

A Century since the Great Union

THE TRUTH ON OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH HISTORY

Reflections on how an anniversary
is assessed

"The best way to predict the future is to create one"

Peter Drucker

Marin DINU¹

Abstract: *The approach of this theme - an assessment of a certain timeline that has a complex significance, both eventfully and societally - is specific either to an editorial, in brief, or to a more methodologically complex synthesis, in the form of a book. This paper, which, to some extent, would qualify for the rigors of present trends in publishing, is an editorial: one that implies real identification of the problem, understanding of how visions are structured, argumentation of the method of criticism and judgment in finding a solution.*

Keywords: *evolution of a societal entity, socio-human sciences, economic resilience*

JEL Classification: *A13, B41, B55.*

An assessment of the evolution of a societal entity in the context of multiple influences - mostly uncontrollable and unpredictable, with contradictory attitudes, some being coherent and consistent and others incoherent and inconsistent but which make up a critical mass, along with rational and irrational judgment either of short or long duration - cannot be grounded elsewhere than in a comparison with the trends of modernity, with the matrix of their values. When historic reality is in line with the transformation processes of the modernity it becomes legitimate, no matter the outlier pattern of some

¹ Professor, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, e-mail adress: dinumarin@gmail.com

societal experiments or geopolitical projects. When a society fails on the path toward modernity, as it appears to be the case of Romania, we still get the chance to try to understand and explain it by resorting primarily to the socio-human sciences. However, to find a proper measure for the Century that started with the Great Unification of Romanians (or Great Union), as symbolically underlined in this paper amid the general emotions created by a look-back at the past, stands proof that political/geopolitical, economic, and cultural maladies of that Century had been overcome and action must be taken to complete national emancipation. The simple argumentation, even a rational and explicit one, is not enough because today, more than ever, an involvement of socio-human sciences is needed to prepare a synthesis capable of identifying the following:

- a. The lasting trends in the human society evolution and the attitude toward them;
- b. The selection of some projects/scenarios in line with the trends of modernity and the reasons that keep their achievement on the right track;
- c. The chances for catching-up and the involvement of the entire nation in setting the directions leading mankind toward a well-being of living together (cohabitation).

This article makes out a case for the need to create a research program that would use socio-human sciences' epistemic source to elicit the actions able to generate a social synergy for a mature approach to modernity, on the one hand, and to ensure the social stability for modernity, on the other hand.

The moment of truth

The best description of the Great Union is made through an analogy: an astral moment in the nation's fate. The event per se encapsulates a wake-up of the deep tissue of national conscience and a valorisation of the gift of grabbing the historical opportunity, including the diplomatic dimension. No one can deny that the Great Union was, symbolically speaking, a union of feelings and rationales, of identity emotions and of national calculations. But it may equally represent the end of a statal construction cycle, which started in the early 19th century with an exceptional social innovation: the election of a single ruler for Moldavia and Wallachia, which formally united to create the United Principalities. This is the historical moment that put our country on the map of modernity through the creation of an election formula that led to the fulfillment of national emancipation through a nationwide decision, in step with the national will. The political creativity of Romanians had reached an apex on January 24, 1859.

From the socio-human sciences' perspective, the fragments of that century are visible, although they are not always properly explained and understood. We miss the panoramic display, at least historically, of the period when the development was

assumed to have remained a consequence of the very beginning. Such a display may not even be possible, not because of lacking data, but because the theoretical experience is weak in this respect. The contextualisation of the evolution or the focus of the analysis on ideas that would bring together details seems to be altered by the use of forced ideological conclusions. This may explain why socio-human sciences' researchers do not show interest in the history of ideas, and the absence from the universities' curricula of the History of Economics, the History of Economic Thinking, Applied Epistemology, etc. is symptomatic. Events, breaks, confusion-rife episodes are favored against the socio-human sciences that are interested in the evolution of societal systems. Even if entire epochs or political regimes are under scrutiny, they are not viewed in a broader context, leaving aside a certain propensity for setting forth explanations in line with discriminatory intellectual models, the avatars of political correctness.

The mere reference to the substantiation of power - of what is called a political regime, *inter alia*, where some homogenous elements may be detected via the ordonatory principle for all societal domains - is, in ideological terms, precisely that Century. Its timeline (from the Great Union Day) is chronologically made up of the following: 22 years marked by the possibility of national emancipation; 6 years of dictatorship and war; 12 years of Soviet occupation; 8 years of transition to domestic dependency; 17 years of a communist experiment, including the "development" dictatorship; 6 years of social sur-realism and 29 years of uncertain attempts at getting into line with global trends. This would essentially underline the fact that there are too many fractures of the content and direction in a bid to attain the well-being with the first modernity history, where the continuity of fundamental processes is the key to success in overcoming a state of fact defined as under-development. Statistically, we may count 49 years of ideological aggression, domestic excess and social experiments; 51 years under the sign of an option for modernity (of which 22 years of centripetic capitalism - by ourselves - in the balance with the centrifugic capitalism - open doors); 29 years of "capitalism without capitalists" (Eyal *et al*, 2001) and a consumption market replacing the national economy.

It is hard to say whether the past century was for Romanians a consequence of the starting event. No doubt, for Romania it was a Century of radical caesuras, deprived of the possibility to maintain a direction in line with the Western-style winning modernity trends. Over the past century, the most unwanted borderlines of societal experiments had been reached, each being lived as a violent adversity of the other, each attempting to sistematically erase any continuity traces on the path to modernity, especially on the economic front, but also as regards a creative human fund under the pretext of a restauration from scratch of the arhitecture of the present. Thus, socio-human sciences

could not consolidate their meaning or at least ensure the activity of its authentic representatives, being frequently constrained by ideologies aimed at directly serving the power more than they naturally should via a deception of either individual or collective issues regarding the society and finding solutions for the political decision-makers.

The history, as a studied past, has an intelligible meaning only in the contexts or junctures that would be consistent with the lived life. Such an approach is deemed as a normal one. The historical moments are memorable if they match the meta-historical trends which mean the human existence. The history of the past three centuries has a transversal content called modernity. This is an emerging expression of two radical changes of the human condition with consequences for the emancipation, in terms of its rationality by setting the staff and means/instruments that would make it happen: the founding of national states/national revolutions and the setting-up of national economies/industrial revolutions. The nations/states that followed closely these processes, closing up their cycles, have produced and benefited from today's global economy.

The Great Union moment fits in the scale of modernity as a completion of national emancipation, as a statalisation of the Romanian nation. The completion of the national state is in line with the logic of the normal context of modernity. However, an abnormal contextualisation exists and some nations could not escape from this. This imperfection comes as a deviant loop induced by abnormal contexts with geopolitical roots. The 1st of December 1918 moment is the promise of a fulfilment of national emancipation as a state which had been brutally cancelled on August 23, 1939 and August 30, 1940. Today, we celebrate a Century from the Great Union, not a century of the Great Union. Speaking about the Great Union, we speak about what we may be when we know who are we and what we want to be.

Historical experience shows that the evil comes when it is allowed to. The impact of blocking the completion of the nation's statalisation/national emancipation were not offset by the completion of economic emancipation. The incomplete transformation aimed at securing an economic resilience of the state was achieved through the decoupling from the waves of industrial revolutions, fostering a centrifugation of the territorial and functional structure of the national economy. The most violent form of these gaps is represented by the episodes of destructuring/re-routing of the national elites and by the tragedies of sacrifice generations. These placed us in the underdevelopment/periferial area as a country and as a nation. The main consequence of an imature modernity is to abandon the country (when we refuse to be what we can be).

This Century is a real compendium of political experiments, some promising, other risky, though neither of them able to sufficiently bring in the progress that would really place us within the modernity play. Of course, some factors, especially of an exogenous nature, capable of justifying the fracture on our road to modernity may be identified, yet the effects of the endogenous factors cannot be ignored. What matters for the past is the result of summing up or scaling down these effects in the form of everyday reality. Only the present may change this result, although, for this to happen, a firm determination is needed, not only the kind that would involve action and thinking but also a selection of strategic targets, both recuperative and projective. The present would recover the losses of the past and would restore our advance potential toward modernity. It may do so through a complex formulae made of resilience to the limitations to exiting the periphery, many of them geopolitically matrixed, which may be overcome only via internal innovation in line with what is called the leap forward as well as an external support for country projects.

The celebration of the Great Union century does not signal a national revival on the path of innovative modalities to reinsert us into the modernity process. It is easy to detect the wariness of our sovereign re-positioning in the balance of power relationship system nowadays, in a world where many confusions are fuelled by an extremely active hegemonic logistic that eats into the autonomous actions' will. Among them, a special place takes the acceptance of a contradictory situation between market economy and capitalist society for which we opted nearly three decades ago: a market economy centered on its external function, a consequence of an insertion into the regional economy and a society labelled as capitalist by agents coming from abroad. The longest part of the Century that started with the Great Union, as shown above, is actually the slowest, if we refer to either the one with constructive goals, as is the first, or with destructive ones, as is the third.

A symptom for the detached approach of our ranking in the "grammar" of time (Braudel, 1993) is the absence of a vision or at least an explanation on how would have been possible to follow meta-historical trends of the modernity, primarily the industrial revolution, to consolidate our national economy as the key instrument for emancipation. Undoubtedly, we cannot speak of a coherent decision-making, of a minimum trans-ideological and trans-political regime consensus, although political regimes claim themselves as deriving from the philosophies and ideologies of the modernity, rightly so by following the adversity rule. A successive annihilation of our penetration into the modernity, which was favoured by the nation's stationalisation a century ago, has somehow acted implacably. Every political regime took things from the lowest point, it was no question of taking over objectives specific to the maturity of modernity processes, even if no one considered taking over the methods as well.

The challenge of forms without substance still operates now in terms of the national identity.

Sadly though, the socio-human sciences had failed to approach this idea-inspiring moment in a bid to feed the national experience toward the maturing path of all the processes of modernity. The past three decades of what we call the Century since the Great Union have revealed the consequences of our lack of continuity in enlarging the treasury of ideas able to help inspire and innovate the change management. What a magistral achievement would have been if, at the start of the post-communist transition, we had been neared the fulfilment of the other modernity avenue, that of the development based on the industrial foundation of the national economy and, by harnessing the geopolitical context, we had restored the national stationality of the Great Union! What was missing was the concrete approach to modernity ideas, not only their mere claiming, compared to the righteousness that history devolved on us as a nation. Both the "Little" Union, as it definitely expresses an innovative power of our national political thinking, and the Great Union, as a triumph of generational synergy, would not have been successful without a smart involvement, without science and conscience as they say, without a vibrant need for ideals regarding the cohabitation and the facts from which the history of the modernity is made of.

Frankly speaking, it is not the past that is tormenting us, but rather the present which seems to have forgotten that it has to avoid impoverish the past. The abandoning of the industrial revolutions route is similar to the greatest denial of the option for modernity. The highest setback occurred on the path of emancipation, with the industrial de-professionalisation of the population and its decoupling from the creative spirit of modernity. Nothing could replace the support to the access to modernity, to our way out of the modern systems' periphery, which was industrialization. The model of Western development clearly shows that successful modernisation is achieved via the force of industry, in all its successive forms brought in by industrial revolutions, including post-industrialism (Wallerstein, 2013). One may only keep the pace of development by following the maturity path of the modernity processes in order to boost the chances to control a national destiny in the post-modern era, actually to pass to another modernity.

I am referring to the historical chance of the last third of the Century since the Great Union, as only what is present in the history flow could offer the practical possibility to correct some past dysfunctions on the modernity avenues. The celebration of the Great Union may become memorable by a right judgement of what went wrong only if this triggers a vast, necessary and ultimative correction of the national direction.

What is to be done?

A. Cognitive cooperation

For socio-human sciences, time is seen as a reflex of the modernist idea of progress. Economics regards time as a sense of development, as a teleological form of structuring people's expectations, as a promise of healing childhood diseases that would generate febrile ideals such as liberty, equality, fraternity. The comparison with such axial values for mankind opens the doors of social knowledge toward all socio-human sciences. But the modern theoretical experience is rather hampered by the lack of a cognitive cooperation method.

What may appear as common projects aimed at assessing complex processes, even the one of the historical set-up of societal systems, are in fact concessions of successes of other sciences, without resulting in any organic syntheses. There are few exceptions in terms of historians, not so many though¹. Literature shows that Economics gives in principally when it stubbornly tries to judge the time segments in front of history, politicalology, sociology or psychology. This makes it permissive to the neverending distinctions of visions, ideologies and behaviors. In Economics' papers influenced by these sciences what prevails is the fact not the process, the narrative not the truth, the reasoning not the cause, the intention not the finality. For Romania, I would mention just one successful integration of several analytical perspectives for studying Economics in the works by Costin Murgescu, in *Mersul ideilor economice la români* (Murgescu, 1994).

The assessment of a century of Economics may seem a rational impossibility without the moderation of theoretical achievements gained in a completely different ideatic context. The state of social knowledge looks like a parcelled territory, with impenetrable borders, deprived of communication. The intellectual exercise of inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary cooperation is avoided, against the background of a methodological argument between natural and socio-human sciences, favoured by a lack of epistemological coherence of the later. What is put forward as a need for synthesis remains merely a pretext for academic lecture. When something like that does emerge, it is only a mechanical pooling of texts resulted from a fragmented research of socio-human sciences. An allergy to teamwork by socio-human science specialists is a persistent gift if we surf the library shelves. As regards an assesment of the long-run,

¹ Fernand Braudel with almost his entire work aimed at identifying the position of the economy within the global social systems, providing details on the complex reasons and conditionalities regarding the long-term human action, as well as the inter-relationship between economy and society, especially that between market economy and capitalism and Immanuel Wallerstein, interested as well in the economy and how things work in relation with society.

broad-based societal process, we may find some festive works, mostly a collection of images and occasional impressions. If we are to faithfully expect a great synthesis, it is worth mentioning one special fact: a great synthesis seems to be gently approached in the initiative by the National Economic Research Institute to display some fragmented research over the past decades through the online initiative of *Colecția Tezaur* (the Treasure Collection), which puts together editorial contributions written from different perspectives, horizons and destinations. This may be the most significant tribute of the economic research to mark a century since the Great Union.

It is said that when feelings come into play, perception should be sharpened, otherwise the trans-regime assessments, events' panorama, multi-generational conclusions, the evaluation of ruptures, the judgement of openness risk to narrow the significance and to lower the bar for knowledge foundations. This is the only solution to avoid formal thinking, conventional phrases, easy records. It is obviously a challenge for a model preferred for decades, in some cases for three quarters of the century since the Great Union and which had upset the perception of that memorable event as an excess of effusion or had emptied the analysis of its content by exhibiting elitist ambitions. In our case, the socio-human sciences had been infected by ideology and contaminated by epistemic isolation, not only because social shocks had made the rule in the research area, but because of a giving-up on any school of thinking, on institutional formulae, including editorials, whereby some inter-disciplinary cooperation platforms could have become functional or thematic debates would have kept alive the interest in complex implications of the social context. Over time, the counterpart for the betrayal of the object of socio-human sciences was brilliantly illustrated by the works of Virgil Madgearu and Mihail Manoilescu in Economics, Gheorghe Brătianu in History, Dimitrie Gusti in Sociology, Constantin Rădulescu-Motru in Psychology and Lucian Blaga in Philosophy¹.

In order to turn aside or away from rough territories, the socio-human sciences should treat time as a result of an epistemic self-assessment, a distillation of achievements and of precipitations of penetrations, which would enable to discover the measure that favoured long-term development trends in the society. What brings consistence to cognitive cooperation is, in a major sense, the strategic trend related to the modernity processes. They have trans-generational, multi-secular and a rewarding status. Of course, any self-assessment is made in relation to a set of values that have been themselves subject to evolution. The relation with the trends always preserves a long-

¹ The works of these great Romanian thinkers is somehow maintained in the editorial circuit, but is insufficiently valued in the circuit of ideas even though some exceed by far the specialized interest in the history of national thinking, such as those by Mihail Manoilescu and Lucian Blaga.

term benchmark, while the swings are frequently behavioural errors which get corrected. The issue of critical thinking, aimed at recovering the gold nuggets out of the theoretical storm of the century, becomes an exceptional challenge for socio-human sciences as well as a methodological and epistemological maturity test for the research community that needs to get out of the pressure of the uniformizing, conforming and non-communicative thinking models.

Any successful assessment is essentially a self-imposed process of a research community sensitive to the scientific context, not to the ideological offer, a community aware of the quality of connecting with the ideas that support long-term winning trends in civilisation. Ultimately, the most relevant element of how accurate a self-assessment is lies with the time, with its scales and intervals differentiated by the factors always likely to escape the habit, suggesting a Utopia and bordering a Dystopia. The experience of the inter-war generations which were fascinated by societal myths, of the post-war generations that were detoured by the survival need from previous projects or of the post-communist generations which were likely to adopt lab theories, without any criticism, reveals a tableau of the concessions from the benchmarks that would make the socio-human research legitimate, that would bring an effective maturity to the modernity processes, that would synchronise actions inspired by ideas with contemporary trends and trigger a return to the crest of a wave of a civilization dominated by rational thinking.

Celebration time is the most sensitive part of our relation with history. But the pretext is the past whose limits and limitations should be marked from the standpoint of the present. Actually, the anniversary has a meaning as a public action only if it makes the present the object of a complex analysis that would bring to the fore its continuities with the past, but especially its fractures that provide somehow its substance and foresee its future. The first conclusion is that such self-assessments are absent, the current bias toward empirical studies extremely centered on details, even if significant for the need to substantiate effective decisions at a given juncture, is blurring the understanding of the whole, the rational targets' teleology. The usual way to describe such a situation is the impossibility we create ourselves, based on the rule of the minimum effort, of failing to spot the forest from the trees.

The socio-human sciences' effort was not always focused on what matters as a directional factor for the formative experiences, as it was the case of the national project of Spiru Haret¹, on the general objective, which would reveal that a certain modernisation stage

¹ The initiator in Romania of the most broad-based and concrete emancipation process, based on the construction of the education system that brought the country into line with the trend opened in Central Europe by Bismarck, as regards the professional emancipation of the

has ended and does not remain a “wind rose” if its cultural foundation were prepared. The educational weathervane of the past century left no chance for a sedimentation of attitudes, for an internalisation of the values of an alive modernity, and especially for strengthening the cultural foundations of personalities fed on the durability spirit for a synchronization of options for civilization with the national projects. Symptomatic for this is the very idea of naming the transformational processes following the communist regime as being post-communist – an uncertain evolution in the wake of communism – which instilled ambiguity and even induced a feeling of wandering into an experimental, unexpected and extemporary labyrinth rife with abstract, untested ideas.

The socio-human sciences’ self-assessment is, frankly speaking, an attempt to keep the course of thinking in a bid to avoid a loss of judgement in the unlimited Utopia and a failure into the straits of Dystopia. The performance in self-assessment comes when the socio-human sciences do not get hostile on the ideatic front via a contamination with the ideology narrative, becoming thus the source of wandering for a generation, for example, when many cannot avoid the short-term trap as a vehicle for the political power interests. The performance is when it manages to stay in trend that always opens the way to cohabitation, whose result is even the life lived without the ideologies’ noxae and halucinogenic history. It is not the idealist propensity that returned to the body of socio-human sciences via the backdoor, it is rather the accession of social thinking to the ideal of well-being as an approximation of finality, always intermediate, of the life lived individually and inter-individually. In fact, social sciences are managing the medication of methodological isolationism, offering a chance for a more coherent perspective on social reality.

Underneath this way of structuring the self-assessment is the human phenomenon *par excellence*, not the things created by the human condition, such as political systems. The socio-human sciences’ self-assessment starts with the human and always returns to human, to what makes him/her different, to the rational thinking and action and to the moral judgement of facts, including the parts of the societal systems with trustworthy reasoning. The purpose of self-assessment is not only to reinforce the epistemology of the social knowledge, but also to understand to what extent socio-human sciences acted as a guide for the social action as regards the major trends and domains. The sole benchmark that would confirm the purpose of socio-human sciences as a guide for the social actions is the statistics of people’s well-being, the twists and turns of history notwithstanding. More precisely, the data set revealing that the society followed, no matter the geopolitical or politically imposed loops, a modernity process, that has

people, a government policy to put in place the material conditions for training people in the professions brought by the industrial revolution.

attested the maintainance of the options for certain routes as the Western countries' performance shows, the one to achieve well-being which has materialized through industrialization and emancipation.

There is no dispute over the fact that any self-assesment starts with a handicap due to the limitations of a fuzzy process, which is the thinking that thinks of itself. Adding to this are the difficulties to understand the typology of the social thinking, from the historical thinking to the national thinking. The split of the human intellectual experience on the type of thinking casts a shadow on what seems to be universal for the human existence, his/her power to judge trends that are consistent with lived life in terms of duration as a stability of the natural well-being state. The fragmentation of the social thinking – of the well-being thinking as a cohabitation – distorts the relevance of the universality of human nature and its relationship with the historical time. Surprisingly enough, it also generates, in a non-natural way such as mesianic profecies, areas of wandering for the social discerning, leaving room for options for abnormal trends, social experiments and deviant loops.

The creative function of the social sciences assumes a trans-generational internalisation of the values of the modernity, a permanent action toward a growing-up in the transformation process, which would create well-being via the scientific, technological and organisational innovations and abilities to replicate the infrastructures of liberty and of the individual, social and national emancipation.

There is a goal outside the social sciences' view, something that makes sense by a creative transfer of theoretical achievements - such as the significance of time relative to what makes the human nature different - the reflexivity and the possibilities to acknowledge a conceptual representation of time. Time, as we all know, is testing the limits of the conscience. Out of its sequency, the conscience is related solely to what we call the present and from the present only with an unmediated context is rational (deriving from sensations). The future does not hinge on perceptions, but rather on imagination, which creates possible scenarios, more or less valid. The other sequency of time, the past is a matter of sentiments, of the history per se, of human representation and understanding of the past by the human, is a matter of choice of an image that depends on feelings filtered through thinking and intuition. The relativity of the visions comes from the type of thinking. For History, it is the material proofs of the past that count.

The coherence of history is, however, the effect of a more delicate process: the re-living of feelings/predetermined dependencies, originated in the identitarian circumstances (Friedman, 2013). Time is ineffably the factor that shapes its own identity by broadening its learning horizon. The human being is (sensorially) limited to the continuous present,

the access to the past is made via learning, especially organized and institutionalized learning. Natural learning is permanent (lived life), whereas institutionalized learning lasts one third of the average lifespan at least. The average vision on history is the result, without change, of the quality of continuous learning and of the institutionalized one. The understanding of our development, including the historical one, belongs to each generation and each individual. Therefore, the past should be learned, it is not a natural possibility of our conscience.

B. The correction of achievement

Jacques Attali made the following remark: "Romania has always lived in the nostalgia of a glorious past, showing respect for its bureaucratic groups, rebuilding them forever." (Attali, 2007). To exit such a confusing area there is a corrective approach available that involves the national will and a firm commitment of the individuals.

The first correction is for the mindset that prevails in the clarification of our relation with the more recent or more remote past, and in the overcoming of the obsession for restoration, either as a re-establishment of a certain defined order of justifications or as a replay of the illusions regarding the revival of the Golden Age. It may be some sort of a spiritual reform that would revive the sense of reality and the build-up of destinies patterned by the logic of the present. This would amount to a moral revigoration that should create antibodies for the diseases of history, develop the nation's ability to avoid trends leading to dystopian experiments, and also a social anomaly, to weaker resilience to geopolitical shocks.

In this area we may identify a revival of interest in following the course to the values that are in line with the human values as well as a regeneration of structures via which social judgement has frequently led the country to the crest of the wave of history, making the progress of civilization perceivable. At the same time, subtle energies are to be revived, at least those that have strengthened our identity in the world and substantiated our power to innovate in societal terms. In poll position lies moderation, well-behaving as well as an intransigent community spirit relative to violence, eccentric behaviors and the relation with cultural models of wisdom, sacrifice, dignity, etc. One may spot here the way to restore the fine tissue of Romanians' character, which is fueled by trust in cohabitation, in the action with goals aimed at the ideal of national liberty and dignity, which were manifest in the critical moments of our evolution throughout time.

The correction of deviant trends that would lead us deeper into the periphery implies a lasting option for social development. It is worth mentioning that today it is of utmost importance to give up taking over the methods which keep people's mind occupied with the fear for an existence shaped after messianic models along with a display of concern for adversity as the sole way to get personal and collective redemption.

The present-day agenda of Romanians should include four objectives that define his/her life expectations' pattern: an energy satiety, urbanization, dissemination of the values of the knowledge society and the structured ability to stay on course for development and withstand the world's turns and commotions¹. It should be noted that these objectives are meant to bring the country again within the modernity trends and to enable the present to lay down a solid foundation for avoiding any obstacles on the road to the future, as a result of unpredictable circumstances. It is compulsory that, beyond the elements that are relevant for the option for modernity, the country should have access to adequate means to mitigate any barriers on the path to emancipation.

It is beyond any shadow of a doubt that a correction of our path so far toward modernity has in all the four above-mentioned objectives a formula of action in the long term, able to make possible the catching-up of its past gaps and deviations and which would push forward a vehicle fit to keep us on the modernity course in the next multi-secular cycle. In fact, we may consider that the efforts to upgrade and make functional these strategic goals generate the fusion of four transformational forces: energy, comfort, information and security, which with no exaggeration are the materialization of the double essence of the second phase of modernity, the revolution of survival and the revolution of cohabitation. Romania cannot escape these trends without condemning itself to precarity.

The key to this ultimate reinsertion in the longer, durable trends is the quality of the intellectual elites as a reservoir for the economic and political elites. Seen somehow radical, the investment in education is essentially an investment in the fund of our identity resilience, whose characteristics are based on superior training focused on innovation, including societal, organizational and strategic innovation.

The elite's profile should highlight the adoption of an intellectual way of thinking in a world where the rational motivation needs to be able to dismantle the post-truth era (Keyes, 2005). As the knowledge society takes root and broadens, the battle for prestige in the world would inevitably (Dinu, 2010) take place in the field of creativity potential. The reconstruction of the elites is the big and natural manifestation of respect for our ancestors that have excelled in creativity to make, against the tide, the Unification and, later on, the Great Union of Romanians. The outpost of a revival of intellectual elites should ensure that socio-human sciences would help near the transformational phenomena that are estimating our future.

¹ An exceptional study by Ian Morris regarding the conditions for the world's development in millennial terms, based on a model with four large groups of indicators that may be calculated from ancient times to present. See references.

There is a great confusion due to the way internal decision-making factors got activated and how the perspectives of others have been crafted on the perils of our behaviour which was contaminated after WWII by the military occupation and social sovietism as well as of the isolationism in experiments doomed to end up in failure (Dinu, Brateş, 2013). All these had been possible thanks to the external connivance for the Western way of life that was not always defined in moral terms as well as to domestic connivance to deviant loops of the last part of the Century since the Great Union. The trends in the evolution of things had been at loggerheads throughout the whole period, leaving behind many unresolved issues which translated later into irretrievable social costs. The key issue of the present time, which somehow cyclically resurfaced in the last quarter of this century, shows how deliberately legitimate the national strategic options are. This caused the critical mass of the agents of change to feel not enough motivated to act efficiently. It also explains, to a great extent, the precarious state of societal innovation and the national bias toward compliance to externally managed trends. The quality of involvement cannot be tested solely via modernization projects, deriving either from a synchronicity agenda, but via a critical association to supra-national projects.

The issue of behavior, including the links between a past where moral experience was ideologically driven and a present where the life pattern based on moral foundations, is not officially promoted, carries the dimension of a social experiment - most relevant is the waning around of institutions responsible for social security and justice, fueled by a hallucinating substantiation of the a fear to revive our dependency on Eastern projects, creating a genuine platform for reversing social engineering. We have to admit the existence of a certain evolution, imposed by exogenous factors, that would break the balance of the current structuring, of what is essential in the people's life and what is induced so that the perception would follow the avalanche of mere trifles, of accessories. The mediatic hype of the obsession for eventing news, for the exceptional, the radical *breaking news* is catching the eye in shows without any logic or narrative, while the mind is exhausted of energy being pushed into the bow-wows of an emotionally-driven virtual reality. The post-modern social anomy is amplified by the absence of a model able to protect against the contamination, contagion and manipulation aimed at preserving the position achieved on the path of the maturing first modernity, in fact a world where competition is not meant to secure only economic prevalence, but also decisional prevalence over the benefits of the global order (Kissinger, 2014).

Moreover, socio-human sciences, its Romanian servants, should be more vocal in decoding the subtlety of these issues that have chronic consequences and could push the social enthusiasm to resolve and pursue an up-front approach to the challenges of the second modernity. This way we may expect the correct consequences of returning

into the modernity play, and relive sistematically, individually and societally the emotional experience of the Great Union!

References

- Attali, Jacques (2007), *A short history of the future*, Polirom Publishing House.
- Braudel, Fernand (1994), *The Grammar of Civilisations*, Meridiane Publishing House.
- Dinu, Marin (2010), *The Economics of the Dictionary. Epistemic skills exercises*, Economică Publishing House.
- Dinu, Marin, Brateş, Teodor (2013), **The revenge of the past**. *Capitalism over five post-December months*, Economică Publishing House.
- Eyal, Gil, Szelenyi, Ivan, Townsley, Eleanor R. (2001), *Capitalism without capitalists. The new leading elite in Eastern Europe*, Omega Publishing House.
- Friedman, George (2013), *Frontier lands. A Geopolitical trip in Eurasia*, RAO Publishing House.
- Keyes, Ralph (2004), *The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life*.
- Kissinger, Henry (2014), *The global order. Reflections on the specific of the nations and the history course*, RAO Publishing House.
- Morris, Ian (2012), *Why the West still keeps the lead and what history tells us about the future*, Polirom Publishing House.
- Murgescu, Costin (1994), *The economic ideas path for Romanians. The modern era*, Vol I, Vol II, Enciclopedică Publishing House.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2013), *To understand the world. An introduction to the analysis of world systems*, Idea Design & Print Publishing House.