

MIHAIL MANOILESCU

ANALYST OF ROMANIAN INTERWAR BOURGEOISIE

Angela Banciu
Politechnic University

This paper, removing the ideological charge from which the defects and limits of Manoilescu's thinking originates, reveals the great value and contemporaneity of his ideas regarding the analyze of the Romanian bourgeoisie in relation with the European one. Manoilescu's fundamental contribution to elaborate the theory of the bourgeoisie, reflected by the case study of the Romanian bourgeoisie, is accentuated starting with ten large analytical components: the idea of classes, the sociological category of bourgeoisie, the idea of structuring the bourgeoisie in the two distinct levels, the formulation of the social regularity, the accenting of the role and value of the modern institutions, the psychology and life style of the Romanian bourgeoisie, the precision and force of the embodiment of the psychological profiles of the professional bourgeoisie categories. I believe that Manoilescu's analysis, by language force and elegance, remains unique in the specialty literature.

In Romanian modern history, Mihail Manoilescu represents an exceptional politic and culture personality. He was a brilliant engineer, politician and above all an Romanian economist known worldwide and whose work is untouched by anybody until now, through his monumental scientific activity, published all over the world. His bibliography is impressive and contains, according to his followers, 128 papers and many studies and article.¹

Graduating "Bridges and Highways School" in Bucharest as head of the class in 1915, he entered in politics trough an exceptional engineering achievement. "Is right – Manoilescu said – that my specialty would have fated me towards the quiet and unilateral role of technician and leader, but my political side it was more powerful than the time-serving of my career"². The scientific and political interest regarding the elaboration and endorsement of Romanian Constitution from 1932 imposed him as a "great speaker" at the public meetings at the Romanian Social Institute, leaded these days by the great sociologist Dimitrie Gusti³. Having an analytical Anglo-Saxon spirit and a German logic, associated with a Latin soul, he created a paper heaving an European and world impact, and in the same time bringing to those days specialty literature an original Romanian contribution.

I don't intend in this paper, to elucidate some of the defects or limits of Manoilescu's thinking, which in a big proportion belongs to the time spirit. "Time's- Manoilescu's said – change the goods criterions and value hierarchy"⁴. The analysis of Manoilescu's work, show us one of the most complicated theoretic ways of the interwar political culture. His scientific step wears both his clear and logic print of engineer's mind, and the interpreting difficulty that arise from the interlacing of sense and creativity with his ideological options, from one or other period of theoretic structures.

In his good fate, sincerity and also with a profound morality he impress his readers- Manoilesu stated "my life it was a long line of individual consciences and political ethic

problems, which I solved, good or bad, but empirical, after indistinctly inspirations and under imperatives of which I don't know for sure their origin"⁵.

Mihail Manoilescu's theoretical and political trajectory it was one of a disappointed person. Surely this is how a distinguished theorist of Romanian liberalism arrived later to some ideas which predict the right wing totalitarian state. Personal disappointments and the interwar political crisis will generate resentments regarding democracy, raised from his great fear of anarchy, which appears also in many others intellectual souls. At the same time, the difference revealed between the political aspects of modernism promoted by the liberals in the social life and the way of life in rural society creates him profound thoughts concerning bourgeoisies and her role in Romanian interwar society.

The paper called "The Sense and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies" it was published in 1943, after twenty years since the authors has written his last Romanian book, excepting the opening lecture at the Polytechnic University in Bucharest, appeared as "Attempts in the Philosophy of Economic Sciences", in 1938, and the "Lecture of political Economy and Rationalization" published at Polytechnic in 1940.

The paper's great value and present interest, if we eliminate her ideological charge, consist in author's faultless analytical device, destined to identify all the management virtues of the class responsible for the establishment of market capitalist economy⁶, the liberal revolution and promoter, a class economically destroyed, political and physical by the communist force and which came back in a spectacular way, through a real power and an irony of history, in Romania's contemporary life, after the totalitarian system has crashed.

In the conditions given by the existence of free market economy, it raises once more the problem of bourgeoisie birth, her necessity were a strategic option for the historic moment that we live in. The need of support, through institutional mechanism, of bourgeoisie and of pseudo-bourgeoisie professional categories, according to Manoilescu, meaning the middle class, in a contemporary language, is an acute demand of our society development.

Alongside Stefan Zeletin⁷, Mihail Manoilescu give us the most profound and shaded sociological and political analysis to millenary "career" of the bourgeoisie in the XXth century literature, having as a direct expression the reveal of the Romanian bourgeoisie characteristics in proportion with the European one⁸. The author propose, and succeed, to elaborate a scientific book, analyzing and explaining the phenomena's of Romanian present days bourgeoisie "on all her levels of manifestation"⁹. Is- after author's expressions- "an examination of the merits and reductions of the bourgeoisie based on the idea of nation"¹⁰. If Stefan Zeletin was concerned to elucidate the "forces that lift bourgeoisie", Manoilescu tried to uncover the great "standings and constants of bourgeoisie as a organizing class of production"¹¹. Zeletin was concerned in "the immense thirst for power"¹², the monopolization of bourgeoisie, in her increasing stage, Manoilescu instead, revealed the souls and spirituals duties of bourgeoisie, creating a unique socio-psychological analysis of it.

The fundamental contribution of Manoilescu in the social sciences field consist in drawing up the bourgeoisies theory, which was effected as a study on Romanian bourgeoisie¹³. Including all the specialty papers of the era, his analysis are grounded on an impressive bibliography including fields as: History, Sociology, Economy, Politics and Psychology. Exist at least ten ideas which reflect, in my opinion, the main analytical components of bourgeoisie theory through history view, and which I will develop.

First of all, the *idea of class* as social group composed of many families, having a duration, a continuity through filiation and which keeps constant certain social, economic and psychological characteristics. Being a hierarchical and plane social group, the class has an essential element, the possessions or lack of wealth, as well as specific spiritual patrimony which establish his psychic performance. The class social function is correlated with the idea

of power, define through this one's aptitude "to put into strike" and "through the size of evil which the strike can produce to national collectivity"¹⁴.

Secondly, *the sociological category of bourgeoisie*, which he analysis, in historical way, after encyclopedias and authors. He makes extensive references from *The General History of Civilization in Europe* by Francois Guizot¹⁵, *Social Science Encyclopedia* by Karl Brinkman or *Political and Critical Dictionary* by Charles Maures, to the famous papers of Vilfredo Pareto or Werner Sombart.

Pointing out the bourgeoisie spirit, Manoilescu said, that the bourgeoisie nation became at Sombart "more an individual and psychological one rather than a collective and sociological one"¹⁶.

For Manoilescu, bourgeoisie a "social class almost millenary which main tasks is to organize the work and production (first manufacture and then any production) based the possession of her instruments"¹⁷.

The readings scope and, especially, knowing very well the European and World specialty literature of that period helped him to decipher all the functions which belong to the bourgeoisie in society. It had been in a great measure the owner of the means of production, she carried out both her political leadership function for the conservation and development of state¹⁸, and the cultural one. In culture field she has three different roles: produce, deliver and use cultural values, carrying out, in Manoilescu's opinion, in a pre-eminent way this mission, in the middle of the Romanian nation¹⁹. Then he create the idea about the distinction between the nationalist interest and the bourgeoisie one, as an instrument of historical-sociological analyze for the Romanian bourgeoisie, pointing out, in a special way, the importance of the Transylvanian bourgeoisie in reunited Romania.

He found out, with regret, that the beautiful traditions of merchants from Brasov and Fagarasi, and especially those which belongs to the banks, were persecuted, in a systematical way by the liberals. He considers, by rights, that Transylvania, having a thirty peasantry, comparatively with the ones from the Old Kingdom he can build an healthy organic base for so called "superior bourgeoisie economy"²⁰. In Manoilescu's opinion, the Transylvanian bourgeoisie appeared as a volume not yet used by the "virtual and promises" for power's strengthening.

Thirdly we separate the *idea of the bourgeoisie structure on two levels*: a) so called bourgeois, which includes the big manufacturers, the big merchants, bankers, the big rural owners, and b) pseudo- bourgeois or those who practice free trades and which build the legal frame, administrative, technical and cultural necessary for organizing work and production(engineers and economists, magistrates, lawyers, doctors, teachers and the members of the professional, high rank office workers and officers).

Fourthly Manoilescu brings a number of explanations regarding *the trinity: bourgeoisie-capitalism-liberalism*. The three realities and phenomenon's which are combined and inseparables "appeared at distant epochs"²¹. The bourgeoisie has existed since the XIIth century until the end of the XVIth century "without the possibility to speak about the capitalism and less about the liberalism"²². It has developed in the mediaeval environment before the liberal capitalism, which is a XIXth century creation. The economic concept typical for this stage, after Manoilescu, it has been the corporate²³. Starting with the XVIth century, when appeared the first economic and social capitalist manifestations, the bourgeoisies has lived through XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries in the absolutist monarchy environment. Now the enterprising spirit has overtaken the traditional one, giving birth to the capitalist spirit. The specific economic conception for this stage it was the mercantilism.

At the end of the XVIIIth century and the beginning of XIXth century appeared the liberalism based on the free will principles and the non-intervention of the public power in the

economic life. The bourgeoisies had developed in the political environment of the democratic constitutionalism. The specific economic concept for this stage it was "laissez faire", "laissez passer"²⁴.

Showing a synthetic and all-inclusive spirit, the erudite Manoilescu offers us the most beautiful and colored image for the historical evolution of bourgeois, his analysis's can be compared from the scientific view with the present's theories of the modernization and the development. At the same time, being a follower of the neo-liberalism, from 1922-1923, Manoilescu tried to reveal the bourgeoisies mission in the liberalization and democratization field. Later, under the influence of European and Romanian politic events, he will believe that the liberal component is the most processed to times usage.

Fifthly, Mihail Manoilescu brings to Romanian History and Sociology the second series of methodological and theoretical contributions concerning *the social regularity enunciation* of "burning periods" of Romanian society development. That phenomenon's which in West had taken place secular; at us it had taken place for decades. "Our evolution, under socio-economic report has accomplished in less than a century three stages of capitalism"²⁵, the commercial, the industrial and the organized one. In this way, Manoilescu said, "in less than a century, Romania has burnt all the stages of socio-economic evolution in a precipitant course, which can't find a stop or a respite"²⁶.

Sixthly, next to Stefan Zeletin and Eugen Lovinescu²⁷, Mihail Manoilescu stated in a personal manner, with a great analytical depth, *the "axial" part of industry* in society development, this one being "the key of wealth in modern states". Beyond the superiority and economic virtues of industry, it represent for Manoilescu a base of culture and education, starting his ambition "that multiplicity of tehncis and scientific specialties which represent the beauty of modern culture"²⁸. *revealing the role and values of modern institutions*,

Seventhly, Mihail Manoilecu brings a significant contribution in as well as this one's meaning to Romanians. In the analyst conception are instruments for "continuity and social stability, trough which is practiced, in a performing way, the instructive influence of national elite over the people"²⁹, it's institutions forming the people. It work as a magnet – Manoilescu told- destined to attract forever the people higher than their own value"³⁰ producing permanently improvement and refine the customs. Approaching the subtlety of Alexis de Tocqueville³¹ regarding the influence of institutions over conceptions, M. Manoilescu believes that their "great mission" is to influence souls and to create "customs at their height"³². He makes a clear distinction between the general problem of institutions educational values and the particular one for values and opportunities of import institutions in underdeveloped countries. He shares Eugen Lovinescu's opinion regarding the importance of so called European institutions in the process of development at the Romanians. Simultaneously, he consider that is necessary to try to realize an inventory of past institutions to find some gaps in the manner in which our days institutions are created. Approving the convenience of import institutions, he considers that they are "suspected of maladjustment" because presents sometimes a big difference between their exigency and the customs state, the education work becoming, in this way, impossible "because it claims a leap to big for the human nature"³³.

It is clear that the Manoilescu's analysis's about the role and the importance of institutions had been subjugated to sudden modernizations, and through the over wrapping of institutional mechanisms, the conflict between tradition and Europe it had been a constant of Romanian political thinking for over two century, at this moment, freeing us from Europe obsession, we can peacefully watch the continuity of our institutions and culture, acting for their good performance. And in this step, Manoilescu's ideas can be better known and well used.

Ninthly, we think that M. Manoilescu, through his excellent capacity for synthesis, has captured the best *the psychology and the way of life of Romanian bourgeoisies*. In the interwar period, many historians, sociologists, philosophers, men of letters had tried to point out the specific features of Romanian bourgeoisies, comparative with the European one (as for example N. Iorga, D. Draghinescu, St. Zeletescu, C. Radulescu-Motru)³⁴. Manoilescu offers us, the most extensive, systematic and original analysis of capitalist spirit at Romanians. His ideas keep the comparison force in report with the European bourgeoisies and with the Romanian bourgeoisies after December 1989, not enough clean-cut, structured and put-together in Romania, and being for over a decade and a half in transition's "cyclone" toward the market economy.

Mihail Manoilescu, according to the time's elite intellectuals, thinks that "our spirit is far away from representing a bent for capitalism. Our nature makes us sooner anticapitalist", because "the Romanian doesn't have through predestination bourgeoisies virtues"³⁵.

If Werner Sombart or Max Weber³⁶ had appreciated the fact that exist, both nations with capitalist spirit and others opposed to this one, Manoilescu consider that nations, as individuals, are divided in mercantile and heroics, and Romanians "found their place sooner between heroic nations rather than the mercantile one"³⁷. Romanians, are related with Tracs, Latin and Slavs, they don't have ethnic bent for the capitalism and, also, in the same time is a nation of shepherds and farmers, the environment doesn't favored their capitalist habits. When our peasant "has money"-Manoilescu said- convert them into heavy gold necklaces collected at girls necks, and he doesn't invest or speculate them"³⁸. Romanian's business doctrine is anticapitalist, because his life principle is concordant with a popular saying, which the analyst invoke it, "better with a clever man losing than a fool wining"³⁹. "He doesn't indicate a materialist conception about life, but a esthetic one"⁴⁰; the joy of being together with a clever man means for the Romanian more then the satisfaction of wining. Also, the spirit of the first step is missing at Romanians. The peasant from the village waits everything from the sky, and at town the sky's mystic, Manoilescu said, it finds his collective in the state mystic"⁴¹.

If bourgeois conception is based on quantity, he always wanted to grow his gain, the Romanian has a conception based on quality, even if his ideals aren't the most high. On the bottom of his soul, Manoilescu observed, "Romanian despite money even if he has it and mostly if he doesn't has it"⁴², the generosity and the prodigality it has no affinity with the sum of his incomes. If in West the social uncomplaining ness pressures as a real social "terror", this is not to strict for Romanians. Also, the bloke doesn't always acquire forms which can favor the development of bourgeoisies activities. Manoilescu thinks that, beyond their organic matrix, Romanians had formed, with difficulty, some features specific to bourgeoisies.

In this context, unlike Constantin Radulescu-Motru, which has found as a unique characteristic for the Romanian individualism the egoism, and because of this he can't be a creator of institutions"⁴³, Mihail Manoilescu has appreciated the way in which the Romanians have built institutions after the West example and he points out with pithiness these one's role in the process of creation habits and the virtues utilitarian bourgeoisies, as for example: probity, exactity, seriousness and strictness. These, although off-grade on the scaled of ethical values, represents an essential component of bourgeois spirit. As well as Stefan Zeleitin, he believes in the "spiritual revolution" of Romanian nation, which has to completed his economic evolution, commented upon, but, with humor the fact that is not written in the sky's that a nation has to go over the "machine that deforms souls of bourgeois"⁴⁴.

It seems to be extremely ingenious from the Historical view, the construction of Romanian bourgeoisies, realized by Manoilescu, on the scaled of the two categories of values: the egoist values of the Romanian bourgeoisies are: the rank, the comfort and the security.

“the characteristic of Romanian bourgeoisies – Manoilescu said- is that she values more the rank rather than the fortune” and “ the rush for fortune is just the way to obtain social ranks”⁴⁵. Always ready to scarify anything for the rank, “ Romanian bourgeois doesn't love the rank in order to make a distinction between he and the other peoples, but just for being appreciated, considered and enviable ”⁴⁶.

The boyar's vanity of the rank it has been illustrated, as we know, often in the Romanian pre and interwar literature. But nobody, until Manoilescu, had composed an actual social-psychological theory of Romanian classes. It is analyzed from the existence view of the three scalds which compose it: the political scald, the intellectual and the fortune one.” Any Romanian – Manoilescu said- wants to be first minister, then a famous professor and, only at the end, a wealthy man”⁴⁷. It is, obvious, an ambition contrary to the wishes of the West bourgeoisies.

If the priority of the intellectualist criterion and the respect for the values represents a beautiful characteristic of the interwar Romanian society, at this moment of the development of Romanian society these seems to have lost their meaning. But it remained, completely valid Manoilescu's finding which said that “the aspiration to power creates crooks” as the “aspiration to intellectual ranking creates intellectual crooks”⁴⁸.

Regarding the second selfish value, the comfort or fortune, Mihail Manoilescu makes a finding which become an axiom in Romania after 1989: the facility with which the bourgeois spends money, because, “is more profitable” to be wasteful than thrifty, “ the debtor - Manoilescu said- like we stand before many modern crooks- has joys and pleasant surprises, that the creditor never has”⁴⁹. He appreciate that “Romanian bourgeoisies is not bourgeoisies in one of the essential features; when the West put price on savings, safety and future, our bourgeoisies put price on spending, satisfaction and present”⁵⁰.

The third component of bourgeois selfishness the security, achieved trough fortune and rent , had vanished from the physiognomy of bourgeois spirit. The opinion of the pre-eminent analyst prefatorily the bumble Dom of some contemporary social processes according to which“ through the system of fix salary and social security, the whole society goes into a pensionary regim”⁵¹.

Hierarchical, the selfish values of Romanian structures tested by M. Manoilescu, just like exact science, are opposed to the Western one's, giving Romanian bourgeoisies an *sui generis* character, and it is in a great measure towards a “bohemian lifestyle”. Specific in the West just to artists, at us it becomes a characteristic of bourgeoisies which is, according to Manoilescu who plastic concludes “a bohemian trapped in a cage”⁵².

The second category specific to the Romanian bourgeoisies, the ideal ones, are in Manoilescu's opinion in decreasing order, three: family, country and religion. His remarkable qualities as a sociologist and psychologist give him the power to astound the elements which gives the quintessence both to bourgeois family, and pseudo-bourgeoisies. He distinguish the profound feature of Romanian bourgeois, the aspiration to have” a family house in his property”⁵³, because nowhere “our home” is better showed then at Romanians. Mysterious creature in his abstraction, but “alive in presence and permanent warm is the home”. This one, as Manoilescu said, far from being ridicule, in family crises moments is capable of keeping what “affection for the deficient moment can't hold”⁵⁴. If for the nobles the children represent the permanence of the name and the prolongation in future, of family, and for the peasant usage and support, for the bourgeoisies is all of that put together, but especially a goal “towards who the parents are lowering- trough their preoccupations and the continuous sacrifice- at the level of instruments”⁵⁵. He reveals the difference between bourgeoisies and middle class, regarding raising childrens. Trough education middle class imprint in childrens

a serious and grave value of life while, the bourgeoisies let them to see life through what she offers, "then to what they have the right to pretend"⁵⁶.

The second category of ideal values is represented by the country. In Manoilescu's opinion the Romanian bourgeoisies has more conscience and lucidity than the others social classes, she has the role and responsibility to be a evaluator and a leader on the patriotism line, the war for reuniting illustrates clearly this fact.

The third ideal entity, on the bourgeoisies values scale, is religion. If the Western theorists, as Max Weber or Werner Sombart, had given a great importance to the religion on the forming process and bourgeoisies evaluation, Mihai Manoilescu demonstrates, with interesting arguments, why religion, at Romanians doesn't have any kind of connotation or connections with the capitalism.

Romanian bourgeois is missing religious education, priest failing to be "advisors in conscience cases, or arbitrators in families intimate dramas"⁵⁷. The religion of the Romanian bourgeois is just a "Sunday religion". She is, both in shape and content, far from the mystic veil specific to the West, which has generated, often, a religion spirit extremely powerful or even fanatic. In religion field, Romanians don't have a considerable soul component. Their religious feeling has the origin in the respect for the ancestors, the Romanian frequently talk about "our parents God". For us the religion – Manoilescu said- means "poetry, romanticism, picturesque ness; is a recollection of home, a monastery verandah, a Resurrection night with burning candles who flaringly spreads on villages roads"⁵⁸.

In conclusion, the last original contribution of Manoilescu, which I intend to reveal in front of you, is the precision and strength of expression through which he made *psychological portraits of bourgeoisies and pseudo- bourgeoisies professional categories*, and which are a unique reference point in the analyses of this interwar class. Engineering mind, Mihail Manoilescu has an amazing ability to organize and systematize the material, extracting conclusions of great strength and expressions which help us to understand the similarity and differences, as well the part in society of great manufacturers, tradesmen's, bankers, farmers, engineers, economists, lawyers, magistrates, doctors, members of the professional, high ranked office workers and officers. Their whole gallery, as well as the whole ensemble coherent structured of his ideas regarding Romanian bourgeoisies imprinted, deep, in the mind and heart of his work researcher. We will stop only upon engineers and members of the professional, trying to sketch some ideas typical to Manoilescu.

The origin and profession of engineers have a "roughness and strictness" which made their servants "many times misunderstood and inaccessible"⁵⁹. "Engineers- says Manoilescu- are not round and plastics, but linear and with hard edges"⁶⁰. They are, according to Manoilescu, superior to many professions because "the relation between what they give to Romanian collectivity and what they pretend from it works in their moral advantage"⁶¹. He reproach to engineers the fact that "they are overconfident in man's will and power", forgetting that the society is not so easy to model as iron or steel and from here some deception in their economic actions and especially socials. He also reproach, the wrong way in which they hierarchy their concerns: the technical, the economic and last the social. At engineers the technique always came first because long studies- Manoilescu said- "absorbing and severe" have generated a real obsession for it. He is convinced that "this descending hierarchy scale: the technique, the economic and the social with her correlation: efficiency, benefit, productivity will be inverted someday" and this will mean the greatest revolution "not only in engineers spirit" but in the functioning of Romanian society itself. He consider the culture of Romanian engineers of social science, conducted in the direction in which our elite is more deficient, she is more complex then it first seems because engineers are recruited among the best graduates of country high schools. Admires them for the soul probity which

they show, calling it "rectitude", being explained through the technical profession and the influence of high school education, because nowhere the respect for truth, says Manoilescu, "isn't more imperative than in technique"⁶². The engineers, as the analyst graphically noticed, "hate doubts, nebulousness, half-darks" and see life clearly "as a draw on a drawing board, draw in precise lines"⁶³. Creating the synthetic portrait of his own profession, he visionary concludes: engineers "are in this world most genuine ambassadors of tomorrow society"⁶⁴.

With the same precession and shade he analyze the members of the professional which, according to Manoilescu, they make an electrical world "not only as cultural specialties but also as spirituality, life conceptions and spiritual values"⁶⁵. He divided the members of the professional into two distinct soul category: "the one's that consider University and science as a goal and those who consider them as a way. The first are members of the professional by vocation; they create the University. The second category is represented by members of the professional by interest; they are created by the University"⁶⁶. For members of the professional by vocation science "is their possession and the desk their life"⁶⁷, they are forming "the elite of our elite". The category of members of the professional by interest is considered to be the most hateful, because from "all shapes of social up start the university one is the most horridly"⁶⁸. Manoilescu explains trenchant the birth of up starting, considering that members of the professional by interest "have never know the passion of thinking and working under the impulse unrestrained by the truth", breaking, in the unique opinion of this great erudite, "the eleventh command it hasn't been written: never take science name in vane"⁶⁹.

Analyzing, from historic perspective, the importance and meaning of his work. I believe that forgetting Manoilescu means to do what the communist partied has done, imprisoning him spiritually for the third time⁷⁰, by ignoring or libeling his ideas. For him the communists have tried to destroy his identity by burying him in a secret place, there is an answer of history which put in the right place the activity and people's destiny. She claims, with tolerance, to restore his honor and scientific merits, beyond the painful wander which Romanian and European interwar political labyrinth have seed it in the souls of many moral and elite intellectuals of the country, among which is, not least, Mihail Manoilescu⁷¹.

This paper, removing the ideological charging from which the defects and limits of Manoilescu's thinking originate from, reveals the great value and modernity of his ideas concerning the analyze of the Romanian bourgeoisie in relation with the European one. Manoilescu's fundamental contribution to elaborate the theory of the bourgeoisie, reflected by the case study of the Romanian bourgeoisie, is evidenced starting with ten great analytical components: the idea of classes, the sociological category of bourgeoisie, the idea of structuring the bourgeoisie in the two distinct levels, the formulation of the social regularity, the accenting of the role and value of the modern institutions, the psychology and life style of the Romanian bourgeoisie, the precision and force of the embodiment of the psychological profiles of the professional bourgeoisie categories.

I believe that Manoilescu's analysis, by language force and beauty, remains unique in the specialty literature.

¹ See Valeriu Dinu annexes at the *Fortele nationale productive si comertul exterior – Teoria protectionismului si a schimbului international*, Editura Stiintifica si Enciclopedica, Bucharest, 1986. Between 1922-1926 he published 18 scientific papers from wich we remind: *Taranism si democratie*, 1922; *Neoliberalismul*, 1923; *politica productiei nationale*, Ed. Cultura Nationala, 1924; *Cum putem reinvia leul de aur?*, Ed. Cultura Nationala, 1923 etc. He published in France in *Revue de Science Morales et Politiques*, *Annales des Finances*, *Revue d'economie politique*, *Les Annal Economiques*, *Annee Politique Francaise et Etrangere*. in Italy *Revista Bancaria*, *Revista Industria Lombarda*, in Germany *Wirtschaftliches Archiv*, *Europaische Revue* in Belgium

Goemaere, in Austria in *Panurope*. Between 1930-1937 he publish the volumes: *Le siècle du corporatisme*, Paris, Alcan, 1934 (376p); *Le parti unique*, Paris, 1937 (250p); *Încercări în filosofia științelor economice*, Monitorul Oficial, 1938 (245p); *Curs de economie politică și raționalizare*, Editura Politehnică, 1940 (446p); *Europa sud-estică în marele spațiu economic european*, 1942. The paper *Forțele naționale productive și comerțul exterior. Teoria protecționismului și a schimbului internațional* was published in Italian, English, Portuguese (1931) and German (1937), as well as *Partidul unic* in Spanish (1938), Romanian (1940) and German (1941). Has hold conferences both in country and abroad. he imposed himself as a great speaker at the debates from the Romanian Social Institute, lead by Dimitrie Gusti. He participated, in 1929, at Paris, to the conferences from the Geography Society and at the International Commerce Chamber, at Geneva, in 1930, at the economic international conference, at Budaphest, in march 1932, at *Conferința danubiană a Uniunii Paneuropene*, at Innsbruck, in Austria, in 1932, at the International Commerce Chamber *Conferința*, at Basel, in Switzerland, in 1932, at the *pan European Congres* etc. (see Valeriu Dinu preface, Mihail Manoilescu, *Memorii*, I, Bucharest, Edited at Enciclopedică, 1993, 9-12).

² *Ibidem*, 9.

³ See *The New Romanian Constitution* (23 de public organized at Romanian Social Institute), Bucharest, Cultural National, f.a.; Mihail Manoilescu, *Neoliberalism*, in *Political Doctrines* (19 political takings organized at the Romanian Social Institut), Bucharest , National Culture , 1923.

⁴ Mihail Manoilescu, *Memories* , I, ed. cit., 17.

⁵ *Ibidem*

⁶ *Ibidem*

⁷ See Ștefan Zeletin, *Romanian bourgeoisies, role and origins history*, Bucharest, 1925; *Neoliberalism, study regarding Romanian' s bourgeoisies*. Bucharest, Ed. Pagini agrare agrar, 1927.

⁸ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sense and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, Ed. Cugetarea – Georges Delafra, 1943.

⁹ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sense and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, critical study by Dan Pavel, edition cared by Leonard Oprea, Ed. Athena, 1997, 60.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, 63.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, 64.

¹² *Ibidem*

¹³ See *Romanian Sociologists, Little encyclopedia* (Coord. by Ștefan Costea), Bucharest: Edited by Expert, 2001. 295-299.

¹⁴ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sense and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, ed. 1997, 83.

¹⁵ See Francois Guizot, *The Civilization History in Europe. From the Fall of Roman Empire to the French Revolution*, Concept Foundation, Edit. Humanitas, 2000.

¹⁶ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sense and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 93.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 98.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 263.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, 299.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, 147.

²¹ *Ibidem*, 94.

²² *Ibidem*, 95.

²³ The beginning of Historical series of corporate can be seen from theoretical point of view Ch. Fourier, in France, Th. Diamant and I. H. Rădulescu in Romania, following as a significant theoretic step to be told by Mihail Eminescu, in 1880, and by Emil Durkheim, in France, with his famous paper *De la division du travail social* (1885). Then the series contains the Italian fascist doctrines and then pure corporatism of Mihail Manoilescu (Ilie Bădescu, *Romanian political ideas. Doctrines and theories*, Bucharest: Edited by Mica Valahie, 2003, 174, see chapters, *The Corporatist Idea – I, II, III*, *ibidem*, 173-210).

²⁴ See chapter "Bourgeoisies, Liberalism, Capitalism", in *The Role and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, Ed. cit., 94-123.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 126.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Ștefan Zeletin, *Romanian Bourgeoisies, Origins and her Historical Role*, Bucharest, 1925 and Eugen Lovinescu, *The Romanian Modern Civilization*, edition, introductive study and notes by Z. Ornea, Bucharest: Științifică Edition, Bucharest, 1972.

²⁸ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sence and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 191.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, 274.

³⁰ *Ibidem*

³¹ See Alexis de Tocqueville, *About Democracy in America*, vol. I and II, Bucharest, Edit. by Humanitas, 1995.

³² Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sence and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 273.

³³ *Ibidem*, 275.

³⁴ See, in this way, Dimitrie Drăghicescu, *From the Psychology of Romanian Nation*, Bucharest, Ed. Albatros, 1995; Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, *The Romanian culture and politicianism*, in vol. *The energetic personalism and other writings*, Bucharest, Ed. Eminescu, 1994; Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, *the Romanian Nation psychology*, in vol. *Romanian Encyclopedia*, vol. VII, The National Printing, 1938; Ștefan Zeletin, *The Romanian Bourgeoisies, Her role and historical origins*, 1925

³⁵ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Sence and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 366.

³⁶ See Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and Capitalist Spirit*, Edited by Humanitas, Bucharest, 1993.

³⁷ Mihail Manoilescu, *The and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 367.

³⁸ *Ibidem*.

³⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, 367-368

⁴² *Ibidem*, 368.

⁴³ Constantin Rădulescu-Motru, , *From the Psychology of Romanian Nation* ,op. cit., 163.

⁴⁴ Mihail Manoilescu, *The Role and the Destiny of Romanian Bourgeoisies*, 370.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, 372.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, 371

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, 373.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, 375

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, 376

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, 377

⁵² *Ibidem*.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, 379

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, 380

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, 379.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 388

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, 493

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

⁶² *Ibidem*, 496.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, 495

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, 496.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, 503

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, 504.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁰ Mihail Manoilescu had been arrested twice. In October 12th 1944 and deliberated in December 1945 and then in December 19th 1948, ending in prison in 1950.

⁷¹ The paper had been presented at the Scientific Symposium dedicated to Mihail Manoilescu from December 2005, at the Polytechnic in Bucharest.