

REHABILITATION OF ROMANIA'S AGRICULTURE THROUGH REORGANIZATION

Marius BĂCESCU¹

Abstract *After sustaining the need for reducing the number of workers in agriculture, making comparisons with other countries, it is shown the way by which the splitting of agricultural areas, according to the Law 18/1991, led to the regress of Romania's agriculture. It is also shown why a development and rehabilitation strategy for agriculture is needed in the next 10 years and what this means. A series of proposals for measures are made, which should be taken into account in Romania in order to rehabilitate the agriculture.*

Keywords: strategy for agriculture, development of agriculture, reorganization of agriculture, rehabilitation of agriculture

Clasificare JEL: J43, J44, J54, Q12, Q16, Q26, R11

1. Introduction

The main individual economic interests of people are related to their right to life, which from existential viewpoint means first of all, the right to have a job, to get an income to cover the consumption of goods and services necessary to their living and family, as well as medical assistance, education, school education, culture and qualification.

Therefore, the existence of any national economy justifies only if it assures goods and services necessary to the inhabitants of the country to live and create jobs inside the country, where active age persons could develop an useful activity to get the income they need.

2. From a major agrarian economy to development industrial economy

Taking into account the purpose of national economy development to pass from industrial-agrarian stage to development industrial stage, Romania should rehabilitate its national economy and after succeeding to cover the fundamental needs of all its inhabitants (food, clothing, dwelling and education between six and eighteen years) should prepare to pass to develop the mass production in industrial field.

¹ Ph.D. univ. prof., titular member of Academy of Scientists in Romania

At the same time, it is necessary that the surplus of persons available in agriculture, where it should be reduced the weight of labour force to about 10%, from those over 40% which was this weight during 2001-2002, to draw them over in other economic sectors.

Today all the countries overcoming the stages of industrial and post industrial development passed through such a change; data in table no.1 present the evolution of employment weight in agrarian sector in 11 European countries and USA during 1953-1967.

Evolution of lower number of jobs in agriculture (in thou persons) in 12 countries, during 1953-1967, economically developed today

Table no. 1

No.	Country	1953-1955	1959-1961	1965-1967	Difference col.3-col.5
0	2	3	4	5	6
1	Austria	920	798	662	258
2	Belgium	337	299	218	119
3	Canada	971	796	668	303
4	Denmark	338	365	315	23
5	France	4.639	4.191	3.341	1.298
6	West Germany	4.182	3.630	2.568	1.614
7	Italy	7.453	6.540	4.656	2.797
8	United Kingdom	1.045	1.002	818	227
9	Norway	330	300	242	88
10	Netherlands	521	465	376	145
11	Sweden	553	524	387	166
12	USA	6.283	5.408	4.061	2.222

Source: Cornwall J., Modern Capitalism. Its Growth and Transformation, Robertson, London 1972, quote by Herman van der Wee, 1984.

In 1950, number of farmers in West Germany was 5.2 million persons, out of a population of 54 de millions, which continuously decreased and reached almost one million in 1990, when sector production increased in absolute values by four times as against 1950.

A similar change took place in Asian countries which succeeded spectacular development in the last 20-25 years!

England had in 1950, only 5.6% of employment in agriculture. In comparison with other developed countries, best percentages were registered in Belgium (11.1%), USA (13.5%), Netherlands (14.3%) and Switzerland (16.5%).

Table no.2, carried out by Dutch professor in sociology and economy, Herman van der Wee, entitled „ Active labour force components in percentages (%) in 20 countries of the world during 1950-1977”, includes four categories of information:

1. Structure of population by age group (% of total population);
2. Weight of able to work population (active age labour force);
3. Weight of women in active age labour force;
4. Weight of active labour force employed in agriculture.

As it is noticed in the last four lines of table no.2, in 1950 (when in Romania 74.% of labour force was employed in agriculture) a percentage close to Romania registered Japan, Ireland and Italy. It was worse for Greece, Portugal, Spain and of course, Turkey. In 27 years, Japan reached 11.9%, Ireland 23.1%, Italy 15.9%, Greece 40.0%, Portugal 32.5% and Spain 20.7%.

Lack of adequate economic training determined post December politicians in Romania as well as in other ex socialist countries, to believe that in market economy services become engine sector of development.

Because in the XXI century, agriculture purpose in a national economy still remained to assure for the country's inhabitants the food need and to give jobs for the inhabitants in the villages, after 01.01.2007, the issue of agrarian and animal husbandry sector rehabilitation became more important than ever in the last 20 years, because European Union regulations and prescriptions came into force, following which Romania reached to import 80-85% of daily food of the population.

Adopting the law no.18/1991 and its implementation was practically an error. First of all, because the lands with which peasants entered willingly or by force in collective households were never nationalized and therefore, on 31.12.1989 were not in the state ownership, except the lands confiscated based on some laws or penal trials.

Secondly, dividing the agrarian areas gave back agrarian production at least 50 years, while embezzlement and theft destruction of ex agrarian cooperatives and machinery and tractor stations endowments left it without mechanization, as happened also to irrigation systems and harvest storage silos.

In one of these years following this type of destruction under the reform mask, Romania was visited by American David Garst, president of American Farmers Corporation, who after the visit declared as follows: „*Breaking down agrarian holdings you gave back agriculture 100 years. What you did dividing the land after 1989 is a crime! A crime resulted from savage, not from capitalism*

principles (...)". Then, „*Mistakes you did dividing the agriculture do not belong to the capitalism. Destruction of capital cannot mean capitalism. You wanted to eliminate the communism and you created poverty*” (quote of professor Mircea Bulgaru, member of Academy of Agrarian and Forestry Sciences, in the communication „*Role of state in the organization and development of rural economy and Romanian state*”, held at the Seminar of rural economy and sociology, on 25.09.2008).

What Romanian negotiators accepted on the spot to conclude the European Union accession treaty is similar to the introduction in a horse race the weak and lame horses called „jades”.

A few decades since 1960, Romania ranged among the first 20 countries in the world producing cereals and meat.

In 2007 Romania did not belong even among the first 40 countries, moreover, reached to import cereals, meat, oil, sugar, vegetables and fruit, while production capacities from the country bankrupted and were liquidated.

Having as much as possible the assured existence by income cashed from the budget and broken from reality „to make” money, some members of intellectual elite of the country, launched since 1990, an aberrant idea for the XXth century, namely inhabitants of Romania could live better from income resulted from sale of production in agrarian and tourism activity.

Totally wrong for those who want to live better than in the XIXth century! That is why, we further analyze this fanciful proposal, using the results obtained by 26 countries with more developed international tourism (table no.3).

In the first 26 countries of table no.3, inhabitants of eight countries spend higher amounts than amounts cashed from foreign tourists coming in their countries (col.6).

Tourism positive contributions to GDP formation register Spain (34 billions), USA (23 billions), Italy (14 billions), France (12.869 billions) etc. (col.6 of table no.3). Column 8 of the same table indicates GDP percentage of agrarian sector. The highest values of GDP agriculture weight are characteristics of developing countries (China, Turkey, Malaysia, Thailand, Croatia, Cuba and Romania).

To have performances from tourism as Croatia, for instance, whose number of inhabitants is five times lower, Romania should be visited yearly by about 42 million tourists, namely about the same as yearly visit USA and double number of visitors in Germany and Mexico (col. 3), number which cannot be achieved ever in dream. Unfortunately, among the countries with tourism deficit is also Romania with minus 28 million USD (col.6).

As it can be read on the last line in table no. 3, in 2005 5.839 million persons visited Romania, meaning an average of 112.288 persons per week or 16.041 daily. In order to increase this number to 42 millions/year, it means 807.692 persons/week or 115.384 visitors/day. For all these, Romania should have assured „housing, food, organization, transport means, entertainment and attractive tourism objectives!

Of course, an active publicity in developed countries from which more visitors could come as against in 2005. Hard to believe that until 2050 these conditions could be achieved.

Until then, we shall see how agriculture should evolve in Romania to support the conditions of an underdeveloped international tourism, to the development of national economy.

If inhabitants of Romania reached that in 2008 to be dependent 80-85% of food imports, any economic crisis or any other kind could do impossible to assure daily food for inhabitants of towns and non-agricultural zones of the country.



**Components of active labour force in percentages (%) during 1950-1977,
in 20 countries of the world.**

Table no. 2 presents the evolution in time of this weight during 27 years (1950-1977) in 20 countries, of which 16 in Europe.

Table no. 2

Specification	Year	Population age groups	Canada	USA	Japan	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Finland	France	West Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	United Kingdom	Netherlands	Norway	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	Turkey
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Structure of population by age group (% of total)	1950	-15	29,7	26,8	34,3	22,8	20,9	26,3	?	22,7	20,8	28,3	28,9	26,5	22,5	29,3	24,4	29,5	26,2	23,4	23,6	38,3
		15-64	62,6	65,1	60,5	66,8	68,1	64,7	?	65,9	69,0	64,9	60,4	65,5	66,7	63,0	66,0	63,5	66,5	66,3	66,8	58,3
		65+	7,7	8,1	5,2	10,4	11,0	9,0	?	11,4	10,2	6,8	10,7	8,0	10,8	7,7	9,6	7,0	7,3	10,3	9,6	3,4
1960		-15	33,7	31,0	30,1	22,0	23,5	25,2	30,4	26,4	21,3	26,1	30,5	23,4	23,3	30,0	25,9	29,2	27,3	22,4	23,7	41,2
		15-64	58,7	59,7	63,9	65,7	64,5	64,2	62,3	62,0	67,8	65,8	58,6	67,6	65,1	61,0	63,2	62,9	64,5	65,9	66,0	55,1
		65+	7,6	9,3	6,0	12,3	12,0	10,6	7,3	11,6	10,9	8,1	10,9	9,0	11,6	9,0	10,9	7,9	8,2	11,7	10,3	3,7
1970		-15	30,3	28,3	23,9	24,5	23,7	23,3	24,6	24,8	23,2	25,1	31,2	23,0	24,0	27,3	24,5	28,7	28,0	20,8	23,4	41,5
		15-64	61,9	61,9	69,1	61,3	63,0	64,4	66,4	63,4	63,6	65,0	57,5	66,4	63,2	62,6	62,4	62,4	62,5	65,5	65,2	54,2
		65+	7,8	9,8	7,0	14,2	13,3	12,3	9,0	12,8	13,2	9,9	11,3	10,6	12,8	10,1	12,9	8,9	9,5	13,7	11,4	4,3
1977		-15	24,9	23,8	24,2	22,3	21,4	22,1	21,3	23,2	20,3	23,8	31,4	22,3	22,5	24,2	23,3	27,9	27,5	20,5	21,3	39,9
		15-64	66,2	65,4	67,5	62,5	64,6	64,0	67,4	63,1	64,7	63,8	57,8	65,9	63,2	64,8	62,6	62,2	62,5	63,9	65,5	55,3
		65+	8,9	10,8	8,3	15,3	14,0	13,9	11,2	13,7	15,0	12,7	10,8	11,7	14,3	11,1	14,1	9,9	10,0	15,6	13,2	4,8
Active labour force	1950	-	38,0	42,7	46,0	48,3	41,0	47,8	?	45,3	45,9	37,2	43,0	39,5	47,1	38,7	44,8	39,0	38,7	?	45,7	?
	1960	-	36,5	39,9	48,4	47,9	40,2	45,7	?	43,3	47,8	43,2	39,4	42,3	47,8	36,8	40,6	36,6	39,0	47,9	49,0	47,2
	1970	-	39,8	41,9	49,8	40,6	39,7	48,3	?	42,2	44,2	37,2	37,9	38,5	45,6	36,5	40,2	40,1	38,7	48,6	49,1	42,8
Of which	1950	-	45,4	45,9	47,9	40,4	41,3	50,7	48,2	42,4	?	?	33,8	39,2	47,1	35,2	45,8	45,6	37,4	50,6	44,9	39,8
	1960	-	21,8	29,4	40,4	38,8	28,7	34,6	?	33,2	35,6	18,0	26,0	23,7	32,6	24,6	27,8	23,0	16,1	+	29,7	?
	1970	-	25,7	32,7	40,9	30,7	31,8	44,4	37,6	?	31,9	31,2	?	31,2	34,0	?	28,9	?	?	36,1	?	?
% L.F. in agric.	1950	-	32,6	37,7	39,3	?	33,0	39,4	45,0	?	36,2	25,7	?	27,0	36,9	?	30,5	?	?	39,4	?	?
	1960	-	37,5	40,5	38,1	38,2	34,7	42,3	47,4	31,1	37,9	?	26,8	30,6	39,3	?	39,3	38,5	29,3	43,5	?	37,6
	1970	-	22,9	13,5	42,4	33,0	11,1	24,9	36,4	28,2	24,7	48,2	40,9	39,9	5,6	14,3	30,5	49,7	49,8	?	16,5	77,4
1977		-	13,2	9,3	32,5	?	7,6	21,2	?	22,7	14,4	33,4	37,1	31,1	4,4	10,3	23,3	44,2	41,9	?	11,1	74,9
		-	7,7	4,4	17,4	18,3	4,8	11,5	22,7	14,0	8,6	38,7	27,1	19,5	2,8	7,2	13,9	31,7	29,5	8,1	7,6	69,4
		-	5,7	3,7	11,9	11,8	3,3	9,1	12,9	9,7	6,8	40,0	23,1	15,9	2,7	6,3	9,0	32,5	20,7	6,1	8,5	61,6

Source: Herman van der Wee, "Der gebremste Wohlstand. Wiederaufbau, Wachstum, Strukturwandel 1945-1980", D.T. Verlag, München, 1984.

Legende: F.m.= active labour force of the country.

**Situation of international changes of tourists and economic effects
obtained by 26 countries in 2005**

Table no.3.

Country	Number of inhabitants million persons	Million tourists from abroad	Billion USD		Balance from tourism col. 4 minus col. 5	GDP total 2005 In million USD	col. 4 related to col.7 in % of GDP	Weight Agrarian Sector % of GDP
			Spent by Foreign tourists In visit	Spent by Natives in Other countries				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
France	60,873	76,001	32,329	19,460	+12,869	2.126.630	1,52	2,20
Spain	43,398	55,557	52,960	18,440	+34,520	1.124.640	4,71	3,30
USA	296,410	42,209	122,944	99,624	+23,320	12.416.510	0,99	1,30
China	1311,904	46,809	31,842	24,715	+ 7,127	2.234.297	1,43	13,00
Italy	58,607	36,513	38,264	26,459	+14,405	1.762.519	2,17	2,30
United Kingdom	60,627	29,971	39,573	73,786	- 34,213	2.198.789	1,80	1,00
Russia	143,114	22,201	7,402	18,795	- 11,393	763.720	0,97	5,60
Mexico	103,089	21,915	12,801	8,951	+ 3,850	768.438	1,67	3,80
Germany	82,469	21,500	38,381	80,276	- 41,895	2.794.926	1,36	1,00
Turkey	72,065	20,273	9,010	1,881	+ 7,129	362.502	2,48	29,50
Austria	8,233	19,952	19,310	12,755	+ 6,555	306.073	6,31	1,50
Canada	32,299	18,770	15,830	23,061	- 7,231	1.113.810	1,42	2,30
Malaysia	25,347	16,431	10,389	4,339	+ 6,050	130.326	12,54	9,00
Poland	38,165	15,200	7,127	4,686	+ 2,441	303.229	2,35	4,80
Greece	11,104	14,276	13,697	3,046	+10,651	225.206	6,08	5,00
Portugal	10,549	11,617	9,222	3,763	+ 5,459	183.305	5,60	2,90
Thailand	64,233	11,567	12,629	5,790	+ 6,839	176.634	13,99	10,00
Netherlands	16,320	10,012	10,463	14,201	- 4,189	624.202	1,68	2,10
Saudi Arabi	23,119	9,100	6,100	3,763	+ 2,337	309.779	1,98	4,00
Croatia	4,443	8,467	7,625	0,786	+ 6,839	38.506	19,80	7,00
Sweden	9,024	7,627	8,584	11,447	- 2,863	357.683	2,40	1,10
Ireland	4,159	7,333	6,722	6,168	+ 0,554	201.817	3,30	2,50
Belgium	10,479	6,747	10,879	16,636	- 5,757	370.824	2,93	1,00
South Africa	46,888	7,369	8,448	4,813	+ 3,635	239.543	3,52	2,50
Switzerland	7,437	7,229	17,961	11,060	+ 6,901	367.029	3,53	3,70
Japan	127,774	6,728	15,555	48,102	- 32,547	4.533.965	0,34	1,70
Cuba	11,269	2,261	1,920	?	?	37.000	5,18	7,00
Romania	21,634	5,839	0,406 ¹	0,434 ¹	- 0,028	98.565	0,00	10,10

To overcome this situation, there are necessary not only programs but also concrete measures to rehabilitate in 4-5 years the agriculture and animal husbandry, as well as taking over by agrarian producers the initiative to process primary products and manufacture food products, to supply the markets, as well as their direct trading. To achieve this purpose it is necessary to elaborate in very short term a strategy of rehabilitation and development of agriculture for the next ten years, with objectives, deadlines and responsibilities involving resort

ministries from the government of the country. Because Romania has further experts in the field of agriculture and animal husbandry, action should not have political character but technical one, out of any policy mixture.

Normally to carry out such objectives, it is necessary first of all to set up the state authority running this rehabilitation, experts and regional authorities putting the bases of farms and enterprises dealing with this issue within each local authority, the major governing and responding over them.

As any rehabilitation, that of agriculture should start with an inventory of issues, a plan mobilizing the resources necessary for the rehabilitation by counties and groups of localities, identifying and setting up the measures mobilizing the labour force available for agricultural works, identifying money funds needed for this action (production means, circulating funds, investment credits), as well as setting up the need of machinery and equipment to be produced by native industry to endow the future modern agrarian households and plants to carry out and process the products of this sector. Because most of labour force in rural area is unskilled for industry, in agrarian community no plants of electronic products are built, skilled labour force should be transferred in other zones. Not being the rural area in the villages does not mean to dissolve the villages, by urbanize them (not meaning blocks or many storey houses and concrete yards) but implicitly, changing the living conditions of inhabitants who live there. It is the model with the most evident positive results in the villages urbanization in the countries on the borders of Rin river from Western Europe, urbanization model which in 1990 could be seen partly to develop and especially to finish. Romania has also over 65 years, an example of recovery after the flow caused by Arges river in Corbeni commune (over 6.000 inhabitants), carried out under the patronage of general Antonescu.

During the Second World War, because of allied bombing over industrial centers of the third Reich (Germany and Austria) many of production capacities were affected or destroyed working for the Nazi war machinery. The need for military technique forced the leaders in Berlin, to take measures to build or improvise in rural area or in the forests nearby some small size production capacities, to be reused after the war to start a sort of industry oriented to peaceful purposes.

Industrialization of a rural area, can start the best with the production of goods from processing agrarian and animal husbandry products and with plants in the food industry, as well as with a handcraft sector, or wearing apparel of subassembly of metallic construction and various works of maintenance and repairs in the field of infrastructure and dwellings, namely works needing a lower number of over skilled people, such as masters.

One of the purposes of industrial sector, during national economy industrialization, is to reduce constantly the weight of labour force in agrarian and animal husbandry sector. In the XXth century beginning Romania, agrarian sector includes over 80% of active population. According to the results of an industrial survey carried out during 1901 - 1902 in the two main Romanian principalities from the old kingdom, 22.517 employers worked in towns and 31.070 in rural areas, while 36.802 workers worked in towns and 7.366 persons in the villages.

In the first fifty years of the XXth century, the weight of labour force in Romania's agriculture insignificantly decreased to 74.1%, then in the next ten years, when at government level industrialization concern started to manifest, it registered a fall up to 56.6% in 1965, then in 1977 it reached 36.8% and at the end of 1989 it reached 27.5%. That is why the weight of agriculture in 1989 registered about 3.02 million persons, out of an employment of 47.28%, representing 10.945.700 active age persons.

Unfortunately, due to the non-industrialization since 1990, the weight of labour force in Romania's agriculture started to increase, until 42.3 % in 2001, amounting to 4.47 million persons of total 47% active and employed persons in the population of Romania of 22.408.400 inhabitants then.

The increase in the number of persons in agriculture meant entering since 1990 about 1.45 million persons, while the number of unemployed "registered" in 2001, for instance, was only 826.900 persons.

Together, more persons re-entered in agrarian sector during 1990 - 2001 and number of unemployed reported existent at the end of 2001, was $1.45 + 0.8269 = 2.2769$ million persons, coming from dissolved industry and services. Total reported to active labour force then, whose number was calculated applying the percentage of 47% to total number of inhabitants indicates a percentage of 21.6%, not including available employees and retired persons granting abusively some age dispenses. Neither Democratic Germans nor Polishes did „arrange” reality as the Romanians, to look better „abroad”! Although ex Democratic Germans and Polishes had higher unemployment rates.

Conclusions

Analyzing all these data, it is concluded that in Romania there is already for a few years a potential of $4.470.000 + 826.900 = 5.296.900$ persons, who have to choose another profession in the next 20 years, while labour force working in agriculture will fall gradually up to about 1.100.000 persons, representing only 10% of total active persons.

For those 4.0 million people (of 5.296 millions) that leave effectively agrarian sector, the government and regional authorities should actively act to create new jobs, they should organize and finance the qualification of these persons in the Ministry of Labour schools.

After parliamentary elections on 31.11.2008, the government should gather some skilled persons to get in touch with those working in the forecast field in ex State Plan Committee and later on in the ministry or forecast commission to carry out a concrete strategy of transformation.

In order that mayors of localities should not appeal to imports bringing commissions or rewards, a law should be adopted as far as possible to make them responsible for the organization, creation and keeping the jobs within the locality perimeter, as first important step for the orientation of local and country authority activity towards the community interests.

Salaries of all mayors and communal, town and municipal councillors should include several sources: the first as a fixed percentage paid from the budget including money transferred from state budget (increasing according to the performance), the second from a certain quota from taxes (set up by the government or commission of Finances-Banks from the Chamber of deputies) cashed from producers in the locality and the third, paid also from the budget, only if turnover of economic units in the locality exceed certain thresholds set up by the law and are yearly approved by the ministry of administration.

This measure should determine all local employed to understand that did not reach these functions to be able to cash income from state budget, but to organize during their mandate economic productive and cultural social activities inside the localities and to take measure assuring and organizing order and protect the citizens and their welfare, with the support of interior ministry employees. For a time period considered transition period, the position paper of Communal Councils members of town halls in rural area, should include material responsibility to organize agrarian units in the localities of the commune, to be done grouping individual properties by model of developed countries in the European Union.

Models of small size enterprises and firms necessary to a rural commune, besides farm or enterprise dealing with agrarian-animal husbandry production in the commune

ANNEX 1.

No.	Enterprise purpose	Type of demand or turn into account to be covered	Economic principle of firm administration	Organization type
1	Dairy products manufacturing	a-inhabitants consumption	Cover costs	s.r.l.
		b-market turn into account	With profit	
2	Mill and/or bakery	Inhabitants consumption	Cover costs	s.r.l.
3	Slaughter house-butcher, meat products production, smoke house, refrigerator	a-inhabitants consumption	Cover costs	s.r.l.
		b-market turn into account	With profit	
4	Marketing products (vegetables, fruit, cereals)	Demand on town retail market	with profit	s.r.l.
5	Carpets, fabrics workshop Wickerwork	Market turn into account	with profit	s.r.l.
6	Repair equipment	idem	With profit	s.r.l.
7	Repair footwear or clothing	Dwelling service (personal needs)	With profit	Personal workshop tradesman
8	Carpenter - woodworker	idem	With profit	Idem
9	Mason, painter wallpaper	idem	With profit	Idem
10	Hairdresser	idem	with profit	Idem
11	Medical cabinet-dentist	idem	cu profit	Property of commune and insurance company
12	Grocery, cigarettes and beverages	idem	cu profit	s.r.l. or family property
13	Pub –brewery	idem	with profit	Idem
14	Transport means and common equipment for locality needs	Unit serving local production units	With profit	s.r.l.
15	Harvest storage	idem	Cover costs	Common property
16	Welding-locksmith, metallic wearing apparel	Idem	With profit	s.r.l.
17	Guest rooms, boarding house	At tourists, guests and delegates disposal	with profit	Family property
18	Saving bank subsidy	Money deposits and withdrawals, pays and credits	According to saving bank and bank system rules	Saving bank subsidy
19	Volunteer firemen	Commune provision	On commune account	Common property
20	Children school transport and town transport	idem	On commune account	Idem
21	Water administration, sewer, electric energy, garbage.	idem	On commune account	Idem
22	Roads-footbridges-water retention dams-ditches	idem	On commune account	Idem

S.r.l. limited liability company

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Băcescu, *Strategii și politici macroeconomice*, Ed. Global Lex, București, 2002;
- [2] D. Fota, *Cum se ruinează o economie*, Ed. Universitară, București, 2007;
- [3] D. Fota, *Introducere în macroeconomia comparată*, Ed. Universitara, București, 2008;
- [4] D.Fota, M. Băcescu, *Criza economică din România anului 2009- Cauze, efecte, soluții*, Ed. Universitară, București, 2009;
- [5] M. Băcescu, A. Băcescu-Cărbunaru, F. Dumitrescu, M. Condruz-Băcescu, *Politici macroeconomice de integrare a României în Uniunea Europeană*, Ed. Economică, București, 2008.

