşescu: (către cei din balcon) "Trage cineva."	Elena Ceauşescu (to the people at the balcony): "Someone is shooting."
Emil Bobu: (la urechea lui N.C.) "Vine Secu'."	Emil Bobu (into N.C.'s ear) The Secu' (Secret Services) are coming.
E.C.: "Ăă, ce vine? Cutremur?"	E.C.: "Aa, what's coming? An earthquake?"
N.C.: "Cee?"	N.C.: "Whaat?"
E.B.: "Vine Secu'. Secu'."	E.B.: "Secu, Secu are coming."
N.C.: "Cee?"	N.C.: "Whaat?"
E.B.: "Vine Secu'. Repede! Secu'."	E.B.: "Secu are coming. Hurry up! Secu'."
N.C.: "Nu, mă, ho!" (adresându-i-se probabil lui E.B. care-l presa să se retragă)	N.C.: "No, you, stop!" (probably addressing E.B. who was asking him to withdraw)
(o voce): "A dat unul ceva, o… (neinteligibil, probabil "o plesnitoare")"	(a voice): "Someone threw something, a… (unintelligible, probably "a cracker")"
N.C.: "Alo, aa..lo…"	N.C.: "Hey, aa … loo …"
E.B.: "Ia, staţi…"	E.B.: "Wait …"
N.C.: "Alo…"	N.C.: "Hey…"
E.C.: "Linişte."	E.C.: "Silence."
N.C.: "Alo…alo…aa…lo."	N.C.: "hey ... hey ... aa, lo"
E.C.: (pur şi simplu scandează) "Li-niş-te,	E.C.: (simply chanting) "Si-lence, si-

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

li-niş-te, li-niş-te!”	lence, si-lence!”
N.C.: “Alo…alo….”“Stai, fă!” “Alo, tovarăşi!” “Tovarăşi, aşezaţi-vă liniştiţi!” “Tovarăşi!”	N.C.: “Hey ... hey ...” “Wait, woman! Hey comrades!” “Comrades, sit quietly!” “Comrades!”
E.C.: “Adunaţi-i pe toţi. Ce e cu voi? Staţi liniştiţi! Linişte! N-auzi?”	E.C.: “Gather everyone! What is up with you? Be quiet! Silence! Do you not hear?”
N.C.: “Alo… aşezaţi-vă liniştiţi la locurili voastre! (se adresează celor din balcon) Asta-i o provocare. (din nou la microfon) Alo! Alo!”	N.C.: “Hey ... quietly go back to your places! (he addresses people at the balcony). This is a provocation.(back to the microphone) Hey! Hey!”

3.4.1. Context

The autarchy that was slowly installed in Romania created the Timisoara gap (1989) with leader Laszlo Tokes and a city in revolt. The armed intervention did not diminish the intensity of the revolt, but amplified it. To this we have to consider a foreign event that is the ascent to power in USSR of Mihail Gorbaciov who introduced the social code of the perestroika, of reforming the communist system. None of these signals stopped Nicolae Ceauşescu from coming back to his own game of speeches or popular assemblies. On December 21st, a great national assembly was called in order to explain the Timisoara events. The ritual is respected in detail, but the assembly becomes a “blind” moment of personal affirmation of the leader’s mental position ignoring public statement. A discontinuity in the development of the ritual creates a gap. The mob becomes one individual body. Fear, heroism create the premises for unpredictability.

3.4.2. Support group

After 1971, passing through an economy of subsistence and resorting to a revolution of hunger (L. Boia (2011), B. Murgescu (2010), V. Pasti (1995), D. Deletant (1998), and T. Gallager (2004)), the Romanian society crumbled within the socialist system. Enclavization, “resistance through culture”, took many forms. Doublespeak and public duplicity were challenged by a new generation which was affirming itself. The generation called “the decree children” which had been planned to create the biological critical mass, was considered to be the spark of the popular revolt of 1989. The support offered to the leader was also certified by the series of abandonments as the events unfolded. From not listening to orders (general Stănculescu), the gypsum wrapping of the leg, to the fact that the Ceauşescu couple got lost on the way, going through comical situations during their flight, and the fact that everyone they met prefered to elude the situation, to abandon, and not glorify their leader.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.4.3. Interpretation

1. There is a succession of monologues. The situation gets out of control. Nobody realizes what is in fact going on.
2. There is trust in the power of the word in reestablishing roles.
3. This is the first Ceauşescu speech interrupted during the period 1965-1989 and the first genuine answer of the popular meeting.
4. The confusion of the leaders, the lack of a coherent explanation to the immediate situation, they broke the "mirror" between leader-audience. Orality, often used in the argumentation already quoted, following the trajectory of the party's ideological culture, in this instance produces primary reactions. "Hello!", "Silence!" and the famous promise of adding 100 lei to each and every salary are part of a repertoire expressing panic, not self-mastering. During the next moment nobody laughed, still, for a few moments when the balcony hosting the participants turned revolutionaries, stirred moments of laughter. The chronology of events mentioned also the moments when people taking the floor imitated Ceauşescu.

3.5. ION ILIESCU 1989-1996
December 1989, the Romanian National Television.

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
Stimaţi tovarăşi, prieteni, cetăţeni. Sînt şi eu stăpînit de emoţie ca toţi cei care au vorbit înaintea mea şi ca toţi cetăţenii acestei ţări care trăiesc momente excepţionale. Dinamica desfăşurării evenimentelor din ultimele zile a fost fără egal. Nimeni nu se aştepta ca acest regim care se vroia atoatestăpînitor, atoateştiutor, atoatefăcător, care nu manifesta luciditatea minimă necesară pentru a înţelege momentele de dramatism pe care le trăieşte naţiunea română, să facă un semn de rezolvare pe cale normală, pe cale paşnică, prin înţelegere cu cetăţenii ţării a problemelor grave cu care se confruntă şi economia ţării, situaţia socială, situaţia materială a tuturor categoriilor de oameni ai muncii din această ţară. A împins pînă la	"Esteemed comrades, friends, citizens. I am overwhelmed by emotion, just like those who took the floor before me and like all the citizens of this country who are living through exceptional moments. The dynamics of the development of the events of the last few days has been unparalleled. Nobody expected this regime, which deemed itself all powerful, all knowing, and good at everything, which could not display the least amount of lucidity necessary to understand the dramatic moments with which the Romanian nation is confronted, to make a step towards normal and peaceful resolution – in cooperation with the citizens of this country – of the serious problems that the economy of the country is confronted with, the social situation, the

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

catastrofă situaţia economico-socială a ţării, tensiunea politică, şi se face în ultimă instanţă vinovat de crimă odioasă împotriva poporului. Vinovatul principal este Ceauşescu! (bărbat: aşa e!) Acest om fără inimă, fără suflet, fără creier (bărbat: fără raţiune), fără raţiune (pe ecran apare lozinca: "Televiziunea Română, inima României noi!") care nu vroia să cedeze! Un fanatic care stăpînea cu metode medievale această ţară! (…) La sediul comitetului central se află reprezentanţii populaţiei. Am vorbit la telefon cu cabinetul numărul unu (rîsete). Nu mai era, nu mai era nici persoana numărul unu, nici secretarul şi secretariatul acestei persoane. Mi-a răspuns un tovarăş Luca, nu ştiu cine o fi săracul, mi-a spus el şi alţi cîţiva care fac parte dintr-un comitet naţional sînt acolo. Mi-au cerut să mă prezint, i-am spus cine sînt, nu m-a cunoscut omul şi n-am putut să închei un dialog (Mihai Bujor: o să vă cunoască!) O să … deci trebuie neapărat să ne organizăm într-un comitet de salvare naţională, să elaborăm un program de acţiune cu două obiective majore: în primul rînd măsuri imediate pentru ordine şi pentru asigurarea desfăşurării vieţii normale, aprovizionarea populaţiei, transport, tot ce este necesar."

economic situation of all the categories of working people of this country. This regime has pushed towards catastrophe the country's economic and social status, as well as the political tension and is ultimately guilty of a hideous crime against the nation. The main culprit is Ceauşescu (a man: indeed!). This heartless, soulless, brainless man (a man: irrational), irrational man (a slogan appears on screen: "The Romanian television, the heart of new Romania!") who did not want to give up! A fanatical leader who has ruled this country by medieval means! (…) The population representatives are at the central committee headquarters. I called cabinet number one (laughter). Number one was absent and so were his secretary and that person's secretary. A certain comrade named Luca answered. I didn't know the poor man. He told me that he and a few people who were part of a national committee were there. They asked me to introduce myself, I told them who I am, he did not know me and we could not proceed further. (Mihai Bujor: he will know you!) He will … so we must urgently organize ourselves into a national Salvation Committee, establish an action plan with two major objectives: firstly, take immediate measures to ensure order and the development of normal life, supply the population with food, transportation, all that is necessary."

3.5.1. Context

Subsequent to the failure of his speech, Ceauşescu was influenced to abandon power. According to S. Tanase (2006), V. Tismaneanu (2005), T. Gallagher (2004), like in 1965, a void of power appeared and one of the second rank activists overtook the main position. It is not our intention to bring into discussion the great debate

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

considering the events as being part of a Revolution or a "coup d'état," but we can easily understand that the T.V. intervention of Ion Iliescu sounded as if coming from a coherent mind, that of an organizer. We could't avoid a similar situation to 1965 which implied a controlled action, manipulating the situation in favour of a certain leader and his acceptance.

3.5.2.Support group

In 1989, Ion Iliescu's group of supporters was small. He was accredited during the first moments of the revolution owing to his presence at the hot spots of the revolt and the way he imposed himself being helped by a small group of supporters.

3.5.3.Interpretation

1. The text combines two sources. One can see on Video that Ion Iliescu makes use of notes (the organization of discourse) and takes into consideration other people's opinions. Compared to Ceauşescu's monologue, the democratic Iliescu is accepted without being asked questions.
2. The plea for order is visible, at least symbolically. The word "silence" occuring in Ceauşescu's speech has here synonimical syntagms, but will soon be part of the official discourse.
3. Compared to the Dinescu-Caramitru dialogue, this one is coherent. This time "wooden language" gives the amount of necessary coherence to a discourse "mastered by emotion". Dinescu-Caramitru are looking for adequate words for a scenario they are working up for the participants within the T.V. studio (TVR).
4. The difference between this discourse and others in the TVR studio gave the impression that it had been learnt beforehand. Ion Iliescu becomes the representative of the System, he is the one who, by being present, gives signals for grouping the old system and for the protection of the old order of things.
5. Actually we have two groups in the confrontation for power: Iliescu and Dinescu. Iliescu held a coherent speech which was culturally recognizable by the revolutionary groups of the moment. Dinescu's group was coming from a narrow impact zone, he was the representative of a less known phenomenon in communist Romania.

   "There was, in Romania, a heroic old woman, Doina Cornea, a crazy poet, like myself, in Bucharest, two or three more in Iasi, and that's all that is the only open opposition to Ceauşescu. (Dinescu, interview Flux24)

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.6. ION ILIESCU
ROMEXPO Discourse, June 15th 1990

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Vă mulţumesc pentru tot ceea ce aţi făcut în aceste zile, în general pentru toată atitudinea dumneavoastră de înaltă conştiinţă civică. Deci, vă mulţumesc încă o dată tuturor pentru ceea ce aţi demonstrat şi în aceste zile: că sunteţi o forţă puternică, cu o înaltă disciplină civică, muncitorească, oameni de nădejde şi la bine, dar mai ales la greu. Şi de asta dată aţi demonstrat cât de importantă este solidaritatea muncitorească. Cu un sentiment deosebit de conştiinţă civică, patriotică aţi simţit momentul dificil şi cu o dăruire exemplară v-aţi arătat gata să fiţi solidari cu puterea nouă."	"I thank you for everything you have done these days and, in general, for your attitude of great civic consciousness. Therefore, I thank you all once again, for what you have proved these days: namely, that you are a powerful force, with high civic and proletarian discipline and that you are reliable people in times of success and especially in need. This time you have proved once again how important the workers' solidarity is. Showing an exceptional feeling of civic, patriotic consciousness, you have sensed the difficult moment and, with exemplary dedication, you have demonstrated your readiness to be solidary with the new power".

3.6.1. Context

Ion Iliescu became the president of Romania after the acreditation speech on TVR. According to the subsequent events, the opponents of Ion Iliescu from the NSF Council (National Salvation Front Council) withdrew (Dinescu, Cornea etc...). There followed a large demonstration in the University Square against the Conservatory measures taken by the leader of NSFC (National Salvation Front Council), President of Romania after May 1990. Important street demonstrations turned into civil wars between protesters and civil guardians. The most important clash took place on June 14th-15th. Miners from Valea Jiului started a serious guerrilla fight against the political oppossition, against the inhabitants of Bucharest, against students and journalists. The miners' attacks (Mineriada) from June 13th-15th 1990 is considered the bloodiest and most brutal of all miners' raids during the '90s. 746 people were injured during the clashes and 6 were killed. Miron Cozma was the only person convicted in the Mineriada Case.

3.6.2. Support group

That we can determine statistically. May 20th 1990 was the date of the elections for the General Assembly. From 17200722 voters 14826616 voted. Ion Iliescu ran for the Presidency of Romania and received 12232498 votes, representing 85% votes.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.6.3. Interpretation

1. For today's reader, the text (ignoring the context) contains details marking a radical change of mentality characterizing a noble group acting positevely: "civic consciousness", "high civic discipline, trustworthy people in good and especially in bad times", "siding with the new regime".
2. The symbolic stress upon these words cannot be indicated by the context. It is true that the miners showed civic attitude as they had been summoned by the new President Ion Iliescu. The miners coming by four trains represented a serious menace for the civic forces such as the political opposition, students, the participants to the University Square meeting, protesters in the Centre of Bucharest who demonstrated against the results of the elections concluded with the declared victory of a former representative of the Communist regime in Romania, Ion Iliescu insistently, deliberately created confusion. The discourse held in the University Square as a manifestation of civic energy is taken over in order to give a name to the force sustaining his own targets.
3. Considering the level of the text, Alina Mungiu-Pippidi (1995) shows that we are confronted with a repeated inadequacy of the discourse of the political Oposition in the University Square to the Romanian reality of 1990. On the one side the thematics, bringing forth realities of democracy as it was during the interimary period, introducing notions of democracy, comparing the system with another (monarchy, for instance) etc... on the other hand the accent on delicate themes. Those which belonged to a new economic system, "the conservatives" were not necessarily Ion Iliescu's supporters, but turned into his voters as they considered the public debate in the University Square an adventure.
4. This reductionist aproach on the situation had also contributed to the absence of a serious broadcasting by Romanian Radio news and TV News of the University Square messages. Likewise, the press did not have a system of spreading the news to small towns and in the rural areas. Consequently, there was a confusion of votes during which "the civics" seemed to enforce the order whereby all the messages were to be distributed by the only communication means in 1990: radio and public television.

3.7. EMIL CONSTANTINESCU 1996-2000

November 11th 1996. Electoral Confrontation between the candidates for the Romanian Presidency: I. Iliescu (PDSR) and E. Constantinescu (CDR), Antena 1

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"E.C.: Credeți în Dumnezeu, dle Iliescu?	"E.C.: Do you believe in God, Mr. Iliescu?
I.I.: Dle Constantinescu, eu m-am născut	I.I.: Mr. Constantinescu, I was born in a

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

într-o familie de oameni evlavioşi, am fost botezat în Biserica Ortodoxă Română şi am această calitate. Sigur, în evoluția mea intelectuală s-au produs anumite deplasări, dar am rămas pătruns de elementele fundamentale ale credinței şi ale moralei creştine. Eu sunt mai creştin şi mai credincios decât mulți alții care îşi etalează în public această credință, cu care eu cred că nu trebuie să se facă nici comerț, nici propagandă politică. "Crede şi nu cercetă!"

E.C.: Aţi declarat că sunteţi liber-cugetător. Asta înseamnă necredincios, deci om fără Dumnezeu.

I.I.: Nu, asta nu înseamnă necredincios.
E.C.: Asta înseamnă. Orice dicționar...

I.I.: Asta înseamnă respect față de...
E.C.: Dle Iliescu, cu limbă română nu poate fi... Când aţi mințit, atunci sau...

I.I.: ... inclusiv oamenii Bisericii evoluează în contactul cu ştiința. Intoleranță de o parte şi de altă nu aduce nimănui nici un fel de folos. "Crede şi nu cerceta!", spre exemplu, este un concept care a fost părăsit de oamenii Bisericii, pentru că se împrumută din ceea ce aduce ştiința, inclusiv în viață cultelor, în viața Bisericii. Fundamental este altceva, ceea ce pătrunde în comportamentul şi în starea morală a fiecăruia în parte. Eu am mai mult decât alții, care îşi afişează credința în Dumnezeu."

religious family, I was baptized in the Romanian Orthodox Church and I have this quality of being Orthodox. Certainly, during my intellectual development, some changes have occured, but I remained imbued with the fundamental elements of the Christian faith and morality.
I am a Christian who is more authentic than many others who publicly display their faith and I consider that this is not a subject for commerce or political propaganda. "Believe and do not question!"

E.C.: You have declared that you are a free thinker. This means you are not a believer, in other words a man without God.

I.I.: No, this doesn't mean non-believer.
E.C.: This is the meaning. Any dictionary…

I.I.: This means respect for…
E.C.: Mr. Iliescu, the Romanian language can't be…
When did you lie, then or …?

I.I.: ...even Church men evolve along with the development of science. Intolerance on both sides could not be beneficial for anyone. "Believe and don not question!", for example, is a concept that has been renounced by Church men because they started to use scientifical data in the context of religious cults, of the Church. Something else is fundamental, something that penetrates the behavior and moral state of each person. My belief in God is stronger than that of people who publicly display their faith."

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.7.1. Context

The democratic change of political Power in 1996, the alternance in government, came into force after the conservative administration of Nicolae Văcăroiu – which had no structural reforms – and after political alliances with the communist side – PCR (Romanian Communist Party) members gathered around PSM – and the extremist side of the political chessboard: PRM (Great Romania Party) as well as the political side which supported the financial fraud (PUNR-Caritas-Romanian Party of National Unity). The cause of the PDSR (Romanian Democratic and Social Party) and its leader, Ion Iliescu's decline in trust ratings was not so much a consequence of the circumstancial political mix, but rather of the lack of an economic horizon and the collapse of the Caritas pyramidal game.

It should be mentioned, however, that Emil Constantinescu was symbolically propelled by the passing of President Corneliu Coposu (1995).

At a moment of public anxiety, Corneliu Coposu was revalorized. The truthful information that had been declared and ignored up until his death, became an engine for a new "revival". Moreover, the fact that Emil Constantinescu was proposed and supported by Corneliu Coposu became certificate of confidence in the "Transfiguration of Romania".

3.7.2.Support group

November 3rd 1996. 17.218.654 electors and 13.088.388 votes: 4.081.093 for **Ion Iliescu**, 3.569.941for Emil Constantinescu and 2.598.545 for Petre Roman. In the second round of elections, after the Constantinescu-Roman alliance, the result was in favor of Emil Constantinescu: November 17th 1996: 7.057.906 votes for Emil Constantinescu and 5.914.579 votes for Ion Iliescu.

3.7.3. Interpretation

1. A simple question determined the interlocutor to diverge.
   This question was not related to the electoral programme, but to his private life.
2. The answer turned into a true verbal frensy, a reverse lesson of political education.
3. This situation was part of a series of incongruences which triggered humour (Carroll, 2015). Inferior-superior, the intellectual (a person who values the notion of God) and the politician. Emil Constantinescu addressed a question to the activist, the post-December-1989 politician Ion Iliescu (even an inferior position within PCR was equivalent to atheism). But the answer is also related to the second mechanism of humour (Carroll, 2015): the public figure's discrepancy between appearance and substance. The context is the one which precisely deschiphers the answer. After a life spent in the Communism period, in a society

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

dominated by atheism, it was difficult to firmly and innocently maintain that you truly believe in God.

3.8. EMIL CONSTANTINESCU
The Conference of the Association of Physicians and Pharmacists – PNȚCD Members, February 25th 2000

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"România se află ca un bolnav în stare gravă, aproape de comă şi are nevoie urgent de o operație. Din păcate, nu mai avem timp să-l pregătim pentru operație, nu mai avem timp să-l pregătim, nici să-l întărim cu vitamine ca să facă față operației. Este datoria dumneavoastră – am spus – să ne asigurați cel puțin sângele pentru o transfuzie, pe masa de operație, astfel încât operația să nu devină autopsie. Este pentru prima dată în istoria noastră când nimeni nu mai vrea să ne ia nimic. Trăim ca într-o situație în care peştii urcă în susul apei. Lucrurile s-au schimbat. Există Uniunea Europeană, care vrea să ne ofere ceva şi ne pune o singură condiție: să facem noi ceva pentru noi."	"Romania is like a very sick man who is close to a coma and urgently needs surgical intervention. Unfortunately, we no longer have time to prepare the patient for surgery, we no longer have time to prepare him, nor give him the vitamins that will help him survive the intervention. It is your duty – I said – to at least provide the transfusion blood for us, so that the surgery does not become an autopsy. It is the first time in our history when no one wants to take anything from us. We live as if the fish swam upstream. Things have changed. There is the European Union which wants to offer us help on only one condition: that we do something for ourselves."

3.8.1. Context

A major improvement in Romania's public image abroad, but a delay of Romania's admission into NATO. The involvement in the Kosovo war. The visit of Pope John Paul II to Romania. On national level: major economic crisis and miners' raids ensuing the bankruptcy of three banks and FNI, political crisis aggravated by the replacement of two Prime Ministers and a fratricidal war between the most important political parties PNȚCD (Christian-Democratic National Peasants' Party), PD (Democratic Party), PNL (National Liberal Party).

3.8.2. Support group

Much weaker in comparison to the election period. Probably formed only of the PNȚCD political group (Christian-Democratic National Peasants' Party) This period

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

is subsequent to two government appointments and the absence of structural reforms, but also to the improvement of Romania's image within NATO and the EU.

3.8.3. Interpretation

1. The discourse is marked by signs of depression: the parabole of Romania as a sick man.
2. Considered from a distance, this expression is merely rhetorical. Romania did not undergo autopsy.
3. On the other hand, the parabole is part of the process of adapting to the audience.
4. The discourse is held in an academic environment and belongs to the medical field.
5. "We live as if the fish swam upstream" which translates in reality as follows:
6. The migratory fish that live in the Black Sea (sturgeons, Danube herrings, mackerels), led by their reproductive instinct, enter the Danube in the spring, swim upstream and after they hatch, they return – both young ones and adults – into the sea. (Source: http://pescar.duv.ro). In this context, the overlapping of the two analogies: the chronically sick man and the reproduction of fish may bring about some smiles, according to the same mechanism of inadequacy (Carroll, 2015).
7. Yet, according to the newspapers of the time ("Romania Libera" Collection, "Adevărul", "Dreptatea"), the discourse did not bring about any smiles.

3.9. EMIL CONSTANTINESCU
July 17th 2000 - Discourse conceding the electoral race

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Mă adresez dumneavoastă astăzi, cetățeni ai României, pentru a vă aduce la cunoştinţă decizia mea de a nu candida pentru un nou mandat de preşedinte al României în alegerile din noiembrie 2000. Trăim o vreme a oamenilor care vînd şi cumpără principii, ideologii, locuri în Parlament şi Guvern, folosind minciuna, şantajul, vulgaritatea, manipularea oamenlior prin orice metodă. În această lume nu am ce căuta. Nu vreau să particip la tranzacţii şi manipulări de nici un fel."	"I am addressing you today, citizens of Romania, to inform you about my decision not to run for the new Romanian presidential elections of November 2000. We live in a time when people sell and buy principles, ideologies, places in Parliament and the Government with the use of lies, blackmail, vulgarity, manipulation by all means necessary. I have no place in such a world. I do not wish to be part of transactions and manipulations of any kind."

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.9.1. Context

Emil Constantinescu brought about the most important surprise in the public space. Finding a technocratic governing solution (Mugur Isărescu was Prime Minister at the time) and having acquired a positive image abroad, the President made a major decision. He chose not to continue the political project, but to devote himself to the civil domain. In a period in which political declarations and actions had no real foundation, the President made a unique, original gesture. He wanted to do justice to his own declarations.

He assumed the failure of the project which brought him victory in the elections. He did not wish to enter a moral skid. At the same time, the discourse was that of a political personality out of tune with the political climate of the time. Politicians continued their mandates as MPs or Ministers regardless of previous results.

3.9.2. Support group

The decision to concede was unbeknownst even to the people close to the President, his campaign members. Metromedia poll: August 30th 2000. Ion Iliescu 49%; Mugur Isărescu 23%; Emil Constantinescu 3,3%. "The Iliescu nostalgia" born out of "the antipathy for Constantinescu".

3.9.3.Interpretation

1. Such a gesture is unique in the political history of Romania.
2. The tone is grave, the gestures are tragical (to be seen on video).
3. The discourse equalized Emil Constantinescu to himself. He recognized his limits and the failure of his electoral promises: the Contract with Romania and the 15.000 experts. This singular discourse becomes a subject of public hilarity.
4. "I was defeated by the system". This was the lable of this discourse, although Emil Constantinescu never uttered these exact words.
5. The lable was more important than the discourse. The public did not understand the dramatic moment that Romania was experiencing, nor the institutional drama behind it, but merely the element of human abandonment.

3.10. ION ILIESCU 2000-2004
January 30th 2003
PNA (DNA The Anti Corruption Direction) Balance sheet Meeting

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Sunt uluit de lăcomia pentru înavuțire a unor oameni instruiți."	"I am amazed by the greed of some well-educated people".

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

3.10.1. Context

Ion Iliescu's return to power determined a mandate characterized by political waltz. On one hand, a reconciliation with the former-political enemy: King Michael of Romania, on the other hand, a "decoration" of political allies of the previous mandate: Vadim Tudor and Adrian Păunescu, whom the public considered to be disputed political figures. Even Adrian Năstase, the Prime Minister of Romania assigned by Ion Iliescu had distanced himself from these two figures. On one hand, Ion Iliescu supported Prime Minister Adrian Năstase; on the other hand he maintained a distance from the Government's inability to control the corruption inside its own institution. We face a fracture between the two institutions (Presidency and Government), although they are part of the same political party.

3.10.2. Support group

4.076.273 Romanians voted for Ion Iliescu in the November 26th 2000 elections. The conservative wing of PSDR (Romanian Social Democrat Party). Although holding power, Ion Iliescu is isolated at Cotroceni. Mihai Dinu Gheorghiu shows that Adrian Năstase renewed the governmental team and imposed a new generation of civil servants/politicians.

3.10.3. Interpretation

1. In the public space, this is the phase of the official institutions' acceptance and acknowledgment of the phenomenon of corruption.
2. During Ion Iliescu's administration no penal trials /investigations were finalized.
3. The contrast between "educated people" and "greed" is expressed in an environment specific to penal investigations. PNA, the equivalent of nowadays' DNA (The Anti Corruption Direction**)**. This proves the inadequacy of the official discourse, but also a careful selection of terminology; the emphatic sign of an intentional stress and a precise target.
4. The humour of the declaration is given by the background. The President of Romania, who had tolerated the corruption phenomenon during his two mandates, only then seemed to notice it in Nastase's government.

3.11. ION ILIESCU
December 18th 2004. Signing the amnesty of Miron Cozma.

Romanian (original)	*English (translation)*
"Mă apropii de finalul de mandat şi am reflectat asupra acestei chestiuni şi am	"I am nearing the end of my presidential term and I have pondered upon this

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

considerat utilă această decizie. Este o decizie de voință politică de clemență. Grațierea nu elimină cazierul, nu-l disculpă. În cazul în care recidivează, îşi va executa toată condamnarea."

subject and I have considered this decision useful. It is a decision of political will, of clemency. The amnesty does not eliminate the criminal record, it does not exculpate it. In the case of relapse, he will carry out the full extent of his sentence."

3.11.1. Context

Ion Iliescu pardons his own "actions and arms", his 1990 partner from Piața Universității. The 2000-2004 mandate was one of reconciliation with different public figures.

However, Ion Iliescu would change his mind with respect to this amnesty partly because of public pressures and particularly because of the consequences of the image he had created during this electoral campaign in which Adrian Năstase was seen as the winner.

3.11.2. Support group

Reduced to a minimum. Ion Iliescu could no longer legally run for president. Adrian Năstase was the PDSR candidate. The gesture /discourse of Miron Cozma's amnesty had a personal stake. Miron Cozma was, practically, "forsaken" in jail by the mass-media, by civic and political groups and even by the participants in the miners' raids.

3.11.3. Interpretation

The declaration triggered general hilarity. The reasons for this are linked to the declaration's degree of "innocence". The President of Romania logically and juridically justifies an act of political will, but the background, the previous relation with Miron Cozma destroys his arguments. It is interesting how the PDSR, the party which led him to Presidency and which publically "denied" its involvment in the miners' raids, was at that point "laughing" at the gesture itself, assuming the background of the declaration. The continuation of this gesture would lead to his marginalization within the party in the spring of 2001, on the grounds of inadequacy. Moreover, in this phase, Ion Iliescu himself displayed signs of inadequacy. He addressed the PDSR Congress using the phrase "Dear comrades".

3.12. TRAIAN BĂSESCU – no more "wooden language"?

Characterized as "the player President", Traian Băsescu imposed the most colourful political language. Although not an object of this study, it is worth mentioning a

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

2016 Business Magazine analysis. President Traian Băsescu's speeches and allocutions from the beginning of his presidency in 2004 until 2014 were tested by wordle.net.

In his increasingly rare public appearances in 2014, because of the months of suspension, the words "Romania" and "must" were used the most. Whether we talk about economy, justice, health, education or infrastructure, "Romania must" ("Romania trebuie") was still the key phrase and the President took on the role of the executive and, as an advisor, he traced the directions to be followed by the Government and the population.

A new trend in 2012 is marked by the appartition of the words "European Union" in the Presidential discourse, based on the European support, often invoked by President Băsescu in the public messages he put forth after the 2012 "Coup d'Etat" attempt, meant to bring about his dismissal and thus the "extinction of the flame of democracy". In the eighth year of his mandate, "Romania [still] must" and all signs of possible change until 2014 are completely absent." The end of the wooden language is still wishful thinking.

4. Conclusions

4.1. Technical statements

a. The quotations were chosen on the basis of their bibliographical notoriety.
b. In addition, the context of each speech was summarized, highlighting only the details that were considered in the present analysis.
c. The object was not to draw comparisons with other groups of humour from politics or society. In each instance, the analysis followed the relation between the presidential speech, the community of his supporters and the socio-political context.
d. Evidently, a speech is the result of a process of collaboration between the President and his advisers. In this sense, there is not enough evidence. Still, there is one case which brought about controversy and hilarity (Ion Iliescu "Thus highlighted, anchored in the synergy of facts, the recourse to universality does not elude the meanders of the concrete" 2004) unofficially recognized and attributed by the mass-media to one of the presidential counselors (Victor Opaschi).

4.2. Under what conditions do leaders fall into "ridicule by means of their own words"?

The main concept on the basis of which the present analysis is built is represented by sociability-humour. Humour is a performing, visible form of sociability (social

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

interaction) within a community characterized by the simultaneity of its members' existence, by temporal continuity, group intimacy, emotional depth, an internal culture, as well as common actions/experiences. As a sociability index, humour, in its full capacity, results in the common, complicit smile of both parties involved: actor and audience. Humour presupposes the other person's adaptation (the laughing and the laughed at) in the sense of learning from the respective situation. Thus, humour is rather a collective learning of one's limits meant to be of use in the possible context of future experience (Kierkegaard, Carroll). Under these circumstances, any changes at the level of the afore-mentioned indicators may produce incongruence, inadequacy and, implicitly, humour.

Humour is one of the public tests by which the actor and his speech receive accreditation from and survive within a given group.

4.3. The presence/absence of evidence

Presidential speeches from 1965 until 2004 are briefly characterized by means of their socio-political context, support group (community of practice) and interpretation and belong to two distinct periods of time: the communist society (1965-1989) and the capitalist one (1989-2004). Considering the manner in which the presidential speech is reflected in the "community of practice", the institution of censorship makes it difficult to identify a true reaction to Nicolae Ceauşescu's speeches. The only exception would be the 1989 moment. Călin Bogdan Ştefănescu's anthology of political jokes starts with the year 1979. Without any direct reference to the speeches subjected to the present analysis, a number of jokes that tackle the intellectual level of Nicolae Ceauşescu and the absence of immediate reaction to the Presidential speech are mentioned.

Nicolae Ceauşescu "became laughable" to his own community. The jokes identify at last one instance of incongruence: public performance. The ideological text was understood as being different because of the manner in which it was interpreted:

a. "Our world is obsessed with three questions: Where is Hitler buried? Who are Kennedy's assassins and who are Nicolae Ceauşescu's school-mates?",
b. "After a detailed social investigation, the conclusion is that Romanians live comfortably through their representatives",
c. "Like a veritable intellectual, Nicolae Ceauşescu speaks multiple foreign languages: old stammering, new blabbering.",
d. "The emblem of the XIIth Party Congress was commonly approved of: a winged bottom with the slogan: who does not kiss, will fly."

According to the rules, in order for humour to function as a learning experience, as encouragement for future change, it requires reciprocal understanding.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

There is no official proof of people having laughed at Nicolae Ceauşescu's speeches or upon hearing these jokes. There was no debate of ideas, not to mention humour amidst his close circle of supporters.

Such oral manifestations represent clues of the enclaves from within the Communist System. (sociable pattern described by V. Mihailescu, G. Liiceanu)

Theoretical interpretations (Kuipers, 2010) in this respect regard the orally dissipated political jokes as a subversive form of social protest, of linguistic and individual liberty.

One can also notice the social enclaves' ability to create social/mental structures based on fiction-humour (by definition, humour establishes feeble links with reality) in totalitarian societies. Hence, we deal with a double fiction, social group and mental structures which create catharsis on the inside and social schizophrenia on the outside, "guarded" by repressive forces (see the Tismăneanu report). They debated the social presence of a leader, in his physical absence. The leader is "felt" as a devouring authority.

In the case of Ion Iliescu's speeches before 1991-1992, we do not possess any proof concerning the humourous reactions of the people, of his community of practice, at least not to this day. We do not have official testimonies ("Dimineata" collection,"Azi"). If during the closed, communist period, official documents could not contain such information because they were subject to censorship, between 1989 and 1991/92 humour was the monopoly and weapon used by the protesters from the University Square community, the opposition group. Signs of the leader's reflection through humour started to occur when the FDSN (Democrat Front of National Salvation) – Petre Roman's group split (Irina Nicolau, Pippidi).

Humour was regarded as a form of hostility, of war between political parties. Ion Iliescu would always smile in front of his own supporters, yet he would never laugh alongside opposition groups. Even if Ion Iliescu "became laughable" to his opponents (see Irina Nicolau (1997) who enumerates different instances: verses, imitation of speeches, pamphlets, satirical press and so on) humour split apart communities at this incipient moment instead of unifying them towards a common goal. Humour acted as an incentive for the opposition and an inhibiting factor for the supporters of power. The analysis given by Alina Mungiu-Pippidi (1995) sociologically demonstrates how the Establishment's coagulation of communities was carried through by means of words and the force of propaganda, the classic media-television model and "wooden language" - all of which represent signs of the supporters' acceptance of their leader.

The Establishment's social mobilization was not implemented in order to find solutions for the construction of society, nor in order to collectively identify a social and economic model (ideas that are part of the political opposition's discourse), but in order to maintain the newly acquired political power.

The political power of Ion Iliescu would send humour into exile, into the well-defined areas which it would isolate mediatically (TVR, The Romanian TV

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

station, remained the main source of information up until 1994-1995, since despite the expansion of the written press, the latter was conditioned by scarce distribution and poor subvention).

Humour had a chance to manifest itself within the Establishment at the moment that Petre Roman's group split from that of Ion Iliescu. On March 29th 1992 one could hear during the FSN National Conference the famous statement:"Out with the University Square" This statement belonged to an "older" member, Ion Iliescu, and was addressed to "the young" group represented by Petre Roman. It was subsequent to a long list of chants shouted by the Petre Roman Group, parodying the conservatism of Ion Iliescu's group. All of them were adaptations of the slogans heard in the University Square in 1990, among which we could mention: "Don't be scared, Petrica will not fall! Vacaru and his people/ Laughable stuntmen". Humour managed to give minimal credentials to the opposing group of Petre Roman.

In terms of Emil Constantinescu's administration and the second mandate of Ion Iliescu, the news of the time ("Romania Libera", "Evenimentul Zilei" – 1996-2004) mention acid statements addressed to political leaders from inside the community of practice/community of interest. Humour is an indicator of democracy in this respect. Even if the leader-other does not participate in this game of humour with a statement, he considers humour to be part of a critical, constructive discourse. In this sense, we can say that humour came to Power along with Emil Constantinescu. "Academia Catavencu", the satirical weekly, and ProTv of course, were highly influential at the time and represented medial tools that had decisive roles (albeit in different proportions) in raising the public's awareness with respect to the possibility of power alternation in 1996.

Without overestimating, we may say that Emil Constantinescu, President and agent of governmental changes, perceived the incongruences within his own system and saw his own limits through humour.

Prompt reactions testify the manner in which he attempted to improve his public image through governmental changes, while at the same time manage alternative correctives to the system.

Three governmental changes took place and multiple anti-corruption speeches were delivered within a period of four years. The evidence of the symbolic alliance between Presidency and Humour is represented by the 1999 secret meeting between Emil Constantinescu and Mircea Dinescu (writer and director of Academia Caţavencu until 1996), Petre Roman and Andrei Pleşu. After dinner, the President dismissed Prime Minister Radu Vasile and named Mugur Isărescu (Governor of the Romanian National Bank) the new Prime Minister. This happened after a number of public speeches given by Radu Vasile in which he proved his inadequacy (Mircea Dinescu-2000).

Emil Constantinescu's concession of the 2000 presidential election was interpreted by the press of the time in multiple manners.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

His gesture was seen as a singular one, unusual for the political scene which had not known this tipe of resignation based on the innability to keep one's political promises.

This meant being equal with oneself, being selfish, being cowardly or setting an example. Emil Constantinescu's gesture was the laughing stock of both his political allies (PD, PNL) and his opponents.

The loneliness of the leader and the intellectual drama, underlined by such attributes as Don Quixote's, rendered him indequate for the public sphere, where political actors practised "amnesia" and political promises, regardless of one's performance during presidential or governmental office.

Ion Iliescu brings back the demagogic, amnesic speech. Ion Iliescu will not include humour in his speeches, but the change in tone and his assumed role of National reconciliation are the result of the existence, of the common acceptance of humour among the forms of public manifestation. Obviously, making amence with King Michael I of Romania, after a long series of previous negative events brought about general laughter, but simultanously became a form of PR, which harmoniously fitted with the image of Iliescu as National peace maker.

Humour is not in Power anymore, but one might trigger laughter through public speeches and gestures and many transform humour into an agent of public image. Moreover, taking arms against the Adrian Nastase Government by means of a critical, anti-corruption speech, shows that the President understood how certain corrupt figures became laughable just by being kept within the Governmental body.

Indeed, Ion Iliescu did not keep the ballance which he himself had introduced. The Idea of national reconciliation was compromised. The clemenence act in favour of Miron Cozma, an act of good will only at the disposal of the President made him look ridiculous, because of excessive personalisation involved. The President and the convict had had a partnership during the June 1990 events that resulted in human casualties. His explanations, his justifications were indequate and produced hilarity.

Economic reality is necessary in order to underline a significant detail with respect to the leader's position and his "political game".

The word (promise, discourse, etc.) looses its significance. In the face of perpetual economic crisis, of faulty economic management, of the absence of a model and of the presence of an endemic state of corruption, the presidential leader and his group of supporters have asserted themselves through the propagandistic word, the word which is a personal asset and acts exclusively in the area of public image.

Bogdan Murgescu identifies the economic collapse of the period under analysis in his analytical work "Europe and Romania".

In his analysis entitled "Europe and Romania", Bogdan Murgescu points out the economic confusion of the period. Mugurescu (2010:465) creates a complex picture of the economic circuits.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

"The Communist heritage", the managerial inability to enter the world market, the absence of institutions and legislation, "the economic illiteracy" of society, the political control of the economy, "the economy of parade" (Pasty, 2006:467).

All of this led to a long period of severe economic recession, an economic collapse greater than that of all the other ex-communist countries. Only after 1996, a slow implementation of new laws took place under the supervision of the Monetary Council, followed in 1999 by an economic relaunching based on EU's decision to accept Romania among its members. In fact, Romania's reforms were implemented belatedly through external impetus, as the country had to meet the requirements of adherence and because foreign investors preferred to do business in strategic branches of the economy (oil, steel, banking, etc).

The political and economic circuit led to the impoverishment of the electorate as well as to it being fed political promises, a gradual withdrawal of the civic forces that had been formed after the 1989 Revolution.

At the level of sociological emotion, all of this led to circumstantial mobilization before the election, as well as an excessive polarization of public speeches and "emotional" mutations in terms of electoral choices. Emotion to the detriment of reason and a spectacle of words instead of a political program.

The presidential word functions within its own circle of interests without making the electorate more mature.

The presidential word perpetuated itself, oblivious to linguistic evolution. An ever growing number of parallel realities have consecrated communities and social experiences which the presidential word could not penetrate.

Only prospectively did we mention Traian Basescu's presidential speech, the President who found a place for humour in his oral declarations. The President and humour blended within one public figure triggered hilarity among the audience and constructed the President's duplicity.

As shown in the "Business Magazine" analysis, the series "Romania must" is part of the President's serious persona that belongs to written discourse, not to the less serious oral one. Yet, according to testimonies, this duplicity did not lead to learning about presidential limits. Humour became a presidential monopoly as well as a weapon against political enemies or personal supporters.

It was also through humour that President Traian Basescu dominated the politically and civically involved society. This type of domination also plummeted when he gave the humourous reply to the 2012 upheaval. Symbolically humour was answered with humour (V.Mihăilescu, C.A.Stoica, 2012). And this type of humour became characteristic of a new generation, of a generation that includes humour within civic practice. Traian Basescu's reply: "He who laughs last, laughs best", given during a TV talk with Raed Arafat, State Secretary to the Ministry of Health was welcomed with an appropriate reaction for the first time under his administration: a civic protest, animated by humourous public performance (slogans,

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

chants, scenes). He became laughable because of his own words. Soon came the President's answer: he reinstalled technocrat Raed Arafat in his former position.

Just like in 1990, humour became the monopoly of civic attitude, of protests, of political freedom.

If in 1990, the Establishment and the Political Opposition were fractured by humour, this time the division took place inside the Establishment, between those who understood humour and those who did not. The resignations of presidential supporters or Government members are evidence of this (see, for instance the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Teodor Baconsky). They were dismissed on the basis of personal declarations. Also, this testifies to the fact that humour, issued from the civic area, and therefore politically neutral, carried weight at presidential level.

References

Barbu, Daniel, and Lucian Boia (Eds.). 1998. *Mitologia comunismului*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Boia, Lucian. 2011. *Mitologia ştiinţifică a comunismului*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Boia, Lucian. 2011. *Capcanele istoriei*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982, 1991, 2012. *Limbaj şi putere simbolică.* Bucureşti: Art.

Brucan, Silviu. 1996. *Stâlpii noii puteri*. Bucureşti: Nemira.

Caroll, Noell. 2014. *Humour: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford Univrsity Press.

Coman, Mihai. 2003. *Mass media în România postcomunistă*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Constantinescu, Mihaela-Viorica. 2012. *Umorul politic românesc în perioada comunistă. Perspective lingvistice*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Constantiniu, Florin. 1997. O *istorie sinceră a poporului român*. Bucureşti: Univers Enciclopedic.

Dinu Gheorghiu Mihai, and Mihăiţă Lupu (eds.). 2008. *Mobilitatea elitelor în România secolului XX*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Drăgan, Ioan. 1993. *Comunicarea de masă şi spaţiul public în perioada de tranziţie.* Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Gallagher, Tom. 2004. *Furtul unei naţiuni. România de la comunism încoace*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Gross, P.. 1999. *Colosul cu picioare de lut: aspecte ale presei româneşti postcomuniste*; traducere: Irene Joanescu. Iaşi: Polirom.

Kligman, Gail. 2000. *Politica duplicităţii*, traducere: Marilena Dumitrescu, Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Kuipers, Giselinde. 2008. *The Sociology of Humour*. Available at: www.academia.edu/1166958/The_sociology_of_humor

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

Lazăr, Marius. 2002. *Paradoxuri ale modernizării. Elemente pentru o sociologie a elitelor culturale româneşti*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes.
Lăcustă, I. 2007. *Cenzura veghează*. Bucureşti: Curtea Veche.
Liiceanu, Gabriel. 1991. *Jurnalul de la Păltiniş.* Bucureşti: Humanitas.
Mihăilescu, Vintilă. 2010. *Sfârşitul jocului. România celor 20 de ani*. Bucureşti: Curtea Veche.
Mungiu Pippidi, Alina. 1995. *Românii după '89. Istoria unei neînțelegeri*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.
Murgescu, Bogdan. 2010. *România şi Europa. Acumularea decalajelor economice (1500 –2010)*.Iaşi: Polirom.
Negrici, Eugen. 2008. *Iluziile literaturii române*. Iaşi: Polirom.
Pasti, Vladimir. 1995. *România în tranziție. Căderea în viitor*. Bucureşti: Nemira.
Pasti, Vladimir. 2006. *Noul capitalism românesc*. Iaşi: Polirom.
Petcu, Marian. 1999. *Puterea şi cultura – o istorie a cenzurii*. Iaşi: Polirom.
Petcu, Marian (ed.). 2012. *Istoria jurnalismului din România în date – enciclopedie cronologică*. Iaşi: Polirom.
Sandu, Dumitru. 1996. *Sociologia tranziției: valori şi tipuri sociale în România*. Bucureşti: Staff.
Stoica, C.A., and Mihăilescu Vintilă (coord.). 2012. *Iarna vrajbei noastre: protestele din România, ianuarie – februarie 2012*. Bucureşti: Paideia.
Ştefănescu, Domnița. 2011. *11 ani din istoria României. Decembrie 1989-decembrie 2000. O cronologie a evenimentelor*. Bucureşti: Maşina de scris.
Tănase, Stelian. 2006. *Revoluția ca eşec. Elite şi societate*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.
Tismăneanu, Vladimir. 2005. *Stalinism pentru eternitate*. Iaşi: Polirom
Tudor, Marius, and Gavrilescu Adrian. 2002. *Democrația la pachet, elita politică în România postcomunistă*. Bucureşti: Compania.
Vasile, Cristian. 2011. *Politicile culturale comuniste în timpul regimului Gheorghiu-Dej*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Sources

Almanah "Academia Cațavencu" 1994-1995
Romanian newspapers collection: „România liberă", „Adevărul", „Dreptatea" (1996-2000)
http://www.flux24.ro/mircea-dinescu-cand-l-au-vazut-pe-iliescu-s-au-linistit-si-au-tras-toti-tricolor-pe-mana-si-au-zis-ca-sunt-cu-revolutia-si-armata-si-securitatea-si-activistii-de-partid/
http://www.presidency.ro/static/ordine/RAPORT_FINAL_CPADCR.pdf, 2006
http://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/discursuri
http://www.historia.ro/exclusiv_web/general/articol/ceau-escu-prima-nt-lnire-scriitorii
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MpL8U-A_-lE

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fCART_QfUvg
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MnRTN7axLNI
http://www.constantinescu.ro/en/discursuri.htm

BDD-A26548 © 2016 Transilvania University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 22:09:56 UTC)