

Abstract
Habilitation Thesis

dr. Viorel Stănică

Territorial-Administrative Policies and Community Development

Territorial-administrative organization of a country – put in practice through legal means - represents an important element of upper-structure as it determines the setting up of the state administration and of all the administrative sub-systems, it frames from a territorial standpoint the political life and it organizes the economic and the social life of a nation. The administrative models adopted are always imposed by the historical, geo-political, economic and social conditions within the territory.

Romania has experienced territorial-administrative organizations at least as tumultuous as its history, the search for the optimal model oscillating between centralized systems and decentralized ones, or imposed models - all of them conceived once the state was united within the framework of a unitary state.

The present study, titled ” **Romanian territorial-administrative policies in modern and contemporary time**” aims to describe the administrative models, to analyze the cases that determined them and to emphasize the impact the administrative organization – ensured through political codes – had on the national territory.

The political and historical developments from the 19th century have marked the evolution of the territorial-administrative organization of the provinces inhabited by Romanians. It is a spectacular period which, at the beginning, marks a separate evolution of the Romanian provinces – Moldavia and Muntenia having a similar path. Being successively under the rule of the Ottoman Empire and of Russia, these territories adopt Organic Rules in 1830 and in 1832, respectively – true constitutions which brought forward a modern administrative organization. Events as the Revolution from 1848 and the Unification of the Romanian provinces (Moldavia and Muntenia) in 1859 resulted in the formation of a national state. The administrative organization within the other provinces: Transylvania, Bucovina and Basarabia show specific conditions of evolution. The development policies of the transport infrastructure have represented an important element in the consolidation of the cohesion of the territory.

During the Inter-war period, Great Romania was confronted with problems specific for a transitory phase determined by the necessity of a legislative unification in order to ensure the

control of the state over the entire territory and over the administrative organization – which proved to be a difficult process. The global economic crisis during 1929 and 1933, the political instability of the country, the setting up of the royal dictatorship and the beginning of the World War II represented complex events which determined a continuous struggle for Romania to find the right administrative model. The creation of the modern unitary national state required the legislative unification of the country. The legislative endeavors regarding the integration of the Romanian provinces have been confronted with different models of administrative organization, which have pre-existed in each of the Romanian territories. Also, the way in which the legislative unification was done encountered difficulties, a series of adjustments and changes being thus necessary.

The administrative laws from 1929 and 1936, which were created under the influence of the 1923 Constitution, introduced two different models of administrative organization: one focusing on local autonomy and decentralization and the other on centrality – both of them within the framework of the Constitution from 1923.

The territorial organizational model based on the regional level, with its characteristics, determined by the 1938 Constitution, which set up the royal dictatorship imposed by Carol II, brings as a novelty the county (*ținutul* in Romanian) as administrative-territorial unit. The in-depth regulations regarding systematization and urban planning are also worth mentioning during this period.

During World War II, Romania implemented, from the standpoint of the administration of the territory, a crisis model, centralized, established by the government led by I. Antonescu

After 1944, the Communist administrative policies had a significant impact on the territory, which was re-organized following the Russian model which divided it into regions and *raioane* (in Romanian). The transformations in agriculture led to the amalgamation of the agriculture lands and the organization of the collective agriculture. Starting with 1968, the creation of counties and the policies of economic development during the Socialist period, all had a great impact on the territory.

In the post-socialist era, Romania underwent a significant transformation of the political system as well as significant changes in the economy, with significant influences on how space/territory is organized. We are witnessing the emergence of new forms of territorial arrangements and technical infrastructure, consistent with similar models existing in the European Union. They range from new forms of administrative organization to technical transport infrastructures and to industrial technical infrastructures.

The issue of development has been involving a serious concern as economic growth, human welfare and social progress are more difficult to obtain today in the context of global economy than in the past. It can be seen that economic growth can be nationally or regionally and simultaneously

there can be serious imbalances between the component units. On the one hand, we record economic growth by means of new industrial implantation, increasing employment etc. and on the other hand increased poverty, unemployment, increased number of the socially assisted, environmental degradation. Economic growth does not necessarily mean general welfare. The development ideal would be for it to generate wealth for everyone.

Community development is a relatively new field of study that has been raising an increasing interest in recent decades. Phenomena arising from the globalization of the economy, especially in areas less prepared to deal with this new paradigm and which absorb the shocks of change more difficult, causes seeking ways of action to ensure sustainability, the sustainable community development.

Fields of study related to community development are: Public Policy, Urban Planning and Development, Rural Development, Regional Development, Spatial Planning, Sociology, Community Psychology, NGOs Management, Public Management, Political Economy and Human Geography.

A subject of practical relevance, Community Development extracts its essence from the multiple experiences of communities of different types and in different places, thus explaining and providing solutions to a broad range of socio-economic problems.

The need to study Community Development is more than obvious. The public sector is one of the most important actors in community development, as it governs and provides the institutional framework for the implementation of normative acts no community can back out from, no matter how high the degree of autonomy. Public authorities' and institutions' cooperation with other development actors, communities, the private sector and the non-governmental one, the agents' understanding of sustainable community development processes, taking responsibility for supporting, assisting communities to produce their own development, represents the solution for a harmonious social development.

Much of the development programs with a governmental, nongovernmental financing or financed by structural and cohesion funds, require the involvement of agents from the local administration to take responsibility for roles of animators, facilitators, development agents, or for guidance and control functions. Their knowledge of community development theories, of the concepts community development operates with, of working methods with community groups, of certain community development models, represents the condition to ensure administrative efficiency and to create bridges to reduce the gap between the administration and the citizen.

It is important and relevant to emphasize the difference between development and economic growth. Economic growth is more focused on quantitative, measurable aspects, such as the gross domestic product per capita, number of jobs, income per capita, number of dwellings etc.

Improving these indicators does not necessarily mean better for the community. On the one hand they should be linked with other indicators in the scope of education, health, poverty, to have a picture of the development. On the other hand, the contexts may differ even within the same regions, or between urban and rural areas. For example, the same increase in the average income/capita may signify more for a citizen in rural areas, where the cost of living is lower than for a citizen in a big city where the cost of living has more components and is generally higher.

Development involves complex and profound changes within the community. These include both the economic changes necessary to increase human welfare and those concerning the functioning of institutions and organizations, the extent of people's involvement in local issues, the level of living, the relationship with the environment.