Humankind is facing an on-going transition:

- According to ancient Greeks, society is regressing from the Golden Age (of the immortal Gods) towards the Bronze Age – or God knows what other metal (of the mortals);
- According to Hegel, by the course of Absolute Idea or of the Absolute Spirit, humankind evolves from inferior towards superior. Hence the notions of evolution, transition, progress, change, transformation, development and growth at the social level, generally speaking, and at the economical level, in particular.

Taken from Biology, the notions of “growth” and “development” indicate organic transformations of a precise consistency according to one of Nature’s Matrixes; some people (and there are many) call it Divine Matrix.

Since Darwin, species have appeared and disappeared also due to sudden environment transformations, emerging all kinds of adaptations and genetic mutations. Despite such hypothesis, because Darwinism remains, after all, just one of the great hypothesis of Human Knowledge, growth, development, evolution and transformations suppose long periods of stability and precise configuration for the structures (anatomically) and physiology of organisms.

The transformations of human society have taken place in two large fields:
- General Knowledge, with its particular aspects: Religion, Culture, Science, Technique and Technologies;
- Mentalities and Behaviors manifested in informal constraints (traditions, habits, customs) reflecting the culture of that community; in the modern ages
the formal constrains are generalized in the shape of institutional, constitutional-democratic legislative systems.

The technological changes manifested in consumer goods and capital assets are the easiest to be assimilated. Sooner or later all human dwellings will be electrified, everybody will communicate using mobiles or videophones, and so forth.

The institutional transformations however, are not so easy to be assimilated. What precisely induces the institutional changes, was wondering, among many others, the 1993 Economy Nobel Price Laureate D.C. North? How, in what way, which is the path a society follows from an institutional form of organization to another one considered superior? Is there any Universal Recipe to be used by every economical-political entity? Which is the recipe, which is the path to be followed?

After almost 44 years of believing we know, obstinately learning the modes of production sequence proposed by Marx and Engels and then approved by Lenin, Stalin and the others, we are facing the cruel reality: not everywhere institutional changes are caused by quantitative accumulations that lead to qualitative leaps, but for most of the political entities they are caused by given order.

The questions that immediately emerge are: “Ordered by whom?”; “In what purpose?” I suggest that for the moment we abandon our vocation on heuristic pragmatism and for now just determine whether things are as they seem to be, respectively, whether changes are not internally necessary, but mostly determined from outside the political entities.

Ever since Marx we have remained with a certain nostalgia, namely that of the internal “laws” of growth-transformation, remainder of negation of negation and Hegelian’s leap. Many have accepted Marx, maybe precisely for because Marxist philosophy was based on Hegel’s and the last one, in its tum, contained Humanism and Illuminist elements, synthetically retrieving – in a proper manner, of course – the whole tradition of Antique and Medieval philosophy.
As researchers, we are tempted to **un**-cover or to **dis**-cover laws “as eternal as possible”. Enforced during historical evolution of human societies the acts and laws reflect inner sides of external influences, first of all from limitrophe systems.

According to which laws have the institutional changes in Romania been made? Since almost yesterday they were pretty clear, explained by the Dialectical and Historical Materialism: the accumulation of capital in hands of bourgeoisie finally leads, by means of the political revolution, to taking over the political power or, at least, to splitting it with the aristocracy. This evolution was recorded in England, which became a kind of model for the continental-European evolutions and for many other regions on the globe. France, Italy, Germany and others followed, almost one hundreds years after England.

Along with the evolution of the **productive forces**, the rise of the **proletariat and working people class consciousness**, and of the **capital concentration**, the bourgeoisie grew obsolete and, by means of reforms or revolutions, was forced to shift / pass to socialism.

Gaining from the radical transformations brought by the industrial revolution after 1800, the political and economical global “order” began to divide the political entities (most of them national states) in developed countries and “undeveloped” or “second rank” states, countries that missed the synchronized start of modernization with the others or weren’t even thinking of starting (the **taking-off** as denominated by W.W. Rostow). The “second rank” regions had to embrace the way of the **progress** already run by the developed countries.

Why is there so much narrow-mindedness in the change approach? Why it was necessary, and it still is, that all countries follow the same institutional path, regardless their informal institutional background (traditions, habits, and customs)? Why should a natural evolution of a certain zone (England) become a recipe for the Universal Progress?
As D.C. North said, in a free world, the institutional changes happen marginally and incrementally.

Marginally, that is the different human communities find out about each other by border lines or commercial point-nodes. Cultural and technological information arrive, first of all, through merchandise and next through traveling, studies a.o.

Incrementally means by real and slow uptake, at the generations’ level, in non-homogeneous way for the different social layers.

From this perspective there are no more “undeveloped” spaces, only identifiable spaces through their own specific. However, humankind has been in a hurry, terribly hurrying in the last two hundreds years and history doesn’t have anymore time! It does not allow any of the new participant countries to modern institutional life to temporally assimilate, at the entire population level, the rules enforced from outside.

Over the time, human individual’s tendencies, as well as those of other communities in history, were those of personalization and identification. At the individual level it means that the man passes from the amorphous individual status as part of a multitude, to the human-person position with judgment and responsibility, determined to define for him the liberty extents in and through his social activities succession. The specifically acknowledgement and cultural identification within the community has been achieved at the maximum historical level by organizing national states.

There is, inherently, a slight tendency of (centrifugal) autarky in this effort of proving and conserving the human personality or the national identity.

During different historical times, to this proving and self-determination centrifugal tendency, it was opposed a centripetal constrain of coagulation and homogenization, either manifested as grand religions or as great empires or custom and political unions, constrain known for almost two decades as globalization.
The force of evolution and progress ideas shaped and motivated the progressive-minded intellectuals' actions that promote the aggressive import of institutions from *advanced, developed and superior* areas. The consistent import of institutions established the institutional incompetence of the so called underdeveloped geo-political and geo-economical areas.

The Specific of the Romanian transition to market economy, and not only of Romania, consists in passing from something strange to something else new to us, in a constant effort of up taking and adjusting some unfitted forms to the context – to our traditions, customs and behaviors. Hence all formalism carried out by the majority of economical agents and by so called *citizens*.

Romania will always be in transition, but not by transforming in the context of *originality* – typical for the West – innovating formulae and institutional solutions objectively imposed by social and economical life evolution, but only in the *recovery* sense, “learning” along the way, giving up with all what was little or not at all assimilated, since it was already obsolete.

The artificial evolution of the formal institutional framework in Romania will become *nature* when local customs will become mere shades of memory preserved only in museums, altogether being replaced by global *traditions*. Only then the mentality and behavior at the individual and community level will harmonize with the real meaning of *globalization*.