

Gheorghe Tașcă. Romanian Capitalism and Cooperation -Past and Present-

Otilia MANTA, PhD

Romanian Academy

"Victor Slăvescu" Center of Financial And Monetary Research, Bucharest, Romania

otilia.manta@rgic.ro

ABSTRACT: Personality of the period 1907-1951, born on January 30, 1875 and deceased under severe conditions on 12 March 1951 in the prison in Sighet, Maramureş County. A law graduate in 1899 with the work entitled "On the evolution of rural property in Romania", he began practicing in the lawyers' bar in Ilfov County, as well as his collaboration with the political economy teacher Nicolae Basilescu. After several years of practicing lawyer he decides to pursue doctoral studies in law in Paris and in 1907 he holds the thesis "La question agraire. Commentaire critique de la législation rurale en Roumanie, Angleterre, Irlande, Allemagne" (Tașcă 1926, 4). Upon returning to the country, he earned the lecturer's lecture at the Department of Political Economy of the Faculty of Law. Motivated by the fact that a law doctor does not entitle him to teach economics and determined by this reasoning, Gheorghe Tașcă returns to Paris to attend the doctoral school in economics, and in 1910 he holds the thesis "Les nouvelles réformes agraires en Roumanie" Doctor of Economics. In 1925 he was elected and became a correspondent member of the Romanian Academy. The term political economy in Gheorghe Tașcă's concept covers the whole spectrum of economic sciences: "The political economy deals with the research of the norms by which goods that are necessary for the satisfaction of human needs are produced, circulated and distributed." Involved in the economic scientific and political life, Gheorghe Tașcă had a particularly active activity especially in the development of the cooperative system. This research paper is an improved and updated English version of a study presented at the *International Conference "Agriculture and Rural Development in a Regional Perspective,"* 2016, Bucharest, Romania, organized by the Institute of Agrarian Economy of the Romanian Academy.

KEYWORDS: Romanian capitalism, co-operation and social inclusion

JEL Classification: G41, P13 and Q13

Introduction

Through the conference "*Romanian Capitalism and Cooperation*" held by Professor G. Tașcă at the Amphitheater of the Carol I Foundation, it brings to the fore all the elements related to the legislation and functionality "of the credit, consumption and production co-operation in Romania", and which continues to confirm the functioning model of the integrated cooperative system with a direct orientation towards meeting the needs of peasant households in Romania (at present, the structure of agricultural holdings in Romania, according to the census of the National Institute of Statistics is almost identical to from 1921, ie about 2.5 million peasant farms subject to the current phenomenon of economic, social and financial inclusion). In the aforementioned conference, G. Tașcă recalls some of the successful examples of cooperatives in the world, starting with December 21, 1844, when the Society of Equitable Pioneers (G.J. Holyoake, Isa Nicolson, Catherine Webb) was founded in Rochdale, presenting credit

copiers Schultze-Delitzsch and Raiffeisen (Franz Standinger "Dei Konsumgenossenschaft, Leipzig, 1908), continuing with the presentation of the Danish agricultural cooperatives, models that influenced at that time the decades to create the Romanian integrated cooperative model, as well as a very serious cooperative literature and very instructive.

Research methodology

In order to base the research methodology on the project, we used classical observation and examination instruments, research methods based on the basic principles of scientific research, respectively: "competence, objectivity, truth, methodical, demonstration, correlation, evaluation of results, utility and psychomorphism" (Ristea and Franc 2013). We used procedures based on factual analysis, intensive documentation at the level of internal and international literature, using the databases and the scientific material existing in the endowment of libraries of specific institutes in Romania and internationally.

The methodology of the paper has as direct instruments the collection of data and information from the literature and from the existing practice in public and private institutions, but especially scientific articles published on specialized research networks (ResearchGate, Academia.edu, etc.), articles published in various journals, relevant books in the field of reference, legislation, analyses and studies, official documents of various tax bodies, tax documents and interactive database of the National Bank of Romania, other relevant sources identified in the libraries: CCFM, Academia Romanian, INCE, IEN, BNR, National Library, INS, etc. Moreover, we analysed the documents using the comparative, analytical, descriptive method, the no participative and participatory observation, and the use of a set of informational sources, the collection of financial data in the established databases.

The information support of the research was provided by the monographs, books, scientific articles, materials of the scientific conferences, the balance sheets of SMEs during 2008-2017, as well as other materials, which are presented in the scientific papers and publications displayed on the official pages of the national and international research institutes, international financial institutions (research centres), etc.

Research results

The idea that Professor G. Tașca vigorously advocates at the conference is "*the idea of associating the forces for solving social problems*" (Tașcă 1926, 3), which is now confirmed in the work of the UN General Assembly and the Fourth P at global level: people, planet resources, prosperity and peace, all of which are sustained by solving social problems through sustainable associative forms. Preserving the institution of capital both in the interwar period and nowadays we do not do it as Professor Tașcă mentions "*for the sake of a tradition*" (Tașcă 1926, 3), but because it is a social and useful necessity for the society as a whole of its needs.

At the conference, the attention that in 1924, in a presentation he had at the Social Institute, mentions relevant aspects of the restoration of Europe "can not be done as long as we do not put this restoration on something new for the workers: Optimism we would only be circumstantial and full of superficiality if we were not placed on social justice. Work has so far been dressed and obeyed. This is not her role. Capital is past work, dead work, crystallized in things. This past work has led, for a century, the living work, the present work. It is unimportant work to be done to work. Work is to be subjected to labor, not labor. But this curious thing lasted throughout the 19th century.

This paradoxical fact is due only to the fact that man was still soaked with old and medieval ideas about work. The twentieth century raised the work to its due. Work is no longer the curse thrown by the God of Man to earn his bread in the sweat of his forehead. Work is the good word that raises man to the height of the creator "Financial Situation, in vol. Foreign Policy of Romania p. 125 (Taşcă G. 1926, 4).

I must admit that these above-mentioned aspects are found to be extremely current in the current context of social inclusion at European level, and Professor Taşcă is even more surprised at his lecture on social issues, the issues of greed of capitalism, the slave-level individual at the level of the leader, the emancipation of labor, the creation of capital-free societies, aspects of the correct division of goods that contribute to "a whole economic order, a whole social order and threaten a whole civilization" (Taşcă 1926, 4).

In the interwar period, joint stock companies are increasingly developing into a common production mode of capitalist society. In these societies, ownership is no longer individual but collective (Rotaru 2009, 5-17). Private property is becoming more and more abstract, the whole property is summed up as it is nowadays according to Updated Law 31/1990, only in the form of a legal title, an action, and most of the times as it was in the interwar period "*the master of action does not even know the thing whose property he is*" (Taşcă 1926, 4). As production was developed in association (collectively) and property became a society.

In pure socialist doctrine, Professor Taşcă points out that "*closeness*" can not become collective except in the situation where production would become collective, but if production was collective, it would not become social. Often, "collectivists" made and abused words when they derived socialist society from the cooperative production system, they generalize and say that collectivization replaced the individual in production, and at that time society was taken as a synonym for the collectivity. The property thus harmonizes on the basis of capitalism to the current form of production adapted to new modern concepts. Fourier has foreseen this development since the early 19th century and has shown, with an admirable predictable power, that the future social organization of the world will be cooperative.

In capitalist production, the association has a determining role. Producers unite their forces, stop believing in their own forces, but in the role of the associative force, which supports the joint place of production, assured outfits, facilities for purchasing inputs and production financing instruments, price formation and knowledge mechanisms and the rules for fixing them, the necessary guarantee for accessing the credits necessary for the optimal development of the activities at the level of the association. They are only part of the facilities of association as seen in the interwar period and are still confirmed.

This explains the enthusiasm with which the great economists of the interwar period received the cooperative movement. In the current context, where about 500 million family farms provide more than 50% of the nutrition needed by the Globe population, we need to reconsider the concepts of inter-war cooperatives and adapt them to our current needs by jointly optimizing Earth resources in supporting global food safety and security (Bălan and Vasile 2010, 177–188).

Another aspect mentioned was that through the vision of Professor Taşcă, capitalist society as now seeks to maximize benefits, seeking to sell the product at the highest price it would be able to obtain. However, this can have a detrimental impact on the consumer. The competition law that had a direct impact on cost reduction, protect the consumer from exploiting capitalist output, was removed by monopolistic cartels. At the time when consumers joined in associative forms, the capitalist threat disappeared. Also, capitalism pursuing the maximum benefit, asked the worker the maximum work

and paid the minimum wage. As Professor Tașcă mentioned, he “*made the capitalist throughout the nineteenth century*” (Tașcă 1926, 6).

The most affected in the capitalist production in the state of inferiority were the craftsmen, the small industrialists from the cities and the agricultural producers in the country, who were surprised without organizing, without information about the place of sale, etc.

The messages posed by Professor Tașcă are confirmed and at present "we have to make people understand that a poor man joins a weak man, do not make two weak people but a physical force; that a poor man joining a poor man does not make two needy people, but a financial force" (Tașcă 1926, 6).

Given that there were many ideological changes related to state intervention at that time, something new was needed, and then the concept of "*Capitalless capitalist societies*" emerged.

In the economic thinking of Professor Tașcă, the cooperative society is "an economic movement whose purpose is to organize a production system in which the capitalist structure and the individual property are kept to achieve a better and equitable sharing of goods" (Tașcă 1926, 416).

In the interwar period, as in the present, there have been more currents in this area. Thus, at the conference held at the Social Institute on February 7, 1926, D. Zeletin stated: "the cooperative aims at the abolition of capitalism and thus the elimination of the conflict between capital and labor" (Tașcă 1926, 416).

"We believe, according to Mr. Vandervelde, that the best way to conceive, in a tangible and concrete way, the mode of socialist production is to assume, according to the model of Belgian societies, for example, a gigantic cooperative with the right associate all citizens of a country, possessing as a social property all the productive equipment of all major industries and in which all members, manufacturers and consumers would choose their managers and produce all the utilities needed to meet their needs" (Tașcă 1926, 417).

Kautsky affirms his image of socialism "What a picture we can make of the social republic of the future, such as those of an immense consumer cooperative, but which would at the same time be a cooperative of production" (Tașcă 1926, 417).

Starting from these ideologues and corroborating with today's situation, as Professor Tașcă shared with us, and Professor Fourier about organizing future societies, we can say that private economic activity in the future will be governed by social power, as was our society at that time and how today is the structure of the population excluded from the financial point of view (about 5.5 million people), the cooperative (associative) society, being one of the solutions for the many and the poor. At that time, Prof. Zeletin said that "*our popular banks are capitalist associations, not workers who would struggle to abolish capital interests*" (Tașcă 1926, 414-415). This conclusion is also generated by the statistical situation at that time, respectively, in 1923, there were 876,000 members in the cooperative associations, and among them about 234,000 members own $\frac{3}{4}$ of the total value of the social capital.

The transition from the destructive capital to this period to the constructive one took place at the time of the establishment of the Land loan. The elements that in the interwar period defined the attributes of establishing a cooperative, namely to establish a cooperative and be successful with it, requires "*courage, energy, initiative spirit, will power, great love of people. Those who devote themselves to cooperative ideas must be true heroes and they must have both bodily and soul health. The cooperative can be based on poverty, but it can not rely on material and moral misery. On poverty can be supported the associated work, the cooperative; of misery deals with mutual assistance*" (Tașcă 1926, 14-15).

All the above-mentioned aspects are reconfirmed in the profile of the possible initiator of a cooperative association nowadays, and more so as the illustrious Teacher of Difference between misery and poverty, which although very close to judging by quantity, maintains the same abyss can not be passed. For this reason, it can be said that a cooperative can not be born in the midst of a misery (the miserable lives in the midst of misery), but it is born on the energy of the poor and thrives under that impulse of poverty. Co-operation can not be born in the midst of the rich, but it is based on moral and intellectual energy, through the power of labor, the dedicated will of the members, the love of people of all the most representative in the local community. The model was, and then is, the cooperative must include the landlord or the entrepreneur and worker, priest and mayor, teacher and small craftsman, and the objective of co-operation remains to solve local problems with local resources adapted to local realities. As Professor Tașcă said, "the cooperative is not only an economic movement but also a moral movement" (Tașcă 1926, 15) and "the cooperative is an association of energies and wills not one of beggars" (Tașcă 1926, 16).

In Romania, the cooperative movement was the first upward movement, and all those involved in the Spiru Haret settlement process and until the time of the conference held in 1926 by Professor Tașcă, the State representatives did not seek to impose, but more to listen to the wishes of the co-operative initiators involved mainly by their social determination.

On a global scale, we are increasingly witnessing the formation of these forms of cooperative association aimed at social, economic and financial inclusion of those in need and the poor.

Between 1919 and 1924, the Romanian co-operation progressed, namely both the number of members and the number of consumer cooperatives, namely:

Table no. 1: Situation of consumer cooperatives 1919-1924

Companies	Members	Shed capital	Net benefit
2.593	236.713	89.747.033	22.340.775

Source: Prof. G. Tașcă, *Romanian Capitalism and Co-operation*, Conference held by Prof. G. Tașcă on 31 January 1926, 11 am In the Amphitheater of the Carol I Foundation, p. 21 and Prof. G. Tașcă, *Economic and Financial Issues*, Edited by A. TH. DOICESCU, Bucharest, 1927, p. 434

According to weather statistics, on December 31, 1924, "out of the 843 companies founded over 19 years of existence, there were 468 cooperatives with 57-646 members, with nearly 79 million capital out of which 52 million paid out, with 21 million benefits during 1923." (Tașcă 1926, 434).

Professor Tașcă in the paper "Economic and Financial Issues" shares some of the measures we should take regarding the setting up of rural associations and which I believe is being reconfirmed today for small farmers in local communities, namely: "it is safe that the reorganization of agricultural production can not be done only by the State. But it is also so certain that no private initiative alone can achieve any result. The opera is so great and so heavy that only by joining individual efforts with those of the State we can reach an appreciable result.

The state must help set up agricultural unions. These unions or agricultural associations will be set up in the communes. All growers in the commune, whether small or large, will have to be part of them. The big owners will have to be at the head of the trade union movement. There is nothing more erroneous than the idea that our great owners do about property. This misconception led them to pass into the latter

times in great difficulties. Big and small landlords should not leave the idea of a property right. The owner does not have the right to dispose of his property, but has the obligation to give the Company the largest quantity of goods; on this obligation and on the belief that only the owner is in a position to give to the Society a large quantity of goods, the right of the owner to exercise that social function is forgiven. The owner must therefore do everything in its power to increase productivity. However, productivity gains can only be brought about by uniting farmers and the large owner must work for the formation of these associations." (Tașcă 1926, 440-441).

Moving from the way of thinking of Professor Trașcă, we come back to the aspects reflected in the current legal regulations, namely recently Law no. 164/2016 amending and supplementing the Law on Agricultural Cooperation no. 566/2004, as well as for the establishment of measures for its implementation. The law in question establishes the legal framework for the organization and functioning of the agricultural cooperative, the agricultural cooperative being an autonomous association of natural and / or legal persons, as the case may be, a private legal person constituted on the basis of the free consent expressed by the parties, operates according to the provisions of this law. Thus, the agricultural cooperative is an autonomous association with an unlimited number of members, with variable capital, exercising an economic, technical and social activity in the private interest of its members.

With the advanced proposals, the definition of agricultural cooperatives of 1st degree includes natural persons, authorized natural persons, being introduced here, for clarification, the individual enterprises and the family enterprises defined according to O.U.G. no. 44/2008, provided that the basic regulation concerns the conduct of economic activities by authorized natural persons, individual enterprises and family enterprises, as subsequently amended and supplemented. Agricultural cooperatives of second degree are, in the new vision, legal entities constituted from natural persons, authorized individuals, and individual enterprises and family enterprises defined according to O.U.G. no. 44/2008 and legal persons, as the case may be, for the purpose of the horizontal and vertical integration of the economic activity carried out by them and authorized in accordance with the provisions of Law no. 566/2004 (www.legestart.ro, accessed 24.02.2019).

According to Art. 6, the agricultural cooperative includes cooperatives, legal entities by fields and branches of activity, such as: a) agricultural cooperatives of services, which provide cooperative services for small producers; b) agricultural cooperatives for purchases and sales, which organize both purchases of materials and technical means necessary for agricultural production, as well as sales of agricultural products; c) agricultural cooperatives for processing of agricultural products, which provide typical, branded products with permanent presence; d) agricultural and small-scale agricultural cooperatives; e) agricultural cooperatives for the exploitation and management of agricultural, forestry, fishery and livestock plots; f) agricultural cooperatives for financing, mutual assistance and agricultural insurance; g) agricultural cooperatives of the aforementioned types and of other types which will be constituted in compliance with the provisions of the present law.

The agricultural cooperative carries on commercial activities, producing goods and services in agriculture, pursuing for this purpose:

- a) ensuring the conditions for obtaining the economic advantages by all cooperating members;
- b) ensuring the requirements of the cooperating members in supplying with the necessary means for the agricultural production;
- c) the acquisition of agricultural, vegetable, animal and fishery goods, according to market standards;

d) creation of conditions for the processing of agricultural products of vegetal, animal and fish origin, obtaining of finished products for the quality of market and consumption standards;

e) valorisation of the produced production;

f) economic and social development of rural space.

Agricultural cooperatives are based on the following cooperative principles:

a) the principle of voluntary and open association;

b) the principle of democratic control of cooperative members within the cooperative;

c) the principle of economic participation of cooperative members;

d) principle of autonomy and independence of agricultural cooperatives;

e) the principle of education, training and information of co-operating members;

f) the principle of cooperation between agricultural cooperatives;

g) the principle of concern for the sustainable development of communities.

We can firmly affirm that only a correlation between the two periods gives us the same approach to the association of small and large farmers in Romania, which would lead to uniting the forces in obtaining the necessary productivity for our consumption as well as for others in need.

According to the estimates of the great agronomists of the moment, Romania's agricultural production capacity could still feed another 15-17 million people over our population, thus contributing to both our welfare and global welfare.

The cooperative movement in Romania - short history

The Romanian co-operative movement has an old tradition, our country being, together with co-operative organizations from England, Belgium, Italy and France, founding member of the "International Cooperative Alliance (ACI)". A precursor was Spiru Haret (1851-1912) who initiated in 1899 a bill on the establishment of popular banks, the involvement of teachers in cooperative activity, the constitution of municipalities, the organization of consumer co-operation, and others. After the First World War, a representative of the cooperative ideas was Gromoslav Mladenatz (1887-1958), who graduated in Germany, finalized by obtaining a doctorate in economics with the thesis "The Cooperative Concept". Professor at the Academy of Advanced Commercial and Industrial Studies, between 1929-1951, he is the author of the "Cooperative Treaty" (1933) and the book "History of Cooperative Thinking" (1935). In his book "The History of Cooperative Doctrines" (1931), the cooperative was "a free association of a number of small producers or consumers, who set up a joint venture to organize an exchange of services between associates." The first forms of association in the rural area of Romania appeared with the introduction of the principles of modern co-operation materialized by Ion Ionescu from Brad (1818-1891), economist, statistician, agronomist, outstanding representative of Romanian agricultural sciences. He expressed his views on various types of associations in the well-known publication "The Romanian Peasant." Thus, the first associations of economy, credit and mutual aid were established in the county of Bistrita in Transylvania in 1851; in the city of Braila in 1855; in the village of Brad in the county of Roman in 1860; in Răsinari commune in Sibiu County in 1867 and in Bucharest in 1870 (Băcescu 2009).

The cooperative was, in the sense of time, a collective economic unit that addressed socio-professional categories with little economic potential: small agricultural producers, craftsmen, employees. The purpose of the cooperative's activity was to satisfy the needs of the associated members and to obtain benefits from this activity. Thus, the cooperative system did not abolish property and freedom, but made them

available to the masses as producers and consumers, widening the social basis of a democratic society. Agricultural co-operation, as an associative form of joint work, was, according to Mladenatz, the only form of social economic organization through which the peasant combines individual ownership of the land with collective ownership of modern agricultural inventory. In the conditions of falling prices of Romanian agricultural products on the international market during the economic crisis of 1929-1933, he recommended the involvement of cooperatives in the grain trade in order to remove the intermediaries and adopt a more efficient production structure. The establishment of agricultural producers in associative forms was appreciated by opening new opportunities for economic development by attracting local, regional or national advantages and using collective power in order to increase the prosperity of their members, their families and the respective community. (Băcescu 2009)

The beginning of the cooperative movement in Europe

The consumer cooperative of the small English town Rochdale (established in 1844) is considered to be the first modern cooperative, based only on its own members, without outside help. It started as a consumer cooperative and evolved into a cooperative with multiple goals, with social and economic activity. The leaders of the modern cooperative in England were Robert Owen (the promoter of self-subsistence of workers - consumers suggesting them to create associations) and William King (who supported the voluntary nature of cooperatives and their political and religious neutrality) in France Charles Fourier, Philip Bisan (the founder of the first production cooperative) and Louis Blanc (he proposed replacing the free competition with co-production), in Germany Victor Aimé Huber (precursor of consumer cooperatives) and Ferdinand Lassalle (he supported the freedom of cooperatives and independence from the state). In Germany, for the first time, credit cooperatives for farmers were created, with Friedrich-Wilhelm Raiffeisen as initiator (1864), (Alexandrescu and Mihalache 2011).

Agricultural cooperatives in the European Union

Since the creation of the CEE, cooperative structures have undergone mutations by organizing producers in the form of local, regional cooperative unions, federations on industries and products, integrating cooperatives with national companies or multinational corporations (Zahiu 2003). In EU countries, agricultural cooperatives are in forms and types that vary from country to country, based essentially on the same principles of organization and functioning that are based on Directive no. 67/532/CE of 25 July 1967 of the European Council and which refers to agricultural cooperatives. Through this directive, "cooperatives are entities that are named as such in the law of the Member State but are based on cooperative principles". In the EU, agricultural cooperatives are organized on three levels, as follows:

1. At primary level, farmers are associated in simple forms of associations which are called first-class cooperatives in the European Union for the joint achievement of the following objectives: farm work; the joint exploitation of the earth; the sharing of production capacities; or to invest in various areas.
2. At secondary level, associations of primary agricultural cooperatives, which are referred to as second-class cooperatives, are set up and are aimed at upstream and downstream investments in agriculture for the collection or processing of agricultural products (Muscă 2000).
3. Third-level cooperatives are organized at tertiary level, by region or even at national level, through the participation of second-class cooperatives that form strong

financial, commercial and industrial groups. These include networks of cooperative factories that provide processing and marketing of products or banks by pooling experience and resources in a particular region or region. It is noteworthy that in the EU Member States no agricultural cooperatives were set up to produce the land and work on the common land, following the model of the former communist states. An exception is made by East Germany, where a large number of production cooperatives of over 1500 hectares have been maintained. The lands of these cooperatives belong to the rightful owners. They hold about 38% of the agricultural area of the East German provinces (Muscă 2000). Agricultural holdings, especially small farms, are developing cooperative and integration ties with large agri-food companies that take over agricultural raw materials on a contractual basis. The Western European agri-food system promotes cooperation in all forms of social organization of farmers: small, medium and large farms, agricultural cooperatives and cooperative societies, national or transnational agri-food firms.

In Western European countries, the specialization of agricultural holdings is an important feature of the production structure, driven by technical and technological modernization and deepening the division of labor. The specialization requires the development of cooperation among agents along the agri-food chains, starting from the supply of inputs, the production of agricultural raw materials, storage, processing and marketing of the products.

The principles underpinning the cooperation relations of the European Union's agriculture are:

- the principle of freedom of choice for the form of cooperation;
- the obligation of members to contribute capital and participate in the economic activity of the cooperative by delivering products, respecting the technologies for producing agricultural raw materials delivered to the cooperative;
- the principle "one man-one vote" in the decision-making made at the cooperative level regardless of the capital contribution;
- the principle of receiving dividends under the statute;
- the principle of "territoriality", respectively limiting the area of action of a cooperative to a given community.

At the level of the European Union, agricultural cooperatives are represented by national organizations and are oriented and supported by the Community bodies: the General Cooperative Agricultural Committee (COGECA), the Agricultural Producers Committee (COPA) and the International Cooperative Alliance (ACI).

Case studies

FRANCE - There are 21,000 cooperatives in France, which include about 75% of French farms. It appears that 3.5% of the economically active population is part of agricultural associations. In addition to production, French co-operatives also offer advice to its members. Thanks to their long experience, they come with valuable advice on agronomy, economics and strategic planning. It is worth mentioning that they also actively contribute to the development of environment-friendly agriculture. Cooperatives also invest in innovation, expanding their sphere of activity and finding new sources of income. An example is investment in biofuels. Farmers' associations also use different management tools to keep price developments on agricultural products under control. That does not mean that their members are reprofiling, agriculture, however, remains their core area. Credit co-operatives also come to their aid. For example, in 2013, Crédit Agricole co-operative bank reported the largest revenue in the system. Two other associations in the same sphere, Groupe BPCE and

Groupe Srédit mutuel, ranked third and fourth in this rating. French cooperatives have been constantly changing, adapting to the economic environment. They started by gathering together the harvest, after which they gradually became cooperative groups. If at some point, someone in the group wants to increase their profits, they only have to create strategic alliances. Alliances allow them to cut their expenses, share experience, and strengthen their leadership positions in the sector. Since French legislation restricts the activity of cooperatives to a certain territory, they have had to develop their own structures to expand and compete. Respectively, although the number of cooperatives fell as a result of mergers and acquisitions, their revenues were instead on the increase.

SPAIN - About 15% of the population is in co-operative organizations, most of them being set up under regional, not national law. Compared to other European countries, the number of Spanish cooperatives is above average. At the same time, they are quite small, with only 39% of them having over one thousand members, which prevents them from earning higher profits. As numerous, so different: from modest local cooperatives to cooperatives with industrial deliveries. There are also large cooperatives processing the products to sell them to retailers. However, about 75% of the turnover reported by Spanish cooperative societies is in the hands of a quarter of the cooperatives due to mergers and takeovers.

ISRAEL - About 70% of Israel's agricultural land is processed by cooperative members. The association is voluntary and exit from the cooperative is not forbidden. The people at the head of the unions are democratically elected, as a rule, among their members. Sometimes people from outside come to the fore, but they must have experience in managing cooperatives or be members of other agricultural cooperatives. In close association with each other, Israeli agricultural cooperatives are organized on two levels: local and regional. The local or grade one is divided into three types: village-level unions, plugs and moshavuri, the last two being the largest. The distinction between these three forms of organization is how cooperatives control production and consumption. For example, in the dumplings the community decides how much each family needs to live, and in moshavuri it is a private matter. Chibuts and mossavas are cooperative production, where household decisions are taken collectively. In the dumplings, the land belongs to the community as well as the agricultural machinery, and the economic activity responds to the chosen leadership. Members of the bunch are not allowed to have the parcels that they can process individually. In moshavuri the land belongs to each household, as well as the buildings on their plots or the agricultural technique, and the decisions are taken by each family. It can be said that the members of moshavuri are, in fact, individual producers working for their own farms. They appeal to village-based cooperative services for: supplying farms collectively, collectively harvesting and transporting merchandise to local traders, and also maintaining machinery and workshops for their shared use. These unions can also book accounts or harvest the production of other customers. Second-tier co-operative organizations operate at the regional level, and include local chickens and mosses, not individual farmers. They deal with the sorting and packaging of harvested produce and are responsible for warehouses, combined fodder plants, elevators and cotton gins - cotton ginning machines. They also deal with plant processing. Second-level cooperatives are also part of the procurement organization. They provide unions with professional consultations and deal with data processing. Most importantly, it plays the role of financial intermediaries between farmers and banks, helping the former to obtain and share loans.

US - There are fewer cooperatives than in other countries, only three thousand in number. Instead, most American farms are part of them. Thus we distinguish cooperatives for sale, transaction termination, supply and credit. Sales cooperatives are

engaged in the processing and marketing of agricultural products. Virtually everything that grows and produces the US is managed by these cooperatives. They also provide jobs for the majority of rural residents. To help farmers who are not able to negotiate, the specialist trading cooperatives come to help them get reasonable prices for the goods they produce. Farming supply cooperatives are engaged in the production, sale and distribution of indispensable products for good household management, such as fuel. Credit co-operatives include banks and associations from the lending system in agriculture. In addition to credits, they support farmers in other operations, such as export financing. Depending on the merchandise delivered to each farmer, one percent of the Union's sales are reliant, depending on which farmers' profits will be calculated. More specifically, after processing, processing and marketing of cereals or other commodities. The affairs of the cooperative are entirely in its hands or, more precisely, in the hands of a board of directors elected by its members. It should be noted that each member is entitled to one vote and all votes are equal, as opposed to joint-stock companies or other forms of business (<http://agrobiznes.md/>).

Conclusions

Along with the concepts of Romanian capitalism and the co-operation of Professor Tașcă, as well as the aspects related to reflecting the present situation of the cooperatives, the organization of the credit for agriculture led to the formation of cooperative associations. Once constituted from a legislative and organizational point of view, the associations once established began organizing the credit for agriculture. "Nothing will bind the members and will not strengthen the association as this organization of the credit. The biggest gap in small culture is lack of credit." (Tașcă 442-443). This is something we still encounter today, the small farmer being largely excluded financially and without any form of credit. Which means that today, we should re-establish those Rural Credit Institutions, given that Romania currently has around 2.5 million rural households that administer about 4 million hectares.

Before the agrarian reform in the interwar period, the large culture used more than half of the entire volume of rural credit at the level of the whole country, which is still confirmed.

The rural credit model function was initially functional by reorganizing the construction of credit cooperatives, setting up syndicated credit institutions along with popular banks, organizing the credit itself is the support of the trade union organization.

The structure of the village bank, through Tașcă's teacher's conception, must be "a serious institution with a competent and energetic director and not a shaky bank, such as the country's popular banks. These could remain for the continuation of the type of credit cooperatives. The syndicate's banks, however, must be anonymous societies quite strong enough to be able to group together the economic elements of the value of the villages." (Tașcă 1926, 444).

References

- Alexandrescu, Filip and Mihalache, Flavius. 2011. *Social Economy and Cooperatives*. Bucharest: Expert Publishing House.
- Băcescu, Marius. 2009. Rural cooperation - A chance for reviving the Romanian village.
- Bălan, Mariana and Vasile, Emilia. 2010. "The Evolution of Romanian Demographic Phenomena in Terms of Globalization." *Annals of Spiru Haret University*, Economic Series Vol. 1(10), issue 3.
- Musca, Dumitru. 2000. *Forms of agricultural association in EU*, Bucharest: Mirton Publishing House.
- Rotaru, Ioan-Gheorghe. 2009. "File din istoria Societății Pentru Învățătura Poporului Român (Files from the history of Society for the teaching of the Romanian People)." *Licentia Docendi* I, no. 1, Baia Mare: Ceconii Publishing House.
- Tașcă, G. 1927. *Economic and Financial Issues*. Edited by A. Th. Doicescu, Bucharest.

MANTA: Gheorghe Tașcă. Romanian capitalism and cooperation

- Tașcă, G. 1926. *Romanian Capitalism and Cooperation*. Conference held by Prof. G. Tașcă on January 31, 11 am. In the Carol I Amphitheater;
- Zahiu, Luminița. 2003. *Agrarian Structures and the Future of Agricultural Policies*. Bucharest: Economic Publishing House.
- Zahiu, Luminița. 2005. EUROSTAT- www.europa.eu.int European Statistics Institute;
- Zahiu, Luminița. 2010. Academy of Scientists from Romania, *Romanian Journal of Statistics no. 6*.