The Balkan region has a tormented history. If we have in view the years after the beginning of the XIXth century we can mention the torturing steal of some interests of the great empires, Turkey, Russia, Austria which had territories in this area and which were colliding among themselves. We outline the strains and endeavours of the former Hellade to redeem under the Ottoman dominance. We have in view the little by little break of the Ottoman monopoly regarding the trade on the Black Sea.

The beginning and deployment – late as compared to the western European countries-of industrial revolution are important. It did not have either the western premises or the favoured national frame, social incentive elements and archaic social arrangements with a powerful slowing role. We also highlight the aspirations for independence of the national entities accomplished as a consequence of taking great national pains and with a foreign support to be taken into account.

We can also point out the religious torments within a space of cohabitation but also of confronting most religions of the world. The second half of the XIXth century and all along the XXth such elements are not pushed aside. Some come up in new forms complicating more both the understanding of the whole and that of the parties. We will stop to the meanings of industrial development with case study in Romania.

1. During the XIXth in the countries belonging to the Western Europe, in the USA and other countries following the industrial revolution, based on intelligence, sparkling creations and remarkable capitalist initiatives, a strong industrialization is taking place. The productive forces have developed and outcomes of civilization sprang out.

This is a genuine revival in the economic and social plan. Having in view the economic capacity stored on the background of some habits and political mentalities, the industrializing states wanted to broaden and accomplish their array of interests in the world, to comprise as many countries as possible within their field of economic, political influence.¹

They were not indifferent towards the development of some national industries in other countries, even if there were preoccupations to maintain economic and social structures right here.

It was full of resourceful, hard working people, but held up by hardships of history in its development. It had been paying for centuries the price of the blood and suffering, the role of advising the European civilization in front of some ravaging attacks. It was crossed by the forced boundaries that split a millenary territory from its unity. It attracted by the gift of the earth and of the people the wishes of the powers of the respective time. It was characterized by a slow disintegrating feudalism

¹ Why should agricultural England be sacrificed in favour of the industrial one? Why the risk to discourage and ruin the farmers? The free traders said: we will impose our food, we will become the plant of the world? But who could foresee the future? What if the world will change, if it becomes a plant, who will feed England any longer? These are questions that 100 years ago A. Maurois asked himself pondering over debates in the English parliament. (Andre Maurois La vie de Disraeli. Libraire Gallimard. Paris. 1929, p 142). The lucidity of the great writer outlined the role attributed to industrialization by the politicians of a great power.
and capitalism with timid steps to be asserted during a period when modern capitalism was developing.

This was Romania of the XIXth century and later, that Romania which was confronted to the new” breaking out” of economic and political scenery. Understanding and analyzing the whole complexity of the realities of the time, the Romanian economists pointed out that the development of the national industry was a condition able to approach progress and civilization.

The development of the national industry was not seen as a “greenhouse” transplant within the economy of the country of some foreign patterns cultivated in different conditions as compared to the Romanian ones.

It was looked upon as a demand required by the evolution in economy, by the existent possibilities. It was a demand of the economic progress as a whole and of agriculture as a demand conditioned by a material and spiritual effort of the whole entity. It was looked as an imperative and Romania’s independence depended on its accomplishment as well as the preserving and consolidation of the national being.

How was the opinion fight going on? How did the economic life evolve taking into account the problem of creation and asserting the national industry on the background of complicated picture we had previously highlighted?

2. The complex process of development in industry as well as the national independence was largely tackled upon in the researches of some representatives of the national bourgeoisie of that period, mostly industrial ones. The theories were asserted mostly in the confrontation with the ideas and theses of conservatives who backed up the agrarian orientation of the economy.

The industrialists used to analyze the necessities and possibilities of developing the national industry, formulated ways and interesting solutions. The theses of Classical Political Economy were taken into consideration and the outlining of the experience acquired by the more advanced states.

The idea of consolidating the country independence within the conditions of national industrial development is being reflected in all mentioned thinking components of some researchers such as D.P.Martian, B.P.Hasdeu, Al.Xenopol, L.Kovary, or some political people P.S.Aurelian, M.Kogalniceanu ².

First we stop to point out some ideas regarding the necessity of industrial development of the country. The important role of the economic factor for the progress of society is outlined, and the culture, civilization degree of any people as well as its welfare are being emphasized; during 1850 when there were fundamental conquests of the industrial revolution, trade exchanges and consolidation of a certain world labour division, an important role in the economic development, in insuring the general progress was to be acknowledged to the industrial development. Romanian thinkers demonstrated this in a convincing way...

Soon after the middle of the last century Dionisie Pop Martian was worried that “today the existence of an unprofitable people in industry is precarious”.

If we start with the important elements of the theories of value and equivalents exchanges and pointing to the fact that the wealth of a nation means its force to provide material goods the mentioned thinkers unanimously assert that due to the lack of the necessary means an economy that is exclusively agricultural hinders the practicing of one that can entail good results.

The work is rough and a low social productivity is being scored, the level of living is low, the natural disasters are impossible to be staved off, the country is poor and powerless.

Mostly agricultural economy, underdeveloped, with natural products or firstly processed losses in trade exchanges with the industrialized countries. It not practicing the conquering of other countries with the assault of arms “they are sending industry and trade “ by having in view economic and political subjugation. “Peoples without industry are starving, are exhausted by those which own it and make them pay dearly for what they cannot provide” ³. M.Kogalniceanu pointed in this respect, ex


prime ministry in Cuza’s time and ministry during Carl’s reign. Such a loss is being illustrated by D.Pop Martian a well known statistician who analyzing our import during 1860 outlines the fact that it was made up of products whose raw material “was sold at a cheap price to the strangers and today we buy them forged by 10-20 times higher.”

Hinting at the disastrous consequences on the nation, of a “clean” agricultural state B.P Hasdeu the scholar outlines that “manufactured nations become the owners of the ploughman nations”\(^4\). Al. Xenopol considered that within a country that has put up with its agrarian state the impossibility of an economic development is determined by the lack of capital and this is engendered by the low economic development and by the losses in the foreign trade and the latter by the low economic development. “the vice of our development, the danger that threatens life and existence” this is the matter. We depend on the foreign peoples and we “are dressed by them, we eat out of foreign plates... we furnish our houses with their objects, we look from foreign windows... what is there to remain of our life, if taken into consideration the alienation of the language, upbringing, customs”\(^5\).

The only possibility to get out of this state of “slaves from abroad”, to prevent the only possibility of asserting ourselves among the independent countries and to progress was conceived by these thinkers as the development of the whole economy, agriculture, transport, trade based on the development of industry. Economic motivations are rigorously developed by Xenopol, Martian, Aurelian... The assertion of the national industry allows the refining of work, the growth of its degree of complexity, the making of a value higher than the one obtained by the rough work of an agriculture so weak from a technical point of view. The assertion of industry assures the increase of efficiency and productivity, entails the progress in agriculture, in all branches, influencing the whole economy, determines the increase of the productive capability of the country and so its wealth, hinders the “outside leak” of natural wealth and of the work. If we take into account the same thesis according to which the national industry is the “most powerful branch of the country wealth” M. Kogalniceanu wanted during the debates of the legislative meeting: “let’s build factories... this will be the only way to defend our country and national existence”.

The necessity of developing industry is linked to the independence, nation strengthening not only with economic arguments but with social ones too and D.P. Martin wrote that industry ensures the growth” of the surplus without which society cannot advance, not materially or spiritually”. Why is there the well being spread in developed countries? (with a developed industry) M. Kogalniceanu, Xenopol ask themselves rhetorically as well as the economist G. Baritiu, ex president of the Romanian Academy. They underlined that the people with more industry that is more science and activity will “prevail without saying on ignorance as light does on the darkness, by emancipation and continuous consolidation, with a higher and higher vitality...”

The opponents of the industrial development of the country were defending their own interests (N.Sutu, I.Strat, Al. Moruz) and were overdoing with much effort asked to the nation in order to set up their own industry. It was a high effort under the conditions of the weak exploring of the natural resources, lack of the market, specialized working force when the price was higher to get domestic industrial products as compared to the similar foreign products.

With the ample dimensions of this effort – underlined as necessary on all plans - Martian, Aurelian, Kogalniceanu, Xenopol, Kovary pointed out the existence of a large basis but not used of natural resources of the country necessary to the development of industry. There were raw materials for the food industry, for the light industry, for that of building materials, we had salt, coal, oil, iron, the development of the extractive industry as well as some processing ones was possible, the metallurgy, chemical, agricultural machines industry too.

The natural resources of the country meant “the power” which allowed the development of the national industry according to one’s own will, “according to one’s own pleasure” as Martian used to write.

On one hand they considered that industrialization engenders the enlargement of reciprocal deliveries of goods between the industry and agriculture of the country. In a genuine agricultural

\(^4\) Traian an I, 8 noiembrie 1869 p 319
\(^5\) A.D. Xenopol, Economic Studies, Craiova, 1882, ed. a II-a, p.4
country that covers its necessities of industrial products by the import “the domestic trade is nonexistent”, the national links are weak while in an industrial country all these are flourishing”6.

The domestic market would have enlarged as a consequence of reciprocal delivery of merchandise between different branches of its own industry. The same as Adam Smith, Xenopol pointed out that the manufacture of matches entails the setting up factories to extract phosphorus from the bones; then factories for the cardboard of boxes and paper for labels; ink production and letters for printing that needs metal to be mould.

The domestic market would have been a favourable frame, an important factor for the development and consolidation of the national economic entity and therefore for the “progress of the Romanian nation”.

If the development of the domestic industry was being considered in the vision of the mentioned thinkers as a condition vital for the consolidation and accomplishment of the unity of the national state, the state was looked upon as an instrument acting for the development of its own industry and therefore for the national prosperity.

By subsidies, tax exemption; by geological prospects and operation under their own management for some national resources; by organizing a system of education tuned to the demands of industrial -agricultural development with the emphasis on practical knowledge, vital for the progress of national economy; by educating the citizens, the traders, entrepreneurs to prefer Romanian products- the state was asked to support the private initiative, to draw a unitary program of industrial development. In what way was it to be done? It did not have to mean a process of creating some industrial establishments at random but an activity coordinated on a national plan” on working out a program and measures to gradually carry it out and in its turning into account “the government had the main role”7 as P.S.Aurelian underscored.

The acceptance of foreign capital, unconditioned entailed first the satisfaction of the demands regarding the development of the country; Martian, Aurelian, Xenopol, Kogalniceanu have fought against the use of this capital. “Sad and painful experiences have shown us the bitterness when a country is in need for foreign capitals.”

The capital necessary for the industrial development was conceived to be ensured from inside the country. This was done by rationally using the funds obtained of the export regarding the agricultural products, by the system of our joint stock companies, by an efficient national system of savings and credit, taxes at state level, measures meant to impede the leak of liquid values.

The representatives of the industrial revolution rejected the promotion of “free trade exchange policy” backed by those interested in the movement of agricultural products as well as the free import of industrial products by Romania. This policy could transform the country into a source of cheap industrial raw materials in the developed states and this endangered the development of industry, the economy, the economic and political independence of the country.

Kogalniceanu used to name the free trade exchange policy as “the death of our industrial development” and Aurelian that the regime “which can maintain the countries at the Danube in an eternal economic childhood” to be “gradually submitted” and Baritiu that the system was meant to “suck, to plunder and to ruin.”

The protective policy of the Romanian state towards the young national industry was being supported. On one side they had in view the domestic protectionism- defined by Xenopol by the creation of all necessary conditions for “domestic products even if at the beginning they were inferior and more expensive than the foreign ones- and on the other side a foreign “protection. The latter was being conceived to manifest itself by customs duty free for the import of the products necessary for the development of industry as well as enforcing high customs duties on the import of products manufactured in our country or might have been produced here, on the import of luxury products.

As it was considered a necessary and temporary sacrifice in favour of asserting the national interests, the protectionist policy was generally looked upon as being the only possibility to ensure the

6 Traian an I nr 87 2 dec 1869 p 351

7 See Texts in the economic literature of Romania XIX th century publishing house of the Academy R.P.R Bucuresti 1960 vol I p 357 360
development of the young national industry. Martian mentioned that the industry hedging is imperative “by all means” for our country.

With such appreciations the idea according to which an economic phenomenon has to be interpreted having in view the circumstances in which it is unfolding becomes obvious.

Aurelian thought that by copying the free exchange policy at that time backed by developed countries such as England was “the saddest example a people could get to when, without taking into account the circumstances it was to be found, what it did was the blind imitation of what others were doing.”

This might be the explanation why M.Kogalniceanu outlines that “regarding the national industry we have to follow the example of all nations, as Venice did during the middle century, Francia during Colbert, Prussia and Russia, by backing up the national industries until they were able to strike roots”.

The protective policy was not considered an instrument of the autarchy policy, it did not deny the necessity of the country’s participation, asserting in the world division of labour. It supported it in this way there were conditions created so that Martian wrote- “within the organism of the universal life” each people should manifest as “being producer and consumer for the other”, including industrial goods. This policy was worked out as a compulsory stage on the way to the industrial development of the country.

3. Following the 1st world war with the completeness of the national unity of the Romanian people- a historical act that has enlivened the creative force of our people and within the context of some important political events for the agrarian reform in 1918-1921 carried on by king Ferdinand- there have been created the favourable premises for the country’s progress in industry, economy.

A part of the domestic bourgeoisie asserted its opposition in front of the growing foreign capital tendencies of “subordinating” its industry, the Romanian economy. The first slogan was “on our own way”. Some measures were set off and they contributed to the development of the national industry, of agriculture, of the economy as a whole. The increase of the national output power did not remove the discrepancies, so serious sometimes between wealth for a smaller number and poverty for more people.

The state, the structure and directions of the national economic development were discussed upon in associations and economic debating societies by using the pages of publications and economic reviews- all of them in a higher number as compared to the period before the Ist W.W. The outlining of some characteristics and domestic outcomes of the economic evolution was to be taken into consideration as well as the answer to the demands of ranking our country within the European peoples.

One might say that the opponents of industry gave up the upholding of the slogan of our country being a “highly agrarian one” before the Ist W.W. The care for its gain makes the respective groups assert the slogan of Romania’s “agrarian prominence”. The legionary fascist slogans such as “back to agriculture”, superficially argued as they had been, they were also blatantly asserted and other painful consequences for the country entailing as an outcome the compromise of the role played by agriculture within the economy.

The hostile considerations for a real development of the national industry were seen in the obvious contradiction with the interests of the native entrepreneurs, of the national bourgeoisie. The accomplishment depended on rendering profitable “through ourselves” the country’s economic potential.

Some conceptions regarding the development of the national economy and industry are outstanding; so there are ministers, professors, men of culture Mitita Constantinescu, Stefan Zeletin, I.N Angelescu, M.Manoilescu, N.Arcadian, Vintila Bratianu. Such ideas were well argued as they stated from theses on political economy, from marginal theses and they asserted the necessity of a certain state intervention in order to support and hedge the national industry and economy.

---

8 Mihail Kogalniceanu Discourse published in Monitorul Oficial of Romania nr 16 20 ianuarie 1874
9 Not often the investigations, the arguments surpassed the explanations which were mostly moral or those of considerations as a whole met before the first W.W. This was possible as a consequence of some notions and specific categories for the modern economy.
Such ideas are a continuation of the thinking line promoted by the representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie in the second half of the XIXth century and the beginning of the XXth.

They differed from the politics of the national liberal party subordinated to some very tangible orders.

The demand for industrial development was not opposed to that of the agricultural one. But the idea of a complex economic development, of its developing branches within the context of industrialization corresponding to the resources of the country – was certainly being promoted.

I.N Angelescu pleaded for “ a national economy fully developed” to come up with the need for products manufactured and to assure an increasing surplus for export.

G.M.Dobrovici- and N.P.Arcadian too - outlined that “ both industry and agriculture have to be developed “, industry “had to be backed and hedged by all means” without forgetting the support that agriculture was in need for. Mitită Constantinescu came with the theory of “the national industrial complex”. “We must become more of an industrial country both towards agriculture as well as towards the capacities and necessities of the country”

By industrialization we had to “correct the structural vices of the economy” – this was the opinion of the quoted economist.

By carrying out a rational ratio between industry and agriculture some economists considered this possibility of population absorption as coming from agriculture and so the removal of the danger concerning the decrease of population as being mostly determined by emigration.

Therefore, the negative consequences entailed by the agrarian economy - economic, social, political- were analyzed. Mitita Constantinescu outlined that the weak industrial endowment of Romania was inappropriate to provide the national needs for manufactured products and this made the import be made of manufactured products and the export of raw materials or products of first processing. With high prices on the world market, there was a difference between the external payment necessities of the country and the possibilities of gathering the means necessary for these payments. This entailed great disturbances of the economic body, “equilibrium breakings…for the structure and functions of our national economy” - this was M.Constantinescu's opinion. “Such realities and characterizations were our addiction to the other countries” the economist pointed out further on, and this was the sad truth of the Romanian economy during that period: the relationship directly pproportional and inter conditioned that existed between the economic addiction towards the powerful countries of that time, hostile to “decentralization” in general, of the industrial revolution and a state of the Romanian economy as under developed.

Similar arguments were used by the economists in order to argue the peasant theses. They were meant to keep Romania within a patriarchal economic and social condition during the XXth century. Between what C.Stere asserted in 1907- that the interest, ignorance or a fixed idea could explain the dream of Romania industrialization and what S. Dumbrava wrote later that “ while the countries in the west were to turn into a new social organization directed by the line of their normal evolution… on the contrary, the agricultural countries in the east had to link the interrupted line of their normal evolution by firstly organizing themselves into peasant states in conformity with their

---

12 It is known that the weak development of the national industry when capitalist relationships were generalized in the villages made impossible the absorption of the labour force. Poverty nourished emigration and this was considered as harmful for the nation. As it deprived the latter from a work potential.

13 This hostility towards the industrial development of the country where industrialization was still at the beginning, “explained” starting with the grounds based on the theory of comparative costs was frankly declared by some doctrinaires representing the political international circles. Among them W.Sombart, P.Caillaux, the promoters of the theory: "complementaritatii economice" – within the context of the "Manifest al bancherilor".
organic demands and structures”, we do not think that there is an important difference. Such appreciations were vehemently attacked by the advocates of the Romanian industrial development.

“Let’s give priority to the agrarian interests but reject the idea of an agrarian state”- these are C.Ianculescu’s words. He underscored that the solving of agricultural problems by the state, considered as highly important – 80% of the country population was in agriculture-was asking for the decisive enforcement of the politics for industrial development.

For the neo liberal economists the industrial growth had to entail the emancipation of the country. I.N Angelescu wrote that “we have to be attentive to the trend that is everywhere in today’s world: hedging the work, rendering profitable the natural wealth and the geographical situations for the people who own them.”

4. The necessity for Romania’s industrialization is asserted in the light of accomplishing some social, humanist purposes, of the country development. Romanian men of science have expressed their views as such.

G. Antipa brought the following thoughts: “we do not aim at exploring the most important wealth of the country to have more gains but to have a greater profit of the invested capital- as in the colonial states- but we are trying to create a profound civilization to comprise the most important centers of the country and to the largest circles of the population”.

Such remarkable arguments for the development of the development of the national industry favouring industrialization in general of the agrarian countries- considerations as the well known acknowledgements confirm, assimilated within the patrimony of the universal thinking, even today very updated- were outlined by “ the new theory on international exchanges” drawn up by M.Manoilescu.

In the respective conception based on the pointing out of the objective interdependences among economies, by tackling industrialization as connected to these interdependencies, the examination of the economic exchanges among the states was deploying not only by taking into account the absolute or relative advantages that such exchanges presented for one country or another.

Manoilescu appreciated the exchange of goods, of products among countries firstly as links among the national economies with different average levels of productivity as exchanges of national labour.

The main role in amplifying productivity is the attribute of “decentralization” of industrial development of the world. “What we then compare when recommending the industrialization of the country- Manoilescu wrote- is not the quantity of work we consume to manufacture some products as compared to that spend by the foreigners. We are interested in comparing the quantity of Romanian work we spend to manufacture industrial products within the country with the one we should spend to manufacture agricultural products we might have to pay- lacking some industry - the foreign industrial products.”

Some other time the economist concluded: “Tell me not only what you are buying but what you are paying with and so I’ll tell you if what you buy is expensive or cheap”.

18 Among these those of J.de Castro. A Marchal etc. We also mention the analysis by Mihail Manoilescu of the tendency to depreciate within the international trade of the exchange ratio for the under developed countries. (“efectul Prebisch-Manoilescu”).
19 As professor Vasile C.Nechita, a tough researcher of the Manoilescu’s doctrines the latter was too great so that the position of the politician cancelled.. the everlasting part of his work… Manoilescu cannot be ignored as he has won a place in the history of the Romanian and world economy.”
There was the same demand to provide the pointing out of intensive factors in the deploying of all activities, the growth of productivity for the economy and therefore the increase of purchasing power. Manoilescu imposed the comparing of national costs of products with the foreign ones and this was recommended to be found at the basis of those decisions able to allow the growth of the Romanian industry.

Analyzing “the new theory of international exchanges” entail some important significations regarding the problem of the opportunity for the creation and protecting the national industry in agrarian countries. The advocates of the industrialization in agrarian countries had considered the respective process as a sacrifice necessary and temporal of the nation- and they pointed that ascribing to “the national pocket” the extra differences to prices for domestic products as compared to the foreign ones were to be covered. The industrial development in backward countries was appreciated not as a sacrifice but as an advantage of the respective countries found in the amplification of the average labour productivity, in the national one. Within the theory of free trade the industrial “status quo” was being promoted, that is the maintaining of some countries’ superiority as compared to others. The “new theory of the international exchanges” met the demands for progress all over the world, of amplifying in all states the social efficiency of the work. “the future of a people cannot be ensured on a national economy grounded only on barley and corn production, Manoilescu stated.

Underscoring the fact that the industrialization of the agrarian countries was not entailing a national confinement, an autarchic development but on the contrary these exchanges were widened, as well as the international work division, and each country’s potential to import and export was developed, it seemed that in Manoilescu’s theory the conclusion was very updated- according to which the intensity of international exchanges directly hang on the intensity of developing national outcomes.

There were studies on the way industry had to develop in order to entail the expected positive results. Such analyses were due to some economists: Mitita Constantinescu, St. Zeletin, M. Manolilescu. They underlined the role of iron and steel industry, the machine one to provide technical means to all industry, agriculture, other branches in the economy and therefore the diminishing of disadvantageous imports as well as for the national defense. These branches were “the backbone” for the industrial development, “the first to be taken into account by a country with a wary economic policy”.

The necessity and possibility for the development of the energetic industry” ahead of the other branches” is also outlined as a good managing of the hydro energetic potential by building some power stations in Bicaz, Portile de Fier.

A chemical industry was asked to contribute to the supply the domestic demands and to enlarge the export in this way the consolidation of the domestic market was ensured as well as the independence towards the foreign countries of some branches.

M. Manoilescu outlined the efficiency of food industries within the economy. “the productivity of low work in agriculture finds a happy offset as food industries, most of them agricultural have a low productivity as compared to the other industries… for agricultural countries within the national soil of the products as the most important means of balancing for the low productivity of human work in agriculture”. The idea that incurs is that with the development of agriculture the efficiency of food industries increases.

Among the main principles asked to guide the energetic policy of the country were called: the “Using the best conditions for energy resources to have profit for the national economy” as well as “saving the energy resources to form the economic reserve of the future”.

The processing industry was meant to provide “the rendering profitable of the national wealth under the conditions of saving as much as possible the raw material, the labour force and available capitals”. An important contribution was being asked form accomplishing “fine” products and using the residua “to the maximum”.

The solidity of some economic arguments is proved by other arguments too

Such as the obtaining of some high economic efficiency and the assertion of the national industry were regarded as having connection with the adapting capacity to the changing technical and

---


23 Buletinul Societatii politehnice, nr 12 1931 p 2366
organizational demands, with the competence of industry and economy to answer the severity of world competition. In this respect I.N Angelescu wrote that “the person who is not in tune with his time is being pushed aside from life and another is taking his place”\textsuperscript{24}. The decisive conditioning between efficiency and the dimensioning of enterprises according to the demands required for the development of national industry is being highlighted. And the flexibility that has to be given to industrialization as it needed to be looked upon as an unlimited process in time, tuned to changes and improvements according to market demands.

A problem of utmost importance for the Romanian economists interwar was that of establishing the financial and currency resources necessary for the industrial development. Mitita Constantinescu wrote that they were considered as essential- such as using a higher part of the national income for accumulations, a more judicious use of device fund to get some equipments, technical experience and raw materials from abroad. Even Ştefan Zeletin who considered the development of industry necessary to satisfy domestic needs did not exclude the fact that industrial products were to be exported in future as this was supposed “to be not too much of an adventurous thought, while we might believe it as having that deeply rooted agrarian mentality”\textsuperscript{25}.

The neo liberal economists’ standpoint towards the foreign capital was marked by the slogan: “by ourselves” which came with the recommendation for this capital not to uphold the majority in the basic branches of the economy and Zeletin’s thesis that pointed the necessity for a more direct access of the Romanian industry to the advanced technologies of the western countries.

A particular accent was on the problem of ensuring the labour force necessary to the fulfillment of this desideratum.

The qualities of “the human” were outlined as being able to offer serious chances for the success of this action.

The positive side was underscored as there was a confronting with those theses which were promoting a fatalist philosophy on “the incapacity” of the Romanian to work in industry as “the Romanian soul, so subjective in expansions as it is” did not have the required availabilities, could not carry on the necessary discipline for this purpose. In the respective industrial theses the difficulties of an economic and social nature were not overlooked as being asked by the imperative of ensuring the labour force necessary to the development. The training of people “is the most difficult problem” – this is what P. Arcadian frankly stated, but “it has to be solved once for ever”. The intervention of the state was asked, the corresponding tuning of the educational system and training. The possibilities of the domestic work to qualify itself and progress at the level of the demands asked by a powerful national industry were conditioned by the joining of the technical culture of the specialist with the economic one, by pushing aside the abstract vision on problems, by cultivating the ability and development by the professional training of the workers.

More of the ideas we have outlined, aimed at accomplishing the profit on the basis of some tough policies. The chosen pattern was the western capitalism. St. Zeletin wrote that “there was no country able to create a national industry but by using the political power and placing back of interests regarding the capital what they called as being the organizational force of the state”\textsuperscript{14}.

Zeletin considered that the political power meant to carry on Romania’s industrialization was the dictatorship of the financial oligarchy (in the positive meaning) in this way preventing a regime of privileges and favours, exploiting the payee (270). As a promoter of the reform doctrine of socio economic solidarity I.N Angelescu outlines the necessity to have some concessions for the “low classes”. This idea had in view the reducing of social conflicts.

The concrete situation of Romania within the international capitalist frame; that of some domestic and foreign leading groups; tough confrontations among the domestic political forces-sometimes they damaged the possibilities for industrial development, for the economic growth of the country. Such elements explain why valuable ideas for the national industrialization which were suited to some progress demands and which had even the material conditions for their accomplishment could

\textsuperscript{24} I. N. Angelescu, \textit{Problema financial a.} București, p. 81

\textsuperscript{25} Şt. Zeletin, \textit{Neoliberalismul. Studii ast/pra istonei şii politicu burgheziei mmame.} Edit revistei “Pagini agrare si sociale”, București. 1927. p. 120

not come to life at their real value. Such elements explain why steps of economic policy inspired by such ideas have entailed limited results and even contrary to the initial targets. Such jealousies: are a modern expression of Cain and Abel.

5. The II nd W.W entailed everywhere in Europe and in the Balkans too the order economy. The end of the IInd WW was not only a great victory of democracy against a violent, bloody dictatorship but a serious concession made by the two democratic powers – The Great Britain and The USA to a great power in the east URSS, also a victorious country during the war with the greatest human sacrifices and characterized by a tough and primitive dictatorship. It is about giving up to URSS of 100% of the influence in the states of Central and East Europe- Poland, the Czech Rep., Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia. And this represented the evolution after the rules of the soviet giant.

There are the conditions when the destiny of Central and Eastern Europe was written. How was it for agriculture, industry? In some countries –Bulgaria, Romania- a more oppressive regime towards the peasants incurred the “socialist” change of agriculture The public property and the collective one were the result and an insignificant quota of private property of the peasant on the yard and garden. In Poland, the Czech Rep., Hungary - the socialist agriculture was on one side of the agricultural perimeter, on the other there was the private one which resisted well even if liable to continuous attack from the part of the party and the state. The difference for the first group of states was given both by traditions as well as by the powerful influence of the church in this area of Europe. The Balkans fell on the hardest part.

The countries of Central and Eastern Europe were able to nationalize the private property and this happened in transport and trade too. The outcome was a strict, centralized planning, extremely bureaucratic – necessary to build a new “soviet” society. We are not the advocates of those who consider that during the 45 years nothing was there accomplished in these economies, no progress was made nor achievement was carried out. Not even the system before the war was a perfect one. But mostly with the1960s and then in Romania, Hungary, East Germany and Poland then the Czech Rep. reforming steps were taken against red tape so that a classic market was to be created,. We can firmly say that Balkan countries were either very obedient –Bulgaria, Romania- or “iconoclast-“ Albania and Yugoslavia. The countries belonging to this region were in a worst position than those of the Central Europe if we have in view the wars during the first years of the Xth decay. The exception is Greece where a huge aid from the West put an end to the communist expansion even paying the price of a military dictatorship.

Revolutions ended the above mentioned evolution in this part of Europe. Regardless whether peaceful or violent they were all a popular democratic negation, a decisive rejection of the dictatorial close soviet, red tape like system, inefficient on a long term; they have marked a re credibility of the system of market economy for the enterprises.

The experience between 1850-2000 concerning the development of national industry has proved to be positive mostly after the revolution at the end and the beginning of the 90s. positive as it “ shed light” on what had to be undertaken when there was a harsh competition on the market, for the integration of the economies of those states within the European economy and the world one, for a globalization that changes the data towards the past but in the sense of pushing aside or dissolving the national economic identities. These are basic factors in accomplishing and explaining the 30 glorious years, of Europe and the world , and such identities are functioning; the difficulties they confront with are engendered either by their exacerbation or by their elimination from the economic interest area. So, it is imperative the appeal to the experience of history beyond the romantic side of some ideas- real sometimes too- to outline steps and solutions acceptable for everybody.

Is there the concept of “Balkan capitalism” functionally” conceived?

We can say that “the stigma” is being still maintained on the Balkan space. The unhappy Karma proved by history seems to become the present and the future….

The economic lagging behind adds to the ethnic and religious mosaic and is made more severe by the 50 years of communist isolation. Cultural traditions of a certain type, the weak resistance to the non democratic pressure, the degradation of social cohesion, the historical rivalries, the deepening of the economic imbalances and poverty are hard to be defeated.

Neither crisis, nor strains in the region, changed into bloody wars to modify the frontiers can be ignored and this still keeps the validity of the expression” the Balkans – Europe’s powder barrel”.
More than this, by taking into account a rich and democratic Europe, this region is being indebted to solutions for a certain future.