

ECONOMIC HISTORY
MARGINALIA TO THE VOLUME “CU MAREȘALUL PÂNĂ LA
MOARTE” [GOING TO DEATH WITH THE MARSHALL] BY GEN.
CONSTANTIN PANTAZI

TRAGIC DESTINIES IN A SWIRLING WORLD

Dan POPESCU

“A nation can only by itself be saved”
Nicolae Bălcescu

This would happen especially during the first days after the Revolution when my aunt would type on a typewriter the articles for "Liberalul", whose editor-in-chief I used to be. Similarly, especially during those days when I used to sit with my uncle, my mother's brother, who was a cavalry officer, a former second lieutenant and lieutenant in the Royal Guard, answering to the call of the country while on the East Front, up to the Don Bend and Kalmyk Steppe, and again serving on the entire West Front, up to Tatra Mountains. During those times, we came to talk about General Constantin Pantazi, who was loved and respected in the army. My uncle, among other things, adoring horses, the same as C. Pantazi, knew well the renown general also through his father, my grand-father who was a General too, a gunnery General, however. My uncle was at the same time a friend of his son, Ion Pantazi, also a cavalry officer, second lieutenant and who served on the front as well.

They were not protected by relationships or the positions they held, preferring, to a warm bed, harshness, great risks, the hardships of the front and fights with the enemy. Many times, they had the ground instead of a mattress and the Lady with the Scythe at every step. They were injured several times but they went back to fight. And, for their deeds they were awarded orders and Romanian, German medals etc. They were not the only ones, similarly, many others, hundreds of others, thousands of soldiers, NCOs and commissioned officers who, at the call of their nation, would fight with dedication in the war.

And in the country, because they stood against “Russians”, not few officers, more or less belonging to bourgeoisie, were “expelled” from the army and not only, but especially of their kind. Many were imprisoned, humiliated, downgraded, left without work living from hand to mouth. It was the new political system that would mutilate such people. Others, protected by the system, with caps and “tam-o’shanter on one eye”, would replace them; they had “a good file”, not like others who came with Tudor Vladimirescu and “Horia, Cloșca and Crișan” etc. Many times, lacking the needed value, apprentices turned overnight into lieutenants, factory carriers turned into captains and majors, factory turners transformed into colonels, and locksmiths turned into generals. Likely did it happen in education and not only. Plenty of “trained” remained there not for a short time. I might exaggerate, but still, no. In time, after the ‘60s, things would change. Nevertheless, coming back to the subject... Some of the chiefs of the times, placed over those excluded, undertaken by the new power into high positions, did not move a finger, including the Head of the State. It didn’t even happen with the “Hitlerite” Germans...

...My uncle would tell stories about “Old” Pantazi: it was August, 1938 in the evening. I had a leave from the Palace and I was walking to the South on Regina Elisabeta Blvd (afterwards re-entitled “6 Martie” [March 6]), on the side with many cinemas. A baritone voice called me: “Cornet Vrăjitoru, what are you doing here?” It was General Constantin Pantazi. “Aye-aye, General, I am walking. I have a few hours’ leave.” “All right, Vrăjitoru, have a great walk!” ...Elegant ladies and lasses, more or less aristocrats, fancy hats, elegant gentlemen, immaculate uniforms, gold embroidery, luminous pubs, a few luxury stores – watches, bijoux, clothes. Films with young and leggy Rita Hayworth, beautiful Danielle Darieux, young Gary Cooper, cynic Clarke Gable, voluptuous Jean Harlow, merry Claudette Colbert and Myrna Loy, cow-boy Tom Hix, the inflexible Harry Baur, the well-known Charles Vanel... A glimpse of the General, sociable, friendly, feeding all cavalry officers with a feeling of solidarity. The war was yet far away, Carol II – “The King spends time with Elena” – was the country’s dictator and he was not leading too well.

1. But who was this figure in the Romanian army? Some time ago, I believe on a Saturday, on sale with the daily journal “Adevărul”, there was the work “Going to Death with the Marshall”, “memories” of General Constantin

Pantazi. I immediately bought the book: “Paul Editions”, 350 pp., impeccable work. A very good friend drew my attention to it - prof. C. Butiuc – but also “Tribuna”, signed by Nani Dobra. Serious work. I was interested in the epoque, in Marshall Ion Antonescu’s personality, in the personality of Army General Constantin Pantazi, Undersecretary of State for land forces in the War Ministry between 1940-1942, once with the forming of Ion Antonescu Government, and afterwards, a War Minister between 1942-1944. He was one of the “key characters”, maybe the most important, after Deputy Prime Minister Mihai Antonescu, in the team of the State leader. I was also interested in the country economy during the mentioned war and in the manner in which the Marshall faced his destiny, he, coming to the country rule during times of great difficulty, when they got to think even about Romania’s dissolution. I was interested as well in Mihai (Ică) Antonescu (not a relative of Ion Antonescu), as a professional, being an International Law Professor, former professor to King Mihai, interested in George Alexianu, Transnistria Governor, in General Piki Vasiliu, a Minister of the Interior, all condemned to death and executed in the famous “Vale a Piersicilor” [Peach Valley], from Jilava, June 1, 1946. These were death condemnations by “Tribunalul Poporului” [“People’s Trial”], to a great extent, a mock trial: “Procesul Marii Trădări Naționale” [“The Trial of the Great National Treason”], with the accused not allowed to talk, especially when they referred to “hot” subjects, with some defence lawyers pleading insensibly, without touching on particulars of claim, with a hand-picked hostile audience, completed with an unleashed crowd, brought in front of the Trial Court, vehemently crying again and again: “Death to Antonescu!”, “Death to the criminals!”

There were three more death condemnations: Radu Lecca’s, the one who – as he would state – directed the fate of the Jews during those times in Romania, Eugen Cristescu’s, the Head of the Secret Services and, behold, Constantin Pantazi’s. During the last moment, a few minutes before the execution, they were acknowledged “Acquittal”, Redemption from “death”, being sentenced to prison for life. Pantazi and E. Cristescu both died in torment in prison, the only one seemingly going out, after many, many years, being Radu Lecca, the one who, in prison, wrote a book of memories entitled “I saved the Jews in Romania”, released on the market a long time ago.

Constantin Pantazi wrote the above-mentioned book at the beginning of his detention, in secret, managing to release it “outside” with the help of benevolent jail guardians. His son, Ion Pantazi – afore mentioned -, took care of it, and then, with remarkable toil, it was attended to by researchers

Alexandru V. Diță and Adrian Pandea. This volume of C. Pantazi, too, had an essential contribution to decoding “mysterious Antonescu”, for a long time the mystery being sealed by a decision adopted during the times of Prime Minister A.N. This “mystery” remains even currently, many things being confusing and even unknown. Certainly, the present writing is not meant to be a historical research in itself. A remarkable professor from Iași, Gh. Buzatu, as well as many other researchers did this. Some of them continue to do it. As for my *marginalia*, I will strictly refer to several details of the mentioned issues.

2. Constantin Pantazi was born on August 26, 1888 in Călărași. His name was, in fact, Constantinescu, he was the son of Captain Constantinescu, from Pitești, the Marshall’s birth place. Therefore, he was a veritable “escu”, his brother, also ranked a General, being named Vladimir Constantinescu. However, as researcher Adrian Pandea would write, “we found out no precise statement on the moment and reason for changing his family name to Pantazi”. Usually, we add, it happens the other way, from Pantazi or other foreign names, one would transform one’s name into the originally Romanian Constantinescu. Similar to his mentor from Pitești, Ion Antonescu, Pantazi attended the Military School of Commissioned Officers for Infantry and Cavalry in Bucharest, graduating in 1908, and then, between 1909-1910, he attended the courses of the Special Cavalry School. He distinguished himself in the Balcanic War, on the fronts in Bulgaria, in 1913, and then, during the First World War, in the fights of Oituz, Cașin and Fata Moartă etc. Among others, one of his superiors would appreciate him as “an officer without fear but rather fearful, in excess,... a temperamental with a calm aspect but with, however, a plus of physical and intellectual energy”. At the beginning of 1918, he was the commander of a troop in Regiment 2 Roșiori, relocated to Bessarabia, where he imposed himself through the strictness with which he controlled Bolshevik Russian troops from the area of Bender-Chițcani... A Brigadier General in 1937, he would live the tragedy of the Romanian army and authorities’ withdrawal from Bessarabia (June – July 1940) as a result of the Russian territorial rapt, supported by Germany. He knew Ion Antonescu well, fighting besides him several times and bearing him special appreciation... On September 7, 1940, he was named by the State Leader, right after his installation, Undersecretary of State for the Land Army and then, from 1942 until August 23, 1944, he was War Minister for the Marshall,

being promoted to Army General in 1943. He would be arrested on August 23, from the King's order, at the Royal Palace, then sent to USSR and brought afterwards to the country as one of the main accused in the Trial of May 1946. Although he was cleared from several charges, he remained with others – “he was one of the closest partners of Ion Antonescu, being the advocate and devoted joint author and confederate in all criminal actions of Antonescu Government, where he was a first hand and due to the importance, during war, of the department he ruled” (see “the Trial of Marshall Antonescu”, Marcel-Dumitru Ciucă Publishing House, Bucharest, 1995). Being sentenced to “prison for life”, he would die, as I said, in January 1958, in atrocious torment in Rm Sărat Jail. He used to be the Marshall's key hand.

3. The volume “Going to Death with the Marshall” has Ion Antonescu as main character. He was born in 1882. He was son of a commissioned officer and his mother was “an aristocrat from the countryside nobility”. His first rank as a commissioned officer in the army: second lieutenant in Cavalry during the campaign against Bulgaria. Afterwards, during the Great European Civil War, for a long time also named the First World War, he was an army commander leading the first operations of Northern Army. Then, from October 1916, he was a General of the entire Army. He was a military attaché most appreciated in Paris and London and from 1940 he was the State Leader. Non-allied Romania in a swirling world. As C. Pantazi would write, Anglo-Americans encouraged ambassadors and relationships with Germany, with Führer Adolf Hitler; ... vague promises... the entrance into fights for regaining Bessarabia and Bucovina... the continuous war in the East... the country's administration... the harshness of defeat after Stalingrad... discussions regarding the Armistice... the Marshall's arrest at the Palace on August 23, 1944... hand-over to the Soviets and transfer to USSR... his trial in Romania... his condemnation to death... his execution on June 1, 1946... the calm and predestination he received death with... the last words of the Marshall: “I am not dead. Keep shooting!”

C. Pantazi's son, the young second lieutenant and then lieutenant, Ion Pantazi, also a cavalry officer, would demand, in a few days' time after graduation, to go to the front (in the East), where, for years, he would fight heroically. Once with his father's arrest he began a life of hardships, being eliminated, “unblocked” from the army, being expelled from the Law Faculty

in study year IV, and being investigated, arrested, beaten and tormented for almost 16 years – for one year, having a forced residence in Călmățui, in Bărăgan. More than ten years and a half he was stolen from treacherously. In his detention he was used to difficult work in mines, especially lead mines, passing through many political jails in Romania: Aiud, Cavnic, Baia Sprie, Oradea, Jilava etc. After “being set free”, he would work in the mine as a mine foreman for hydroelectric plants in Argeș, Lotru and Someș... In 1978, after 11 rejected requests, he received a tourist passport and remained as a political asylee in München, afterwards writing for many newspapers and owning his own journal. He would die in the capital of Bavaria in august 1996, and, according to his wish, the urn with ashes was brought to Ghencea Military Cemetery in Bucharest.

Here are a few details before practically approaching some economic issues: Ion Pantazi’s wife, like so many others, was arrested, under various childish reasons: she communicated with him, she gave him shelter, she knew about him etc; then, the young officer tried to escape, handcrafting instruments and attacking the guards. As a result, he received punishments to the amount of more than 100 years of prison he would have never gone out of unless the 1963, 1964 political armistices. He used to be intransigent, and very dedicated to his Romanian military creed. Martyrs, unfortunately, are not part of our reality, but they remain in our conscience and in eternity. He would write “I Went through Hell”, a tragic volume, tremendously sad – on the few days of freedom he had, some time in 1956, between two condemnations, two detentions: *but at the same time, I used to listen to Europa Liberă. It was August 23, 1956. I could, therefore, find out that our country was celebrating 12 years since the “liberation”, since democracy had been installed, since King Mihai, through an act of great courage, had brought our country to the side of its “natural allies”. This event was broadcasted by Europa Liberă. Naturally, I would ask myself a question: I wonder if we, the formerly imprisoned, are still strong in the mind? In our trials, we were frankly told this: “you are not strong in your heads!”. Now, we hear the same from our much dreamt about free life! Yes, ... stolen lands, stolen houses, arrested intellectuals, arrested youth, arrested, tormented and killed peasants, all these, begun on August 23, 1944, are a sign of coming back to democracy, to the natural allies, to freedom! This event is celebrated in the West in a similar way to Bucharest! We are insane! We are insane! ... Most certainly, trials that had condemned us were only trying to protect society isolating us from it ... I find out that his Majesty has recognized the Parliament (formed as a result of*

false elections in November 1946 – our note) *and that it indulged in having his Majesty present!!! Where are the soirees of the Italian, French Embassies, of the American and British military missions? Where are the luxurious pubs of Bucharest? Where are the saloons open for American officers? They all went down, for everything was the vain illusion of a sick world. This entire society rejoiced when "Mihăiță" stabbed the Romanian army, bringing about "democracy". Today we have it with the selfless help of the "natural allies"!* We were stupid not to have understood who we had as Head and what this had been about – I hereby, paraphrase the author.

4. "The Betrayal of the West" is, certainly a point of view one cannot ignore. Like his father, who in Antonescu Trial denied the crimes the Marshall was charged with and stated: "I associate with all the governing acts of the Marshall... Now, being known in the manner I evaluate my personal answers, I stand by the side of the Marshall, so that next to him I take full responsibility", similarly, like the Marshall, and like many others, people like him pursued, mainly, to re-unite Grand Romania; that Romania, built in reality with so much blood, suffering and hard work, and destroyed during the bloody year of 1940. These were the circumstances: ignoring others, especially France, Great Britain, United States etc., they would impose an alliance with the very "patrons" of destroyed Romania ... Let it be clear: until about 1942, Germany had been looked at with great admiration as the "Master of Europe". Afterwards, less and less, until the annulation of May 1945.

Reading, these days, the "Memories" of great Nicolae Iorga – 1938-1940 –, concluded a day before his assassination in Strejnicu Woods by a "legionary team of death", one may see in them a somewhat another point of view on Antonescu. For example: (1938) "...Academy discussions on electing General Antonescu. I am trying to certify that we are dealing with a man who did not write, with a General who did not defeat, with the "legionary" sympathy, and one of Codreanu's intimates. The king might feel offended..." etc., etc. This must be taken into consideration. Iorga and Antonescu are relatively different also in what Carol II was concerned... Nevertheless, had Iorga not been killed, the way he was, by Horia Sima's legionaries, most certainly, after August 23, 1944, as ex- Prime Minister, ex- Royal Counsellor and as a historian – a contemporary of Roller Regime historians – he would have gone to jail, dying in torment and fatigue like so many others. Moreover,

General Aurel Aldea, installed as a Minister right after August 23, 1944 in the Governments of Sănătescu, had an opinion as well: he cried out, it is said, to the arrested Marshall, that – I quote from my memory – *we should tie you down in an armchair and walk you around on Bucharest streets and in the country, for the widows and mothers deprived of their husbands and children to curse you, for the sons deprived of their fathers, as a result of the war you created by the side of the Germans*". One must obviously have such a view in mind, too ... However, in order for things to be clear, Aldea died in prison as well, a few years before General Pantazi. And so on... Not all, on the other hand, were happy before 1944: there used to be a lot of indigence, poverty, ignorance, illiteracy, unclean businesses and numerous crookeries, thefts from the State money... This wasn't quite a prosperous country. Those who would cry for the goods stolen by the communists weren't many. King Carol II called General Ion Antonescu to lead the country because it was not going upwards, but downwards; which does not excuse at all the criminal activity, the crimes, the veritable political genocide of the repressive apparatus installed after 1944. What about the anti-Semite politics and the Holocaust accusations? Horrid situations. It is, almost impossible, to give the verdict "a hundred percent so or differently". The guilt and the merits are established, in fact, *post factum*, by historians. And there is still much work to do. When one assumes a role as such, as a Leader, as a Dictator, responsibilities are also tremendous: satisfied, unsatisfied and not only... Coming back to economy...

5. The economic aspects are important. After 1918, numerous and serious problems would come to life, ones which the authorities of the reunited country had to face. Mainly, great war destructions, the consequence of some heavy fights with the enemy on the Romanian territory. And not only with the enemy, but sometimes also with the Eastern "ally", namely, the Russian forces who had fled, would flee from the front in confusion... Great land areas, deeply being "dug up" for bombshells, and being shot at, burnt woods "being robbed", a great number of totally destroyed houses or uninhabitable ones... about 1 million people fallen victims of military actions, indigence, about 1/5 of the active population of the country, an acute food crisis, the cereal export, massive in other times, now inexistent, a demographic country disbalancing – the great number of soldiers, dead, mobilized, especially young – who would make 20% of the cultivated cereals area remain

unworked, only $\frac{1}{4}$ of the industrial enterprises, encouraged by the State and 50% industrial production in comparison to the one before the war. A dramatic fall. The railways, locomotive and coach parks decreased to 65%-85%... Peace treaties had evaluated our losses – to practically beneath the normal level – to 32 billion golden coins, respectively to 16 years of lost work, to which one would add the expenses generated by the “recovery”. Unfortunately, as a result of various “arrangements”, although victorious, we would not receive a dime.

A difficult situation which the reunited country “Great Romania” confronted. The agricultural reform and other reforms mattered a lot. We also had the world economic crisis of 1929-1933, which, in great effort, we managed to overcome. There had been created – better said, deepened – the great traditional links between all Romanian Provinces: Muntenia, Moldavia, Bucovina, Bessarabia, Transylvania, Banat... An important role in this sense was held by the great Romanian economist Mihail Manoilescu, the one who conceived the essential national-wide Program meant to recover the country and speak the same economic language – during the new stage of after-war and after-crisis Romania.

...The year 1940 will again tear the country apart, under the shield of Germany, Russia and Italy. A great part of Transylvania, Northern Bucovina, Bessarabia etc., “are expelled” from the official borders of Romania. However, they were never out from the hearts and soul maps of all Romanians. The Romanian economy is again fragmented. It is the moment when General Ion Antonescu – brought to the leadership of the country by Carol II as Romania’s last hope but also the king’s, of escaping alive in case of the country’s bad management – has to deal with some of Romania’s serious, acute existential problems, political and economic problems, social, even cultural ones etc. Really difficult. Not just apparently, but effectively he can only see an alliance with Germany. Difficult to accept, but even more difficult, to deny acceptance. I showed before what C. Pantazi wrote, on that “faute de mieux” accepted alliance by Great Britain and USA ambassadors. General Antonescu preferred it. Maybe not terribly well advised, he would “game” everything, including his military honour, on the “card” of Hitler’s Germany. He did not negotiate petrol at stake, he would consider it a lost cause. Carol II had already tried a strong vicinity with Germany at the moment when, in Bucharest, on March 23, 1939, the Treaty on Promoting Economic Relationships between the Kingdom of Romania and the German Reich would be approved. Berlin would aim doubly: 1) to obtain an increase in petrol,

wood and mine extract imports; 2) to promote a long term mutual economic partnership. By accepting these German targets, Romania would require, in exchange, border recognition but also military partnership for the munition completion especially in the military aviation, as well as the building of a munition industry on a German basis. Among other provisions, there were: a percent of the amounts obtained from Germany as a result of munition delivery, infrastructure development and the building of public utility plumbing were to remain in Romania as capital interest in mixt projects.

The Treaty was due in 5 years and already – applied as such – it meant Romania’s complete adaptation to German interests (we saw what happened with “the border recognition”). The Treaty was, according to many, “a double-edged sword”, arising suspicions in Moscow even if the German party did not respect some of its provisions. Ion Antonescu Government amplified, to a good extent, this treaty, mainly on the side of Romania’s obligations. We weren’t quite manufacturing for ourselves or for export in general. In fact, Romania’s development of production would become totally subdued to German interests. And what we would manufacture for ourselves, was, in fact, for them. For example, as Constantin Pantazi would write, equipping some Romanian factories with German technology was accomplished with the purpose of producing the munition needed by Germany. Then, another provision would be to build an oil refinery for octanoic benzene as supplementary supply for our oil refineries. Nevertheless, these refined products were, finally used to the interest of our partners. Arming the Romanian troops with German stuff was done, but almost never at the established, required or re-demanded levels. And there are other numerous details... There certainly were also good parts, even remarkable ones, for example, purchases would be made at government level without intermediation, the cereal share given to Germany was to be negotiated annually. However, during the very summer of 1944, at the Marshall’s direct requests, Germany would pay, many times, even in gold. The stock of gold in the National Bank of Romania was consistently increasing, not at all decreasing. We might say, a merit of persuasion from the part of the Marshall.

6. The way it resulted from General Pantazi’s volume, who was put under pressure by some, and directly by Hitler, but also through his persuasions – despite the warnings of some generals resigning from the Army,

Antonescu would completely engage the army and the country in the deep and destructing war beyond Dniester, not only against USSR, but also against its allies. One thesis Hitler based on and which was taken into consideration also by Antonescu was, therefore, the one of supposed and founded weaknesses of the soviet army proven in the fight of USSR with Finland in 1939-1940. This would include the supposed lack of popularity of USSR heterogenous population to the targets of the communist army as well as the supposed lack of bravery, of dedication in fight of the soviet soldier, a fatal error, if we are to think also about the fact that the German Romanian troops were sometimes received with flowers in Ukraine, for example. Nevertheless, after the crimes committed by SS in the country, they were “hunted” stubbornly enough also by partisans and soviet soldiers.

Due to the allies’ intervention, especially USA’s, due to the help, support and leader qualities possessed by Stalin and the Führer’s stubbornness to fight to the last man, to the total destruction of Germany for a lost cause, Germany lost the war. It fought the entire world and had no odds to win. A heavy blow was also given to it through the loss of Romanian oil. The results were visible. Here is a detail: it was around 1940 when a German diplomat, of rank II, but smart, intuitive, educated: Hans Bernd Gisevius, counting in oil barrels for the countries engaged in war, confessed to some intimates: “Germany is lost.” This happened during full German glory. Engaging the country in a war and spreading it, Marshall Antonescu believed, hoped in victory. When he understood, however, that the war is about to be lost, he did not become a fanatic. He pursued to take Romania out of the war. In comparison, Hitler was a fanatic: losing the war, he pursued to destroy Germany in the face of history and to make the country perish by his side. Antonescu, on the contrary, almost directly negotiated the armistice and desired acceptable conditions for Romania in order to stop the fights. Not at all did he desire it to perish. This is also said, among others, with an extreme significance, by Gh. Magherescu in his remarkable work “The Truth about Marshall Ion Antonescu”. In conclusion, a lucid Antonescu, not a fanatic one. Besides, the plan for the Romanian troops to stand against the German troops, if reacting despite the armistice, was drawn by the Marshall. On August 23, 1944, this was applied accordingly, but by others, the Marshall being arrested by the very king of the country. And then handed over to the soviets, with his acceptance, even if not directly... Many times, the Marshall desired to take a weapon and fight in trenches. This was not possible: he was the Chief Army Commander, endowed with special rigour, attention to details, a perfectionist.

Even his dignity and his words, in front of the ongoing execution in Jilava, put a light on exactly such death. This happened while former king Carol II, by the side of Lady Lupescu, was merrily travelling around the world... Academician Florin Constantiniu, the son of a general and a man of remarkable military culture, a weekly journal colleague of mine for 4 years (1992-1996), the "National Courier Magazine", poses a question which consistently would urge reflection: (I quote from my memory) *how many Romanian and soviet divisions would Stalin have entrusted Antonescu with in order to fight against Germans?* And he would answer: *almost none.* Certainly, this point of view must be given consideration. However, that part of Transylvania "conceded" through Diktat to horthyst Hungary on August 30, 1940 was the no. 1 objective in both variants of armistice: the Marshall's or King Mihai's, without mentioning that, declared by us on August 23 by leaving the Alliance with Germany and turning the weapons against, the armistice was recognized by the soviets right on September 12, 1944, during the mentioned period, the troops taking everything as "war capture" and this, without fights, without any Romanian resistance. This would include thousands and thousands of militaries, of Romanian officers sent to heavy labour concentration camps in USSR, at the side of numerous Germans but also Italians, Hungarians, not few leaving their bones there.

7. Marshall Ion Antonescu had his qualities, among others, of honour and honesty towards public finances. These are nevertheless important. However, some of his faults were too, very serious. In addition, Hitler managed, what no one else did in history, to exterminate the Jew people and, secondly important, Slavic people. Immense streams of blood, death and suffering, owing to instinctively criminal primitivity and opacity, including for the families afterwards... I wonder, who gave them the right to exterminate people, to consider some superior and others inferior? Why were they not liked? Where were the Jews 2000 years ago, and where were many of today's European, that I appreciate as such? Where were the Germans that did so much for the world culture and civilization? And which, in the immediate history have transformed from a country in ruins into one of the great powers of the world? Where were the nowadays Americans 1000 years ago and where were the Arabs when illustrious Avicenna was considered the greatest scholar of a wide Muslim world? Where were the Maya, Incan, Aztec civilizations

1000 years ago in comparison to the Spanish of the time, who represented, yet, a lot? The Indians knew how to process metal and fire but did not know the horse, domestic animals and pulleys. A moment of reflection, therefore. Where would all these be in 2000 more years considering the demographic changes the way they happen nowadays, the way they will continue to happen tomorrow? Chinese everywhere. Americans, widely Spanish and colour. Indians expand too. United Europe in the amount of about 450 million people, not all of them “Europeans”, a great economic, social, civilization and cultural force however, of *savoir faire* and intelligence. Russian and British, not over 200 million. And in the world, somewhere around 7 billion people, the emergent prevailing... What is there left from racial doctrines? Or from other doctrines. I wonder and ask myself. Am I wrong? I do not believe so...

Without being a fanatic, a cruel, sadistic criminal – see “Nurnberg”, or an ignorant, the Marshall did not understand many of the time realities. He was, unfortunately, “under” some of the malice of his time. It was not at all good. We, of the time, sometimes cannot understand, as well. He remains in the history the way he was. Still, it would be really difficult for him to belong to the future...

P.S.: The funding obtained by President Iohannis from EU for Romania is a remarkable thing. We hope that the money – when it comes – naturally, will be spent with great use for the country.

According to many opinions, the Coronavirus 19 “explosion” in our country in July, c.y., is mainly owed to: a) total insufficient testing during the first weeks of pandemic burst and even afterwards, which generated statements of the kind: we have a better position than other states with a better medical system: Italy, Spain, France, Great Britain, Germany etc. This was not true...; b) the fact that a part of the population is undisciplined. After fancy relaxation, the people did not wear a mask any more, did not respect social distancing, rules of moving around etc., which are a matter of education; c) a medical system which, despite the truthful heroism of those who served, is far away from the one of an advanced European country. This is not valid only for rural Romania. We kept avoiding the pandemics since March, but unfortunately...