

ETHNIC AND STRUCTURAL ASPECTS WITHIN THE REGIONALIZATION PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF TERRITORIAL CAPITAL IN ROMANIA

Eugen, IORDĂNESCU

„Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, eugeniordanescu@yahoo.com
Liaison country APA Division 52, Country representative IAREP

ABSTRACT: Ethnic and structural aspects within the regionalization process and management of territorial capital in Romania Prof. Dr. The article examines the key concepts relating to territorial planning, territorial capital, regionalization and the implementation level of these in Romania. Conceptual clarifications show that the practice of development planning is not uniform in Europe, still there can be identified several axes of reference. In Romania, the discussion about territorial capital is almost nonexistent, and public policies of territorial planning have a declarative character, concrete measures are rare and without consistency and convergence in the national territory or at the level of regions, counties or towns. Unfortunately, the approach of this topic is mainly done upon based upon the national majority binomial – ethnic minority and national unity – separatism, which have remained in the public and political discourse since the early years of the Trianon Agreement. The years of socialist dictatorship sharpened the ethnic divergences and asperities, especially due to the 2 decades during which Romania had exactly implemented the Soviet policy, creating a special regional territorial management for the zones with majority population of Hungarian nationality. The economic crisis and generalized competition for resources requires a serious and pragmatic approach of the matter of territorial planning.

Keywords: territorial planning, territorial capital, territorial governance, public policy, sustainable development, regionalization, collective and individual rights.

1. DEVELOPING REGION IN EUROPEAN CONTEXT

Developing regions are entities of balanced economic and social development meant to ensure catching of gaps and prevention of further gaps. To do this, the criteria used for configuring or reconfiguring the composition of the regions should be subsumed only the objectives of balanced economic development, cohesion and solidarity.

Functionally speaking, in Europe we have administrative regions and statistical regions. Statistical regions are used for statistical comparisons to similar NUTS levels, while administrative regions have somewhat similar functions to Romania's counties (they have elected regional councils and appointed staff, have their own income sources from exploitation of public regional resources and regional taxes or duties). The administrative or statistic nature of regions in the European Union is a matter for the exclusive national governments. Existence of statistical or administrative regions, however, is mandatory for cohesion and solidarity policies as well as for access to structural instruments.

To define the levels of statistic and/or administrative aggregation the Union uses since 1988 the NUTS classification. First Regulation of the Parliament and Council on NUTS was adopted in 2003. NUTS regulation provides a review every three years. For

EU-25 the latest revision was adopted in 2005 and became operational on January 1, 2008. [7]

In 2007 the regulation embedded regional structures of Romania and Bulgaria, at the same time with the accession of those into the European Union (Regulation (EC) No 176/2008 Regulation (EC) No 176/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 February 2008 amending Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 on the establishment of a common classification of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) by reason of the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union - Official Journal L 061, 5 March 2008).

The criteria used for regional division in the Union are either of a legislative nature, or of analytic nature. Legislative criteria are the expression of the national political will regarding the allocation within regions for local communities and population size for each region, necessary and sufficient for effective fulfilment of economic and social tasks. Analytic or functional criteria are defining regions based on analytic requirements in relation to geographical grouping (areas with similar altitude and soil, for example), or socio-economic, like polarity complementarity or economic homogeneity (resulting regions such as wine regions mining area, etc.).

Romania has defined in 1998 in the frame of the Law of Regional Development under Act 151 [5] eight development regions, using normative criteria. They have no legal personality and are not

constituted as administrative-territorial units, being part to the category of statistical regions. At that time, the territorial definition of the eight regions suffered a number of critics, more of political than functional nature. After half a century of communism and centralized economy, unfortunately, functional historical regions in Romania remained only a memory. Beyond any political or doctrinal approach, there were no conditions left for applying the criteria to delimit functional regions of development, the only reasonable way remaining the normative one.

2. TERRITORIAL PLANNING AND TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE

Dividing the territory of a state into economic areas - whether they are administrative territorial or statistic units - is part of territorial planning sensitive operations. Territorial planning has especially concerned developed countries of Europe, starting with the `80s, seemingly being inspired from Dutch model of territorial planning, whose roots date back in the `50s. In Europe and the in the world generally, there is no model of spatial or territorial planning [2], but there is at least one conceptual unit of views in this area. Thus, territorial planning relates generally to methods and models used by public authorities at various levels to influence by public policies the distribution of human activities of economic and social nature to territories where that public authority governs them.

Meanwhile, the spatial approach has recorded significant changes. Thus, while during the `70s there was heavily used the concept of determined territorial zoning (setting of dedicated areas of human activity, such as areas of housing, commercial or industrial areas, etc.), whose expression were specific planning tools such as general urban plans - urban planning area (with uniform and homogeneous areas intended), it is now increasingly applied the concept of mixed-use land (mixed-use land) [1], which has determined the development of more compact cities or some mega-urban structures.

Spatial planning is now seen in developed countries as closely linked to both the sustainable economic development (based on environmental preservation and cultural heritage components) as well as to the social and territorial cohesion. At the level of the European Union, the desire for territorial cohesion is mentioned in the Lisbon Treaty and subject to the "Territorial Agenda" signed by Member States signed in Leipzig, 2007 [9].

The same theme is reflected in the European legislative level in the document known as The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) [9]

Territorial planning should determine - for each of the states (or territories) where it applies - a balanced regional development, based on coherent and cohesive organization of physical, economic and social „space". Through harmonized and integrated public policies, public authorities at all levels should aim to achieve specific and cohesive development of regions, based on joint participation in the partnership of public and private actors. As shown in basic programming documents at the level of the European Union [10] and in various academic researches, [8] regional planning includes both relational and functional aspects involving the material and immaterial factors alike.

Directly related to the concept of territorial planning is that of territorial governance. Territorial governance refers to the existence of „government entity" in the territory to which it refers able to coordinate political, social, economic actors to achieve and implement appropriate and non-destructive public policies to the human and material capital in such a manner as based upon to functional promoting of subsidiarity, partnership and cooperation, make „territories" to strive for cohesive and solidarity recomposition of the European space.

3. ROMANIAN CONTEXT FOR ESDP AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In Romania the most fundamental concepts relating to regional development and territorial planning are integrated into political documents or legal instruments. Thus, regional development law, amended in 2004 [6], declares as fundamental to economic development the principles of subsidiarity, partnership and decentralization. Still, the historical and political situation of the twentieth century in South and South-Eastern Europe has determined the maintaining of practices and political support of total different kinds, which in turn generate political attitudes, legislation and practices quite others than the principles mentioned above, sometimes with accents of irrationality.

The most important interference in this context brings majority-minority national rate. Romania was formed as a unitary national state at the end of World War I upon dissolution of the Austro - Hungarian Empire. Peace treaties signed at the end of World War I set the boundaries of national states formed after disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the special rights of minorities to enjoy.

These rights are defined as collective rights, granted by national or ethnic criteria, rather than individual rights in the contemporary sense of the term. Collective rights of national minorities were guaranteed by the national state whose citizens were/became the respective national minorities. Committed and guaranteed by international treaties, collective rights for national minorities have rather created the increment of xenophobic and revanchist manifestations.

The theme of collective rights and claiming an administration management system based on the ethnic composition of the population is present in claims and policy actions of the Hungarian minority in Romania throughout the period since signing the Peace Treaty of Trianon. The treaty ended a period of „millennial” ethnic and national inequality in Central and Southeast Europe, European area where domination of the Habsburg Empire and later on of the Austro-Hungarian Empire carried on to the fact that most of the unitary national states were set up after World War I. In all these states there was a significant pressure in terms of granting or maintaining collective rights of national minorities - in all cases it is the Hungarian minority - and in particular with regard to self-determination and territorial capital administration based on ethnic dominance.

The already historical tension between the ethnic majority-minority existing in the region in the years before World War I was marked by at least unfortunate occurrences after 1918 and during the World War II. In this category fall, for example, the events triggered by the proclamation by the communists led by Béla Kun of the Hungarian Soviet state. The new Hungarian communist state attempted to reconstruct some of the old borders and attacked Czechoslovakia and Transylvania, trying to occupy them. Romanian army fought back and occupied a good part of Hungary. Under the command of General George Mărdărescu Romanian army entered Budapest on August 4, 1919, occupied the Hungarian capital and determined the resignation of Béla Kun and the removal of the Soviet regime in Hungary, in what was called „the occupation of 45 days”. Horthy became the Hungarian leader, who remained a milestone in the development of the Hungarian irredentist current; due to the alliance managed with German fascism he succeeded to „recompose” a part of Greater Hungary.

In the years following the Treaty of Trianon, the Western part of Romania - Transylvania - had a highly troubled history, being the scene of violent ethnic and ideological confrontations. After the

Great Union of 1918 - the historic event due to which the modern national Romanian state was formed - Hungarian pressures to „recover” Transylvania have never ceased, being part of the general pressure for restoration of Greater Hungary. Horthy's alliance with Hitler brought back a number of territories in the composition of Hungary, for a short time, including Northern Transylvania. But restoring the strength of the Hungarian government and especially the abuses in the areas „donated” by Hitler to Horthy led to an unprecedented deterioration of interethnic relations in the region.

Cancellation of Hitler's arbitrary decisions regarding the territorial configuration of Europe brought back Hungary into the borders established at Trianon, after signing the treaties on peace as a defeated state of World War I. Northern Transylvania returned to Romania, and nationalism and chauvinism have registered significant increases. Both Romanians and Hungarians lived intense years of frustration, both citing different reasons and events that demanded return and revenge. Thus, Hungarians regretted the years of dominance and privileged status of the nation, they wanted them back - „Millennial Hungarian Empire” - and the Romanian national state-supported the national-unitary state formed after the Great Union and demanded revenge for the horrible anti-Romanian massacres such as those of Ip and Trăzneu.

At the end of World War II territories „annexed” by the Nazis and their allies went back to countries where from taken away, but repeated changes of attribute minority - majority since less than three decades maintained at high level the frustration of all „minorities” and „majorities” of the area.

Fall of the „iron curtain” left the region to the discretion of Soviet troops, which established, using tanks and the Red Army, the socialist regimes. USSR would use all countries as to become the Warsaw Pact zone, a policy of „keeping chess” of national authority, in which the minorities were used and relied upon as a true „fifth column” to counter apparent political and ideological slippages. USSR did not want to strengthen national states of the former Soviet camp, but rather to dissolve power and national identity, this dissolution allowing a better implementation of socialist internationalism and policies of exploiting natural and financial resources of „sister countries”.

This context is fully reflected in terms of territorial management in Romania and other countries under Soviet influence, where minorities were used as means of pressure for national governments, under

the apparent principle of „monolithic unity of the working class”.

In Romania the existence of such an approach is visible with the adoption of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Romania, in 1952 [3], where the preamble states:

„National minorities in the People's Republic of Romania full enjoy equality of rights with the Romanian people. In the People's Republic of Romania there is ensured territorial administrative autonomy of the Hungarian population of Szekely districts where it forms a compact mass.,,

Throughout the 1952 Constitution, the only national minority with special rights is called the Hungarian one. This coexists with the provisions of the same Constitution that prohibits „the establishments of direct or indirect privileges on matters of race or nationality citizens belong to” (Art.81). Article 18 of the same Constitution refers to administrative-territorial division of the country and rules the existence of the Hungarian Autonomous Region (RAM). No other region in Romania is furthermore mentioned in the Constitution, excepting RAM, to which the following three articles are dedicated as follows:

„Art 19. The Hungarian Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of Romania consists of compact Hungarian population living there and have autonomous leadership, chosen by the people of the Autonomous Region. Hungarian Autonomous Region covers the districts: Ciuc Georgenes, Odorhei, Reghin, Sângeorgiu de Pădure, Sf. Gheorghe, Târgu Mures, Târgu-Secuiesc, Toplița. The administrative center of the Hungarian Autonomous Region is the city of Târgu Mures.

Article 20. Laws of the People's Republic of Romania, decisions of central and state provisions are binding on the territory of the Hungarian Autonomous Region.

Article 21. Regulation of the Hungarian Autonomous Region Autonomous is issued by the Regional Council and submitted for approval to the Greater National Assembly of People's Republic of Romania.”

To these there is added Article 82, which provides that „(...) In residential districts with other populations than the Romanian nationality, all bodies and institutions will use oral and written language of those nationalities and will be appointing officials from that nationality or of other locals who know the language and way of living of local people, „which was preferentially applied to

the Hungarian minority and - only sometimes - Saxons.

Special rights granted to the Hungarian minority should have reduced inter-ethnic tensions and dim revanchist pressures. Unfortunately, the result was exactly the opposite: the Hungarian Autonomous Region has undergone a real process of ethnic and linguistic enclave, largely because of the extensive and often exclusive use of Hungarian language in administration and public life. Frustration of Romanians becoming minorities in Romania was added to the already well based frustration of Hungarian to be Romanian citizens. The 50s, when - truth or fiction - to buy something from the market or in a store in Târgu Mureș one had to ask in Hungarian language, had led to increased nationalist attitude of the Romanians in Transylvania. For those Hungarians whose dissatisfaction referred to „the loss” of Transylvania, the existence of Hungarian Autonomous Region RAM was an additional occasion to express nationalist and chauvinist feelings and to deplore the „Greater Hungary”. The effects were certainly visible to the communist government in Bucharest, which in 1960 amended the administrative-territorial division, obviously to decrease the share of the Hungarian population in the region, renamed the Mureș-Hungarian Autonomous Region (RMAM). Thus, Luduș and Târnăveni districts, mainly inhabited by Romanian and Mureș Region belonging until 1952 to the Mures Region, are to make part of RMAM and Târgu Secuiesc and Sfântu Gheorghe, mainly inhabited by Hungarians and belonging until 1952 to the Stalin region would be part of the Region Brașov (administrative region successor of Stalin region). The administrative-territorial reorganization obviously centred on the „Hungarian topic” signals a deeper detachment from the „party line” drawn from Moscow and shows that the communist government perceived the effects of the administration of the territory according to ethnic criteria as negative. In 1968 the whole Soviet model of administrative-territorial organization was abandoned, all regions being dismantled. From that moment until today, administrative - territorial unit is the county.

Establishment of the Hungarian Autonomous Region and its operation between 1952 and 1968 as special administrative zone formed according to ethnic lines and with two official languages (Romanian and Hungarian) demonstrated that the economic and social effect did not grow solidarity, but rather the increased frustration and separation. Tragic events of Târgu Mureș in 1990 - during which violent street clashes between Romanians and Hungarians occurred- clearly showed that the level of frustration

on both sides was extremely high and broke out in the street in an unfortunate way. Provoked or not, part or not part of an extreme scenario, the events in Târgu-Mureş showed that the collective mental state in Transylvania remains a hot spot.

The small space and martial history of Europe have made today on any of its territories, regardless of the state or nation to which they belong, to occur nationalist chauvinistic and revanchist movements. Each of the „claiming parts” chooses a landmark in time and a principle to which they relate, to invoke „historical injustice”. The same goes with the Romanians and Hungarians....

Accession to the European Union should have solved many of the political frustrations of Hungarians and Romanians in Romania and Hungary, the territorial capital management and creation of economic development regions are expected to change the point of gravity of argument - and dispute – from ethnic criteria and binomial majority - minority to cohesion and solidarity criteria.

It would have been expected a reconfiguration of space for public debate and political action, both from the Romanian political actors and political actors from Hungary. The Romanian politicians and large parties or organizations like the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania UDMR - representative political organization of the Hungarian minority, formed in December 25, 1989 - would have been expected to leave the register of ethnic issue in terms of territorial capital administration and discuss, make decisions based on functional criteria defining the European principles of solidarity and economic and social convergence. EU accession of both Hungary and Romania means accession to the principle of cohesion and solidarity, to that of democracy by ensuring mutual prosperity and equal chances. Collective rights, on ethnic or any other criteria are not subrogated to all such action directions and ultimately lead to differences and divisions.

European regions are not - and functioning of the Union will not allow them to be! - reasons and models of division, but reasons and patterns of decentralization, that bring economic, political, social decisions as close as possible to the citizen , the manifestation of „Unity in Diversity”.

4. ETHNIC INTERFERENCE IN ROMANIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTION

This did unfortunately not happen, although during the last decade, Romania has become an example of good practice in relation to the rights granted to

national minorities and - especially - the Hungarian minority.

Maintaining centralized paradigm and ethnic paradigm is still evident especially when it comes to territorial capital management in general and regionalization in particular.

In all forms it has been working in, the law upon regional development states that

„Development regions are not administrative-territorial units and do not have legal personality” [4]

Negative determination in the text of the law indicates two critical points in the political debate in Romania on territorial capital management: centralization and „unity.”

Or, on the one hand, creation of several development regions with legal personality would significantly reduce the degree of centralization of political and development decision, the „legal person” having substantial autonomy and being able to manage budgets.

Thus, lack of legal personality for developing regions protects the central state just against the „danger” of losing total control exercised in particular through the attribute of administration and allocation attribute of the National Regional Development Fund - the fundamental source of financing multi-regional development programs - financed from the state budget.

Moreover, establishment of development regions as administrative-territorial units is seen in the Romanian political and public environment as a dismantling action, breaking the „unity” of the Romanian national unitary state, defined in the Constitution.

Such an approach seems at first sight absurd, but put into context of the historical events mentioned above, it makes sense: at least in part, both Romanians and Hungarians continue to evaluate management and political decisions in the 21-th century according to ethnic and national paradigm of the early twentieth century.

Remembering the Hungarian Autonomous Region is still vivid in the social conscience, many Romanians consider that such an entity should no longer exist, while many Hungarians consider that restoration of some forms of territorial entities with ethnic Hungarian majority is a desirable and priority objective.

The main political parties in Romania and UDMR- The Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania - as the political representative of

Romanians belonging to the Hungarian national minority - are on this topic in a continuous action-reaction relationship type.

Especially before political elections, the political discourse is more and more acute, some Romanian political leaders trying to discredit opponents by exacerbating the nationalist and chauvinist discourse.

The same phenomenon is recorded in the component entities making up UDMR, Hungarian leaders trying to fully capitalize Hungarian ethnic discourse and - sometimes - chauvinistic and revanchist.

5. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACH IN TODAY ROMANIA

Although these are mostly political approaches in the public discourse, relating to regions, in Romania there is no lack of views based on applying fundamental principles of contemporary efficient administration of the territorial capital.

Thus, in relevant analysis, there is required to amend the law on regional development, not as geographic reshaping of developing regions, but in the sense of change operating principles.

After 12 years of operation, statistic and structural analysis indicates that the current approach has failed in respect to the basic objective stated and assumed, respectively reduction of regional imbalances and prevention of causing further imbalances.

Thus, the distance between the eight statistic regions in terms of key macroeconomic indicators did not significantly decrease, but increased in some areas.

Failure is put mainly on account of maintaining excessive centralism, allocation of insignificant funds from the state budget for regional development, but especially because of the non-existence of one entity endowed with authority in order to set up and implement regional development plans.

Major financing of regional development projects from European funds show the low level of budgeting priority that the national government allots to regional development and to a balanced and efficient administration of the territory.

Decision making in „partnerships”, according to which there are formed the Regional Development Councils is now taken by competing entities, each county, city or village represented by mandate into this Council, seeking mostly to attract more consistent funds for the administrative-territorial unit where it comes from.

The members of this Regional Council are therefore more likely competitors in terms of financial allocations, rather than partners who offer and support programs and projects on cohesion and solidarity.

Such a point of view is statistically supported by the analysis of average financial allocations for the counties that make up the regions; average multi annual allocations per district are not significantly different, which may suggest a distribution rather on the principle of „fairness” than a distribution on the principle of competitive projects (which it is expected to bring much higher allocations in developed areas, with greater economic, management and absorption capacity) or on the principle of concentration (which would focus on funding a branch and well-defined territorial area).

Dispersal of funds in the frame of the administrative-territorial units is usually maximum in the county where there is located the headquarters of the regional development agency, a situation which shows again the tendency to manifest particular interest in addressing to local development rather than to regional interest.

Out of these reasons, there should be presumable a greater efficiency of regional allocations and a rebalancing of funding from local projects towards integrative projects, if regions had a technical body with regional decision-making, not dependant by the political aggregation on principles of partnership and political and administrative actors in the components counties .

It is unlikely to solely change the approach of regional development in Romania, since the political and legislative pressure is continuous in the paradigm antagonism „ethnic determination” and „defence of national unity” and works - as I pointed out - onto the principle of action and reaction.

In this continuous action-reaction is registered also the latest legislative proposal amending the law on regional development of UDMR (Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania) member of parties of government arch that supports the replacement of the 8 existing statistical areas with 16 regions of the same nature. Moreover, the legislative initiative concerned, currently located in the parliamentary debate, proposes only this amendment, leaving untouched the rest of principles and action schemes mentioned in the previous law.

One such newly created region would „restore” just the former Hungarian Autonomous Region, which reopens and amplifies the „reaction” to defend the

national unitary state defined by the Constitution of Romania.

Reasons accompanying the legislative proposal coming from leaders of UDMR (Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania) are representative for freezing the ethnic paradigm of post-Trianon: ethnic minority must be protected by collective rights and positive discrimination, failing to become a minority „oppressed.”

Of course, also answers of Romanian leaders have remained frozen into the same historic period: the emergence of administration enclaves with a majority population belonging to ethnic minorities questions the unity of the national state and the rights of „majority.”

Unfortunately, these claims and counter-claims block the debate that is more than necessary on the future and efficiency of regional development policies, optimizing approaches for coherent management of territorial capital, etc.

Even this legislative proposal is supported or disputed beyond the general framework of European regional development policies.

Thus, the regulatory NUTS scheme allows significant modification for the territorial structure of one or more regions, if designed to reduce development disparities among regions in the same state - explicitly – if this reduces dispersion of population in the regions concerned.

Switching from the current 8 development regions to the 16 statistic regions of statistic development does not reduce the regional population dispersion and has as an effect the increasing of regional disparities.

Thus:

- minimum maximum ratio for the population exceeds 1 / 3, 5
- minimum / maximum ratio for average number of employees exceeds 1 / 17
- minimum / maximum ratio for gross profit exceeding 1 / 29
- minimum / maximum ratio for area exceeding 1 / 88

Referring to better economic structure of land, the project ignores even the minimal spatial data, such as those on transport corridors and easy access to locations. It is clear that a better and balanced structure of a territory is not as to occur if transportation networks connecting counties that are members of a statistic region are rarefied of poor quality.

Unfortunately, the 16 proposed statistical regions would have major transportation problems in more than half of cases.

Even the region of interest for UDMR (Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania), Covasna, Harghita and Mureş – now belonging to Region 7 Centre, together with the counties of Alba, Brasov and Sibiu - would become one with major problems regarding internal motorways and railway link between counties and their capitals, mainly due to major mountain landscape and the contact and minor contact with the highways and pan-European transport corridors.

Also from this point of view, creating a region to contain only Bucharest Municipality is completely out of coherent vision for regional development.

Bucharest - Romania's capital, with a population of over 2 million inhabitants - and many other cities, is smothered in its own territory. In terms of development of industrial sites and residential areas, Bucharest is simply „overflowing” the surrounding villages.

At this time, the development of a metropolitan area is of extreme emergency because lack of infrastructure coordination and especially lack of adequate resources in areas surrounding urban infrastructure and business, has created a true blocking development.

In terms of the basin of interest to workforce, it covers a radius of ten kilometres around the city, but urban public transport and rail transport are still not designed to meet such an influx of people and goods.

Lack of coordinated policy and a consistent funding situation will lead to a permanent situation, significant development suppression and increased production and housing costs. If Bucharest by itself will become a statistic region, we will probably have Bucharest Metropolitan Area which will include pieces from several regions, with all complications and the emerging financing blockages with gaps and significant differences with regard to development goals and their financial coverage.

Each municipality will continue to fund municipal infrastructure as before, roads, etc. on its territory, with all the negative implications of the management space.

Situation of minimum and maximum values within the 16 proposed new development regions, in terms of population recorded statistically, the average number of employees reported in balance sheets in 2008 (excluding national business companies) and

gross operating profit reported balances accounting in 2008 (excluding national business companies) and

the surface is:

	Population	Employees 2008	Profit in 2008	Square km area
	733 884	49.713	566,613,965	285

These minimum and maximum values correspond to the following regions of the UDMR proposal:

	Population	Employees 2008	Profit in 2008	Area kmp square
Min.	Giurgiu, Teleorman	Giurgiu, Teleorman	Giurgiu, Teleorman	Bucharest
Max.	Bacău, Iași, Neamț, Vaslui	Bucharest	Bucharest	Arad, Caraș-Severin, Timiș

Around the proposed new structure, poverty pole seems to be in Giurgiu - Teleorman, which would hold the national minimum (and at some indicators the EU minimum) for many economic indicators relevant to local and regional development. Giurgiu-Teleorman would be unlikely to reduce disparities, regardless of the growth model that Romania would practice. Even after the Soviet model of economic growth (“maximum mobilization of capital and labour”- extensive growth model), implemented by the socialist regime in our country, this new region would have serious difficulties because it registers a minimum of population, minimum of employees and third place in the queue in terms of area (after Bucharest, Botoșani, Suceava), indicating a low presence of natural resources in the territory. In terms of investment, unfortunately, Giurgiu and Teleorman recorded a bad situation both to FDI (foreign direct investment) and capital or industrial investments in general.

6. SOME ISSUES FOR TOMORROW...

Thus, the changes of territorial allocations within statistic regions would configure an increase of regional disparities and re-concentration of the minims in from the Northern Eastern part of Romania to the Southern part.

- Romania’s passing from the 8 statistic regions to 16 such entities without juridical personality and without them being constituted into administrative-territorial units, does not at all lead to a more balanced structure of territorial capital management, still, moreover, leaves unsolved matters of principle for regions’ operation, whatever these are constituted upon legal or analytical criteria. Besides, any change of this kind leaves furthermore unsolved essential matters regarding the administration of territorial capital and regionalization, such as:
- Which is the „intermediate power” between national level and NUTS 3 or LAU („Local Administrative Units”), whereas level NUTS 1

(so called macro-regions) and NUTS 2 (regions) have only a statistic existence?

- How are the principles of decentralization and subsidiary applied if there is no functional or administrative joint between the Government – national budget and the next administrative-territorial level, being in force to function as an administration entity of the public budget (so called „chief accountant”)?
- How will there be ensured the interest and mobilization level to develop statistic regions, if there is no connecting functional formula from developing efforts to results and available budget (for example by introducing some taxes or fees for the regional level and, as a consequence, reducing taxation at national level – explicitly – he share of national allotment to finance regional development projects)?
- How will there be determined and kept the politic interest for regional development and good administration of the territorial capital since for this level there is no political responsibility, because there is no competition and political delegation at the level of NUTS2?
- How will we succeed in the accelerated development onto different priority domains in different statistic regions, while the national law does not allow the assignment of regional/local facilities to assure the „guidance” of the investment capital towards domains or regions which are declared to be of priority interest?

Of course, the list of basic questions could be at least several times longer, still – unfortunately – the public and political debate in Romania regarding regionalization and effective and efficient management of territorial capital is and seems to remain anchored into a resolute period of time and into an antagonistic and non-functional register.

BIBLIOGRAFY

1. Lagendijk, A., Regional Learning between Variation and Convergence: The Concept of 'Mixed Land-Use' in Regional Spatial Planning in the Netherlands in Canadian Journal of Regional Science, Volume: 24. Issue: 1, 2001, pp. 81+.
2. Tewdwr-Jones, M., The Planning Polity: Planning, Government, and the Policy Process, Routledge, New York, 2002
3. *** Constituția RPR/Constitution of the Peoples' Republic of Romania
4. *** Law No 315 from June 28, 2004 regarding regional development, art. 5.2., Official Gazette of Romania No 577-June 29, 2004
5. *** Legea dezvoltării regionale nr.151/1998, Monitorul Oficial al României nr. 256/16 iulie 1998
6. *** Legea nr. 315 din 28 iunie 2004 privind dezvoltarea regională, art.2, Monitorul Oficial al României nr. 577/29 iunie 2004
7. *** Regulation (EC) No 1888/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 October 2005 amending Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 on the establishment of a common classification of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) by reason of the accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia to the European Union - Official Journal L 309, 25 November 2005)
8. *** Shaping EU Regional Policy: Economic, Social and Political Pressures, Academic Conference Programme, 8th & 9th June 2006 Leuven, Belgium, <http://www.regional-studies-assoc.ac.uk/events/080606prog.pdf>
9. *** The Treaty of Lisbon, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:>
10. *** Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/306:SOM:EN:HTML>

