

## EUROPEAN ANIMAL HUSBANDRY - THE BASIS OF WORLD ANIMAL PRODUCTION AND MODERN ANIMAL HUSBANDRY IN ROMANIA

Condrea DRAGANESCU

University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Bucharest, 59 Marasti, District 1, Bucharest, 011464, Romania, Phone:+400212227912, Email: condrag2002@yahoo.com

**Corresponding author:** condrag2002@yahoo.com

### Abstract

*The world modern animal production, like the whole actual civilization is a product of the Europe of the last five centuries. The European animal production was the effect of an territorial expansion and dispute, cultural development, urbanization and industrialization under the conditions of the market economy, and also of the direct intervention of the states, especially in the 19th century. The extension of the European civilization at world level has brought Europe a danger besides profit. The underdeveloped area of the globe has become competitive and risked the position of leader and even the security. In front of the danger, the European countries joined their forces and in order to assure their food and political security, they established a Common Agricultural Policy (Treatise of Rome, 1957). This policy offered Europe the opportunity to recover its supremacy and food security, but the strong subsidization, which was the basis of the decisions regarding institutional restructuring, and the increase of production led to non competitive production cost. As a result, it was imposed nowadays a new PAC restructuring in the sense to reduce subsidies. "The enigma and historical miracle", the Romanian nation, has reappeared as a state after a long period of historical anonymity, determined by the new masters and immigrants or natives in the ex Eastern Roman empire. The tradition, the ecological and political conditions made as the actual and ex motherland of the Romanians to become a pastoral area, extended on a large territory, marked by four sheep breeds, their creation and ownership. The Romanians have been, therefore, outside of Europe, the founder and profiteer of the new civilization created by it. The political circumstances in the last 50 years favoured a "terrorist" modernization of agriculture, a remarkable animal production, mainly in poultry and pig farming. This progress collapsed at the same time with the terror and Romania remained an underdeveloped country in the EU, disadvantaged by the new competition and PAC. At present, it is imposed:(a)revitalization and sustainable development of the intensive industrial farms;(b)revitalization of the pastoral production systems;(c)development of the organic agriculture systems and temporary maintenance of the subzistence farms; (d)rural development and the preservation of the old Romanian village civilization; (e)development of the scientific life in animal husbandry and a new antitrust system;(f)the right selection, training, promotion and use of the human values.*

**Key words:** animal production, civilization, food security, intensive farms, pastoral production, scientific life, sustainable development

### INTRODUCTION

**"Why Europe and not China?"**

**Jared Diamond (1999)**

**World actual civilization and culture, including modern animal production, is a product of Europe during the last five centuries.**

We have to mention that not Europe was the first which stepped on the way of culture and civilization development. "It was the Confucionist China which till the years 1400 was more advanced from a technological point of view than the Western Eurasia,, as mentioned by Diamond (1999, 2005) in an

interesting analysis of the genesis of civilization, culture, power, living standard of the world states. The actual civilization, including the modern animal production, is a product of Europe of the last five centuries (Diamond, 1999, Draganescu, 1984.

Wondering himself „Why Europe and not China?“, why some countries are rich ( a GDP 10 times higher than the poor countries), strong and inventive and other countries are poor, Diamond created the fundamentals to answer a difficult question "What has to be done at this moment?" when (1)Europe is losing its leader position and (2) the actual civilization looks to start its decline.

Romania was outside of Europe most of the years while Europe established its new culture and civilization, but it is close to it at this complex moment.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The paper presents the author opinions on the evolution of animal husbandry in Europe, mainly in the EU and in Romania. A critical approach is carried out using the analysis and synthesis methods and logical deduction method as well emphasizing on the following aspects: why the EU was a world leader in animal production and which were the reasons to start going down; Common Agricultural Policy, and its goals: farm modernization and vertical integration, farm size, the strategy to develop a sustainable and competitive animal production, organic farming versus intensive industrial animal production systems, preservation of the village civilization and traditional values, rural development.

The paper is based on the major publications on the topic but the ideas belongs to the author of the paper. The problems are approached in a critical manner.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

**A background history of the ex orientalis Romanity could be an interesting study of how the geographical position and political context can affect the life of a people.**

"An enigma and a historical miracle", the Romanian nation reemerged as a state after a prolonged historical anonymity.

Disappeared after the year 641 (the replace of the official language in Constantinople from Latin to Greek and the massive immigration of other peoples on its territory), discrete reappeared after hundreds of years, it succeeded in a short time to regain in animal husbandry something of its underdeveloped status and offered to it a challenge about which historians will have the courage to discuss later.

The actual chance and task to go in a competitive way next and at the level of the European developed countries and load current

and competitive with developed countries in Europe should be taken seriously somehow.

Approaching the problem of animal husbandry progress In Europe, more exactly in the North-Western Europe, our essay would like to give its contribution to the understanding of the EU actual actions aiming to preserve its position at the world level and assure the sustainability of the actual civilization, and explain how Romania is thinking to be integrated in a competitive way in the EU actions. In fact, it is about a problem to which the scientists should clearly answer the question: **"Why other countries are rich, have a competitive animal production and Romania does not? Technocrats and policy makers should ask and be attentive to this answer!"**

**I. How the European animal production has positioned as the world leader?** *Partial abolition of the „laissez-fair” ?*

In the last five centuries, Europe has increased forage production, formed new animal breeds much more productive than the previous ones, were built stables, were developed the animal sciences production and average yield, as well as profitability per head increased more. Some European countries have become major exporters of reproduction animals and animal products, making big economic benefits from it. The geographical and ecological conditions, as well as the politico-military conditions favored this development.

In the 15-19 centuries, this development was also an effect of the economic principle of free market supply and demand ("Laissez faire"). "Guns, germs and steel", as Diamond affirmed, stimulated not only the industrial technology and territorial expansion but also food production, the emergence of profitable farms. In the UK there it is said about a **first agrarian revolution (the 15-17 centuries), in which serfdom was virtually abolished**, forced labor was transformed into rent money. A **second agricultural revolution** was the complement of the first industrial revolution (1700-1880) (Draganescu, 1968,1984), often called the golden age of the British agriculture. This led to the rural economy of large landowners, tenant farmers and farm workers. ***It was, however, and the effect of some concrete***

*administrative actions, not of the type of market economy, which need to be highlighted.*

Practically since in the last part of the 19th century was abandoned the "*laissez faire*" principle, (Drăgănescu 1968) of "*solving problems through free market competition*" (which was not identified even today by some "experts") and began a discreet intervention or visible state in directing the economy, animal production, stimulate the development of livestock science. We note a few.

**1. Animal production has practically become the backbone of agriculture.** It had a major share in the agricultural income (63% in the UK, 83% in Denmark) and dairy cattle production had the highest share in the income from animal production. The share of employment in agriculture was very low (4.2% in UK, 16% in Denmark).

**2. The state often started to subsidize agriculture** and protect it at the country borders. In the UK, the first **subsidies** (guarantee of price, subsidies for shares) were granted in 1925 (sugar production). In 1956, they represented 24% of agriculture revenue.

**3. The state has intervened in the organization of agricultural production cooperatives, of vertical integration.** Denmark has fostered since 1900 the association of farmers in cooperatives. The objective was that by supply, processing production (bacon) and wholesale delivery (= vertical integration in the cooperative), to avoid their speculation by the related industries. In the same year, Norway organized the vertical cooperative integration in dairy farming. The systems still operates today.

**4. In some states, some para governmental agencies for animal production have been established.** It is the case of Appropriate Milk Recovery Committee (MMB) and the Committee for the recovery of meat in the UK. Each was headed by an elected majority of breeders (12) and a minority (3) appointed by the State. They had Departments for production, the field service (consulting, production control, progeny testing), AI and veterinary assistance, exhibitions, steers

raising, scientific research and Department for collection, processing and milk marketing.

**5. In some states, it was directly acted to maintain a farm sizes able to maximize its biological, mechanical and economic efficiency.** A number of European countries had social or political reasons to abolish the old feudal estates, economically inefficient and socially unjust, and passing at a large scale not to profitable farms but to subsistence ineffective farms from a technological and economical point of view. Some European countries have avoided the economic decline that this type of "farm" could produce, in two ways:  
- **Maintain sui generis the feudal property and creation of profitable farms by renting.** In England (1965), 60% of farmers were tenants on the lands of some owners who used to rent their land ("Gentlemen Limited")  
- **Legal Prohibition of the division of land property by inheritance** (Denmark in the years 1910, Germany in the years 1930); only the eldest son has still the right to inherit the farm nowadays, the other brothers had to look for jobs in the city, only when they are in need are supported by brother the elder brother.

**6. Professionalization of farmers.** In Denmark and Germany no eldest son could not inherit the farm if he/she has not an agricultural training, at least of a vocational school; otherwise the farm would be sold to a high competence farmer.

**7. Stimulation of farmers' competitiveness by conducting the customs system, namely:** customs-opening for the cheaper agricultural production coming from the colonies (United Kingdom), which forced the local farmers to produce cheaper, however, leading to the bankruptcy of many farmers, but to ensure a cheaper supply for workers in industry, and higher wages and profitability in the industry.

**8. Stimulating marginal and urban agricultural production by:**

- encouraging the townspeople to make agricultural production batches (the hobby) in the surroundings of the cities where the land was inadequate for farming (all towns in Germany are surrounded by such plots);  
- subsidizing animal production in the mountain area (Switzerland, Austria).

**9. Some European countries stimulated the monopol on the delivery of breeding stock.**

To stimulated export demand, it was "scientifically" recommended the continue import in order to avoid " degeneration" of the races. Actually, the differences in environmental ecosystem in the world were ignored and the fact that animals must be adapted to local conditions, actually they did not degenerate, but natural selection helped them to adapt to the environment.

**10. Stimulation of fodder production, which actually operated before the revolution of the European livestock production** in the period 1700-1880. However, some European countries (Netherlands) had also a large part of their forage base "overseas" (Drăgănescu 1994).

11. Emergence of world scientific communities, viable and properly directed, gradually supported by states, has been a tremendous force that ensured the progress of the European culture and civilization. The modern animal sciences and education have their origins in Europe of the 19th century, and the underdeveloped countries have had difficult problems in developing such communities.

**II. A double danger**

**...Why China and not Europe?**

The peoples of the underdeveloped countries, still in demographic explosion, were aspirated and aspire to the living standard of the developed countries ( the Americans, the Western Europeans). The two world wars started at the beginning of the 20th century between the European countries created not only the conditions as Europe to lose its economic and military supremacy and also its supremacy in animal production in the world, but also to be completely erased. After the year 1920, the U.S.A. became the largest agricultural power. Imports of animal reproduction animals from Europe were stopped even from the beginning of the 20th century and gradually its level and economic competitiveness in animal production exceeded that the one of Europe. After the Second World War many countries entered in competition, even from the third world. Despite of its unfavorable

environmental conditions, Israel has the highest average milk production per cow in the world. Under the empire to ensure world peace, where food security has a paramount role, the developing countries have been helped ( green revolution of the period 1940-1972, FAO programs) or have acted themselves to increase animal production and their standard of living at the level of the Western European and North American countries. Japan has reached it. South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong and Mauritius succeeded to reach the Western European standard of living. India and China are still making efforts in this direction. But .. the West Europeans, the North Americans and the Japanese consume 32 times more resources of the planet per capita, for instance fossil fuels, and produce 32 times more trash than the inhabitants of the third world. Are the Earth's resources enough if all the peoples would like to reach this level?

In addition, Europe lost its military supremacy and at one point that it is in a difficult economic and military security. Clear rationale emerged, which are available for Romania too. **"There are many factors which influence the position of a nation in the modern world"**, said Bate and Healy (1980). The power and technology of its military forces, the ability of its industry, the size and capability of its workforce, the cohesion of social its structure, the quality of its political leadership, the degree in which all these collaborate. The events have drawn attention to **another vital element of power resources - food self-sufficiency. Agriculture, and animal production as well, is such a vital resource of the power of a nation.** It provides social cohesion ("Panem et circenses", said the Latinos) and influence all the other factors of the power. In fact, *in the context of food supply globalization, it is a condition for the world peace*, as emphasized at the establishment of FAO, the first objective of the Millennium\*- **the eradication of poverty and hunger. There are countries (U.S.A ) which provided global control by delivering or not agricultural products.** Not all the countries make progress and it started to arise a reverse question compared to the one of

Diamond: **Why China and not Europe .. is making progress?** Regaining the old forces of Europe in the 1950s had become an imperative action for it.

### III.The EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)

*Europe operates to preserve its supremacy in agriculture and animal production.* "EU must become the most competitive and dynamic economy in the world, scientifically determined and able of sustainable growth with more and better jobs and a strong social cohesion" (Council from Lisbon, 2000).

**Through the Treaty of Rome (1957)**, Europe decided to be united to prevent devastation of the internal wars, to ensure its security and restore its economic, technological and political power. **Food for its peoples, a major factor of the internal peace and external security, was uncertain.** As a result, the Treaty of Rome stated, among the other major objectives, the issue of agricultural development through a **Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)**. Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), mentioned by the agreement of Stresa (1958), enjoyed and still enjoys a special attention. It was clear that the goals were:

- **modernization of farms**, production system, and increase of the biological, mechanical, economic, management productivity, and agriculturists' standard of living;
- **vertical integration**, i.e. the integration of food chain by means of which food products produced by farmers reach the citizens and **ensure reasonable prices for consumers and fair incomes for farmers.**

#### III.1.Farm modernization

Obviously the first issue of increasing animal production, farming, was the modernization of farms. It could not be forced, but it needed some "material incentives" and **the modernization of the EU agriculture involved enormous costs, but the EU economy was capable, had material resources to support the effort for half of a century until today. The main used tool was the large subsidies offered annually with over 50 % of the EU budget.** We should note that the EU's annual budget is over Euro 120 billion. *What the Soviet block tried to make by*

*terror, the EU has made by financing.*

The growth of the biological, mechanical and economic productivity of the farms requires a continuous upgrading of technology and management, which is possible only in **farms enough large physically (ha, number of animals), specialized and technologically equipped**, led by competent persons, susceptible to progress and owning equity. The establishment of this farm type was in fact and still remains the major objective of the CAP. "Peasant household" had to be turned into a "farm". More exactly, **the main goal was an agriculture without peasants**, as mentioned a French work of 1965 ("Une France sans paysans" - Gervais *et al.*, cited by Drăgănescu, 2000)

It is clear that: a milking machine would not be used without service and minimum 5-10 cows, and under the current technology, a farmer could take care alone of about 50-100 cows, and a cow should produce 5,000-10,000 l milk per year to be considered efficient from an economic point of view (Drăgănescu 1984, 1992,1995).

Considering all these aspects, Sykes (1963), Drăgănescu (1968) considered that **a small family farm should have at least one of the following sizes:** 100 dairy cows, 800 fattening cattle, 400 ha cereal crops, 20,000 laying hens, 40,000 chicken broilers (230 tons meat per year). This was made by the USA. A part time farmer, who has another job which occupies him 30-40 hours a week, could keep his family raising about 10,000 laying hens or 20,000 broilers-series or 150 fattening cattle.

#### III.2. Vertical integration

**These small farms are viable family in Sykes' s opinion, only if vertical integration in large enterprises or cooperatives.** More than this, he considered that the basic efficiency of agriculture is its **industrialization**, the emergence of companies with hundreds of thousands, even millions of birds. The expectations for the year 1982 were that about **12 companies will control all the genetic improvement of livestock in the Western world**, controlling and directing the genetic improvement of 80 % of the number of animals. The author wanted a massive British

presence in these companies, **otherwise the Americans will be considered the best in the world ... (actually what happened).**

The EU tended towards these targets, even if it did not directly confessed. **The EU Manshold Plan**, proposed in the 1960s, **aimed to replace the small farms (households) with a real efficient agricultural industry. The "farmers" (peasants) pressure avoided the implementation of the plan, but the idea has persisted, even though** many European politicians affirmed that they are promoting family farms, rejected the Manshold plan. **CAP has subtly or visibly favored the large farms, enterprises; subsidies were offered according to production volume, which was much higher in them.**

#### **CAP subsidizing**

The policy to increase agricultural production was heavily funded, as mentioned above, by:

- (a)guaranteed prices** for animal and vegetable products delivered on the domestic market or exported, per animal ( subsidies and border protection )

- (b)financial encouraging of endowment and increasing the farm size**

- **(c)subsidies for the elder peasants** ( over 55 years!) who are retiring, ceasing the land to the modern farms.

#### **Animal production systems**

Production system is a set of elements, subsystems which cooperate to achieve a goal: the economic achievement of products in a given ecological and economic circumstance.

*We should not discuss about animal production without analyzing and solving the problem of optimum operating systems adapted to the given eco - socio-economic conditions.*

We note that the most interesting classification of animal production systems at world level is the one made by Sere *et al.* and also the one made by environmentalists and the problem of systems should be approached in Romania too. We emphasize once again that the production system is a *component of an ecosystem and traditions, so that production systems, especially the extensive ones, could not be simply given from a country to another. The E.U. has not standards for production*

*systems, but call on local expertise to find the most effective solutions. Incompetence which thinks that is competent is a great social danger.*

The classification of systems is a complex problem, depending on the system component used for ecological and geographical diversity where the systems exist. For the lack of space we do not insist upon classification of systems operating in Europe and in Romania, presented in other previous papers about dairy cattle and sheep (Drăgănescu, 2009)

However, we have to remind that the environmentalists noticed *10 production systems for dairy cattle in Europe*, grouped into 3 groups:**(1)Large production systems** with the highest share in EU milk production, which include the mainland about 80% of cows and 84 % of milk production, but they consider that they have a negative influence on the environment;**(2) Production systems having a neutral influence on the environment in a large extent** ( 12% of the cows and 13 % of produced milk); **(3)Ecological systems** (6% of Europe's milk and only 8 % of the number of cows). Perhaps the "systems" existing in Romania are ecological systems but not economic and competitive systems.

Our opinion about **pig and poultry farming** was mentioned since 1994, and about **sheep farming** we recently affirmed that if production systems adapted in Romania are not supported, the country is in danger to lose its economic and historic status.

#### **III.3. CAP results**

Intensive agriculture, stimulated according to the principles of the Treaty of Rome, led to a remarkable prosperity. A slight proportion of each country's population, *5-20 times lower than the one in Romania, produces too much food*, it is true with a price a little high compared to the world market. Analysis of the effects of the policy that led to these effects is a complex item. We note a few.

**1.Agriculture infrastructure was largely modernized.** As an example we give a situation in France (Table 1) and return upon the data from the ICAR (2009 ) concerning dairy farms and production in the member states.

From Table 1 one can notice a high share of enterprises and farms and a decrease of the traditional households. In the USA, the progress was more important ( Drăgănescu 2000b) .

Table 1. An estimation of the farm types in France

Farm type	Average surface (HA)		Share in agricultural land (%)	
	1988	2000	1988	2000
Enterprises (over 100 ha, or 40 cows or 80 sows)	100*	120	35.1	52.6
Family farms	27	45	51.6	32.9
Quality agriculture (wine, armagniac, fat liver)	10	10	2.8	3.6
Agriculture to offer additional salary or before retirement	10	10.5	15	10.9

\*In 1963, the farms over 50 ha owned 28 % of agricultural land.

The recent data regarding the number of cows per farm and production in the EU countries

Table 2. Farm size and milk production (all the breeds existing in the country) the EU member states and in the ICAR evidence (ICAR Technical Series No 13, Jan 2009)

Year	Country	No. of cows	No. of farms	No. of cows per farm	Milk yield/year	% Fat	% Prot.
2007	Austria	527,421	45,847	<b>11.5</b>	<b>5,903</b>	4.12	3.35
2006	Belgium (Valonia)	223,538	5794	<b>38.6</b>	<b>5,678</b>	4.00	3.31
2007	Cyprus	23,701	245	<b>96.7</b>	<b>6,302</b>	3.66	3.34
2007	Czech Rep.	409,802			<b>6,725</b>	3.88	3.37
2007	Denmark	553,000	4,900	<b>112</b>	<b>8,000</b>	4.24	3.43
2007	Estonia	108,400	6,779	<b>16.0</b>	<b>6,368</b>	4.0	3.30
2007	Finland	293,300	13,270	<b>22.1</b>	<b>8,198</b>	4.19	3.45
2007	France	3,799,000	94,432	<b>40.2</b>	<b>6,067</b>	4.16	3.5
2007	Germany	4,087,300	99,000	<b>41.35</b>	<b>7,000</b>	4.16	3.43
2007	Ireland	1,038,520	22,042	<b>47.1</b>	<b>4,722</b>	3.78	3.31
2007	Israel		699	<b>141</b>	<b>11,291</b>	3.62	3.20
2007	Italy	138,000	44,373	<b>41.41</b>			
2007	UK England	154,940	984	<b>157</b>	<b>7,807</b>	4.09	3.32
2007	UK Northern Ireland	97,670	788	<b>123</b>	<b>6,803</b>	3.98	3.28
2007	UK Scotland	102,344	669	<b>154</b>	<b>7,499</b>	3.97	3.28

showed not only a relatively large farm size, it is true with high variability from country to another, but milk production per cow at least double compared to one recorded in Romania ....It is an explanation of the fact that **Romania imports even UHT milk at half price compared to the milk price achieved in the country.**

**2. Production increased much more than needed, supplying the population at reasonable and stable prices, unaffected by fluctuations in the free market. The share of food cost has substantially decreased, accounting for 5-20% of the average wage (in Romania over 50%).** **3. The social structure of the agricultural population was changed and was assured a fair standard of living. Its weight is very low. Practically, today, it is discussed only about farmers, which it is true, not about peasants (which in the Romanian traditional vision, it sounds strange). .. Cervais was right ... Today, it is a France without peasants, as he entitled his book in 1965.**

It is not possible this study and we plan to do a thorough analysis of the modernization of livestock production in the EU, but we note a few other issues.

- In 1989, the average size of family farms in poultry farming was 15, 228 laying hens, 17, 171 heads in the Netherlands and 16,897 heads in the UK.
- The size of family farms raising broilers was 36,952 heads in the UK, 35,302 heads in Germany and 28,814 heads in the Netherlands.
- In terms of poultry enterprises, in the U.S. were 156 enterprises with over 250,000 laying hens ( 47 % of production in 1991) , **22 enterprises having over a million hens.**
- In pig farming, the average number of sows per farm in Denmark was 117 heads. In Italy, fattening farms with over 1,000 pigs produced 20 % of the number of slaughtered pigs, and in England 43.5 % of slaughtered pigs.

**CAP objectives set by the Treaty of Rome were largely fulfilled. Even before 1990, the EU has provided food self-sufficiency.**

**IV.A new stage of animal production in the EU:**

***Redefining CAP: dynamic, competitive and sustainable production***

**CAP has increasingly become a victim of its own success. The EU has started to produce milk, dairy products, meat, vegetable more than it needed, but expensive, uncompetitive in the international market and with a high consumption of non-renewable resources. In addition, the subsidizing for production had also to support export. The EU budget was now subjected to high unnecessary pressure. In addition, *in the 1990s, the world economy and daily life began to be revolutionized by three phenomena:***

- (1) **economic globalization;**(2) **technological revolution, including the internet and new information and communication technologies;**
- (3) ***recognition of non sustainability of the current civilization.***

In such a situation, CAP had to be "redefined", as Fontain subtle affirmed (2007 ).

**The achieved progress created the premise for the CAP reform.**

The farmers' block who rejected the **Manshold Plan** in 1960 regarding the radical elimination of small farms lost influence. Financial reasons caused by an overproduction of milk and other agricultural products led **in the 1980s to the beginning of the system reform. In 1984 it introduced quotas for subsidizing milk production ( no longer subsidies for all the produced milk), and since 1988 it started the limitation of the EU expenses. CAP has remained relatively stable until 1992**, when it was radically changed under the pressure of the GATT - Uruguay Round. **Mac Sharry Reform appeared at the moment of the transition from a directed economy directed towards a free market economy, and reduced the subsidy for meat by 15%, and included subsidies for the unused arable land, reforestation, *keeping the subsidy for farmers at retirement leaving their farm to modern enterprises.***

***Reforms continued after 1992.*** Agenda 2000 reduced the subsidies for milk and milk products and meat, and the European Commission Report of 2003 proposed to reduce the CAP budget, but leave more freedom of action for each country. We note that until 1992, CAP received about 49 % of the EU budget. **The share of CAP expenses was gradually decreased, but sharply thereafter to 32 % ( almost half ) in 2013. For the new admitted countries like Romania, it was a serious warning.** The question arising is: Will be encouraged the recovery of their agriculture ?It seems that there is still a box. For the EU regional policies, which benefited of 17 % of the budget in 1988, the allocation will be almost double by 2013 to about 36 % of the budget . **The CAP change PAC, which Romania is living at its entry, aims to:**

- production slowdown;
- encouraging the use of sustainable methods destined to protect the environment and landscape, to contribute to the improving of food quality and safety, to anima "welfare";
- *protect rural areas, ensuring a certain level*

of economic activity in every rural area (actually avoiding urban population growth, a serious problem affecting sustainable development).

*We note that the EU has had five environmental programs and action is currently in a program entitled "Environment 2010: Our future, our choice". We note also that the definition of FAO (1992): "Sustainable development can be considered when (1) conserves natural resources (land, water, plants, animals), (2) does not degrade the environment, (3) is economically viable and (4) is socially acceptable".*

**Protecting and creating a real "rural civilization", part of the European identity (Fontain, 2007), it seems to be the major objective of the current CAP. The issue is important and interesting, and needs to be carefully treated in Romania. In Bernea's opinion (2006), it will profoundly affect the old Romanian village civilization, which should not be forgotten even if the majority of the space is already "a reality coming in a strong process of disintegration".**

Issues raised by the new CAP is not simple and are "pseudo - experts", as said Cast in 2007, ready to give erroneous solutions, which adversely affect the animal production, and its competitiveness. We note again that of the 10 systems of milk production, 4, namely those with the highest share in production ( 80 % of cattle livestock, 84 % of EU milk production in 2000 ) were considered as having a negative influence on the environment. To leave them, means to block milk production, and, of course, the EU does not make this. It is expected, sometimes mistakenly, the need to largely pass to organic farming, which can not provide food for the world population and it seems that the idea is not available even in Romania too. The idea was systematically criticized (Drăgănescu 1992,...2007), showing that it organic farming should be practiced only in the marginal regions. We emphasize that the EU regulations are sufficiently flexible. They allow to take into consideration the local conditions so that

**not to affect animal production level.** Exaggeration of expectations, scientifically unsupported (welfare, food safety, etc. ) may cause losses and difficult situations. **There is no sign that the EU envisages to give up intensive industrial animal production. It only requires to become sustainable, to protect the non-renewable resources, the environment, the landscape and simultaneously to encourage the maintenance and development of extensive livestock production in the marginal areas (local pastoral systems, pendulum transhumance)**

We note that till the year 2020 it is forecasted a strong development of animal production, a true revolution (Delgado 1999). It will, of course, affect the European agriculture, and the Romanian agriculture too. Delgado *et al.* notifies the seven characteristics of this revolution as follows:

- (1) A rapid increase of demand in the global market, which will affect production methods and trade;
- (2) The demand of products will move to the developing countries;
- (3) Changing the status of animal production from a mixed activity local activity to a world food action;
- (4) Replacement of cereals with milk and meat to feed people.
- (5) The fast increase of demand for concentrated food at the world level;
- (6) A particular stress for extensive resources and stimulate intensive livestock production in the proximity of the cities;
- (7) An era of rapid technological progress, especially for industrial farming.

#### **V. Some problems of a new E.U. member state-Romania**

*"Why not .... Romania too?"*

Romania is in the EU livestock production where the EU was in the 1960s. Romania joined the EU in the year when the EU changed its agrarian policy. Now, Romania has become a major meat importer instead of an important exporter as it was before. Romania imports even liquid milk. Not all the new admitted EU countries are in this situation. Normally, we should ask ourselves

Diamond's question... Why Hungary exports animal products and Romania imports? The purpose of the question is a simple one: **what we did wrong and still mistaken and what we have to do**. The question is not simple and the answer given before ( Drăgănescu 1992 ... 2008) should be completed. We return to a few issues that we suppose attention again.

**V.I. The issue of a strategy to develop a competitive livestock production**

The economic and social efficiency of production remains the main criterion in animal production policy in the short and medium term, adding it especially long-term conservation of non renewable resources. Romania must have a triple objective and a triple strategy to develop production systems, a double objective and double strategy in the management of animal genetic resources.

*Objective and triple strategy for production systems development*

**a.Revitalization and sustainable development** with innovations and highly productivity of the commercial **intensive industrial farms**, especially in poultry, pigs and cattle. The example of how poultry production is recovered should be followed in pig farming. In cattle, must be considered operating systems tailored to Romania's ecosystems and **follow the Norwegian cooperative system of vertical integration (production, processing, sales ) of industrial firms**.

**b.Revitalization, conservation and sustainable development of pastoral production systems** and free grazing (pendular movement, transhumance, sedentary grazing on marginal lands around the village, free grazing). They had and still have for Romania a special economic, cultural and historical importance. The Treaty for Biodiversity Preservation, the need for sustainable development emphasizes their role now. They, a major component of the extensive agricultural systems, where Europe has numerous NGOs and government organizations, **allow meadow, landscape and biodiversity preservation, a major issue for Romania**. Stimulation of shepherds, professional sheep breeders to a vertical

integration that exclude beneficiaries of processing and wholesale trade, including exports, is a major imperative, along with encouraging the small sheep owners, which are now the basis of the sector.

**c.Development of organic farming systems ( organic ), livestock for special products (fatty liver, snails, ostrich etc), using part and medium time farms, even subsistence farms mainly on marginal land**. We note that organic agriculture ( farming), a certain return to the conservation agriculture in the late 19th century, is important for sustainable development, but it provides more expensive luxury food and does not ensure food security of the population, especially for the world population. These farms can play an important social and economic role, if their presence does not affect the development of commercial farms, generally located on marginal land.

**V.2. Rural development and conservation of the ancient Romanian village civilization** **Protecting and creating a real "rural civilization", a part of the European identity ( Fontain 2007)**, it seems to be the major objective of the current CAP. The issue is important, and need to be carefully understood in Romania. The Romanian village is at a turning point of its evolution, as correctly mentioned Scholtz (2008). The EU offers village the opportunity of its integration into the European level, its revitalization, development of culture and civilization. It should be used, encouraged, but not to lose an important problem: to keep the charm and identity of the village. The old village culture, cultivated and scientifically developed by Gusti 's sociological school, is already falling. **The public bodies paid to continue the sociologists' work, have other duties**. *The zootechnicians should note a great truth. The historical mission of the Romanian people, in front of which the foreign and Romanian historians are puzzled, as Bernea said (2006), the persistence of its historical civilization, hidden in the Romanian village civilizations, is linked to the pastoral life*. Its conservation and development, means also the preservation

of the Romanian ancient civilizations. It is a matter of the local authorities, but also of zootechnicians. Rural development, modernization of village life, and the preservation of civilization and traditional culture, especially in marginal areas, can be helped by grazing maintaining and developing.

**V.3. Scientific community. The engine of civilization was and is science .....** and of animal production too, and scientists, scientific communities are the creative force of science. Keeping our opinions about the characteristics of a scientist, science and pseudoscience about cultural models (Drăgănescu 2009), it is necessary to emphasize the importance of the scientific community the assembly of the scientists in the field of animal production, able to detect the new, to direct itself in order to support science and production to progress, to control itself and connect with other communities. Ziman (1981 ) considered that the existence of these communities is essential and, strictly necessary for the development of developing countries. A remark: their formation is very complicated, time-consuming and must be competent and consistently followed. **Simply naming scientists is not an effective and efficient community .. and the gang is not a scientific community . It is important for us to think about this problem.**

#### **V.4. The use of human resources**

The answer to the question: Why a country is rich and another one is poor is given not only by the difference between the geographical position, the past and the difference between the institutions of the states, the "Guns, Germs and Steel" as Diamond thought. The use of human resources is a major cause. A rich country does not export mathematicians but it imports. Not Spain rejoices that it can send people to pick strawberries in Romania but vice versa. **Perhaps society needs more competent people with moral responsibility, ethics, than wise people, in the sense that they know when to be quiet and when to speak, when it is for their benefit. We end this study not by accident reminding of science and education. A**

**modern and competitive animal production could not effectively operate without being directed by professionals with a high level of scientific training. Ultimately, the key to progress is the man, the fair selection, training, promotion and use of human values** ( Drăgănescu 1968)

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Modern animal production, like the whole actual civilization, is a product of Europe of the last five centuries.

The extension of the European civilization at the world level brought Europe a danger besides profit.

The globe underdeveloped area has become more competitive and Europe risked its position of leader and even its security.

In front of this danger, the European countries joined their forces and established a new Common Agricultural Policy to assure their food and political security.

The substantial subsidization of the agriculture development increased production cost and the lack of competitiveness imposed a new and more efficient CAP.

In Romania, during the last 50 years, under the empire of political errors, animal production has become more intensive, and partially modernized, but this modernization failed at the same time with the political terror. Therefore, Romania entered into the EU in the moment when its production was at the level of the European one in the years 1960s, when the subsidies were smaller.

Under these conditions, Romania should pay attention to the following aspects:

- (a) to revitalize the sustainable development of the commercial intensive industrial farms;
- (b) to revitalize the development of pastoral production systems;
- (c) to develop the organic agricultural systems and even to temporarily maintain the subsistence farms;
- (d) to assure rural development and preservation of the whole Romanian village civilization;
- (e) to develop the scientific life in the field of animal husbandry and an antitrust system;

(f) to assure the correct selection, training, promotion and use of the human values.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank those who suggested and required this work, Agatha Popescu for her contribution to the translation of this paper into English and also his son, Andrei Drăgănescu for his help in providing very interesting papers on the topic.

## REFERENCES

- [1]Batie Sandra S., Healy Robert G., 1980, The Future of American Agriculture as a Strategic Resource, Conservation Foundation
- [2]Bernea Ernest, Pande Rodica, 2006, Romanian village civilization, Vremea Press House, Bucharest
- [3]Diamond Jared, 1999, Guns, Germs, and Steel. The Fate of Human Societies, New York, W.W.Norton
- [4]Diamond Jared, 2005, Collapse: How Societies choose to Fail or Succeed. New York. Penguin Books
- [5]Draganescu, C., 1968, Aspects from the British animal husbandry
- [6]Draganescu, C., 1992, 1995, Actual situation, objectives and strategy in the animal production development in Romania I,II,III,IV-Economic Tribune No. 32,33,34,35
- [7]Draganescu, C., 1998, Local sheep breeds from the Central and South-eastern Europe - important points in the Romanians' history (in The Press House of the Romanian Academy -Studies of Economic History, Vol. III:77-99
- [8]Draganescu, C., 1998 Romanian Sheep Production: Spectacular Past, Decline, Uncertain Future.FAO REU Sheep and Goat production in CEEC:179-187
- [9]Draganescu, C., 2000, About models of sustainable and competitive development of animal production in Romania, Scientific Papers Series D, Animal Science, 70-73
- [10]Draganescu, C., 2000a, West-European agricultural policies, Romanian Agriculturist, No.10, pp.11-12
- [11]Draganescu, C., 2000 b, CAP-orientation for the Romanian agricultural policy, Romanian Agriculturist, No.11, pp.6-7
- [12]Draganescu, C., 2001, Romanian agricultural policy and sustainable development of animal production, Annals of University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Bucharest
- [13]Drăgănescu C., 2001, 2002, Problems of free-ranging livestock systems in Romania, In: La Canada 15:7-9
- [14]Draganescu, C., 2005, The progress of animal sciences. Journal of Animal Science.
- [15]Draganescu, C., 2005, Grazing and Romanian history Aromanians - a vector of an ancient pastoral culture, Journal of Animal Science 4:3
- [16]Draganescu, C., 2006, For a New Paradigm in Farm Animal Taxonomy. Book of Abstracts, the 57th EAAP Annual Meeting, Antalya, Turkey
- [17]Draganescu, C., 2008, Sustainable development and the problem of a national strategy for animal production. Journal of Animal Science
- [18]Gervais Michel, Servolin Claude, Weil Jean, 1965, Une France sans paysans, Ed. du Seuil
- [19]Fontain Pascal, 2007, Europe in 12 lessons, Of. Publ UE
- [20]Harlem R.J. from Monoculture and the Future of American Agriculture. in: The Future of Am. Agr.: 117-152
- [21]Klatzmann, J., 1978, L'Agriculture française, Inedit Econ.
- [22]Mendras Henri, 1970, La fin des paysans; changement et innovations dans les sociétés rurales françaises.
- [23]Ruttan, W.V., 1980, Agricultural Research and the Future of American Agriculture. in: The Future of American Agriculture
- [24]Seré, C., Steinfeld, H., 1996, World livestock production systems: current status, issues and trends, FAO Animal Production and Health Paper 127. Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Animal Production and Health Division
- [25]Scholtz Bela, 2008, Structural funds accession by Measure 121, Economic Tribune No.9, pp.78
- [26]Vavra, M., 1996, Sustainability of animal production systems. An ecological perspective. J. Anim. Sci. 74:1418-1423
- [27]Ziman, J., 1981 Puzles, Problems and Enigms, Cambridge University Press