

Merce, Emilian; Merce, Cristian Călin; Mureșan, Iulia

**Conference Paper**

## Comparative study regarding the edilitar fund in Romanian village between the interwar period and communist period

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

The Research Institute for Agriculture Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest

*Suggested Citation:* Merce, Emilian; Merce, Cristian Călin; Mureșan, Iulia (2014) : Comparative study regarding the edilitar fund in Romanian village between the interwar period and communist period, In: Agrarian Economy and Rural Development - Realities and Perspectives for Romania. 5th Edition of the International Symposium, November 2014, Bucharest, The Research Institute for Agricultural Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest, pp. 2-7

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/111602>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# COMPARATIVE STUDY REGARDING THE EDILITAR FUND IN ROMANIAN VILLAGE BETWEEN THE INTERWAR PERIOD AND COMMUNIST PERIOD

EMILIAN MERCE<sup>1</sup>, CRISTIAN CĂLIN MERCE<sup>2</sup>, IULIA MUREȘAN<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** *The archaic Romanian village was and still is ontological mentioned, if not as a human place, than as a safe and beauty place. We forgot a fundamental truth, proved by time and space: „many peasants, high misery”. Making such a mistake, the Romanians reached to praise and idolize the misery which the providence will remunerate. Us the Romanians we did not have the ability, and based on this not even the calling to modernize the agrarian structures. In 1901 England had only 9% of the population involved in agriculture, while we lament about the depopulation of the Romanian villages after the Second World War, when 80% of the population was living in the country side. At the beginning of the XVI century, Thomas Morus stated that England is the country “where sheep are eating the people”. The depopulation of the English villages had happened in that time. That had specific consequences, but at the same time leded England to become the most powerful industrial country. The truth is that during the communist period the Romanian villages suffered the most major modernization from their entire history. For the total number, 70% of the dwelling stock of the Romanian villages went into use during 1948-1989. Exceptions from this fact are the Swabians and Saxon Villages, part of the Hungarian Villages and some villages from Mărginimea Sibiului, Țara Făgărașului and Bucovina de Nord.*

**Key words:** *Romanian village, dwelling stock, inter-war period, communist period.*

## INTRODUCTION

The archaic Romanian village was and still is ontological mentioned, if not as a human place, than as a safe and beauty place. We forgot a fundamental truth, proved by time and space: „**many peasants, high misery**” [3]. Making such a mistake, the Romanians reached to praise and idolize the misery which the providence will remunerate: “*It (the village) kept its virginal autonomy untouched in its misery and its mythology over centuries until it can become the sure foundation of authentic Romanian history*” [1].

The nostalgia of the Romanian poor and primitive leded among the people, including the intellectuals, to an opportunistic behavior with serious consequences for Romania's modernization strategies. Us the Romanians we did not have the ability, and based on this not even the calling to modernize the agrarian structures. In 1901 England had only 9% of the population involved in agriculture, while we lament about the depopulation of the Romanian villages after the Second World War, when 80% of the population was leaving in the country side: “*Humility contempt ancestral faith and traditions under the communist regime which alienated the Romanian peasant himself trying to turn it forced industrial worker*” [2]. Oh, how much lack of realism. At the begging of the XVI century, Thomas Morus stated that England is the country “**where sheep are eating the people**” [5]. The depopulation of the English villages had happened in that time. That had specific consequences, but at the same time leded England to become the most powerful industrial country.

Romanian village in the dirt secular, has been preserved by his poverty, poverty was often shield against numerous invasions because it was tempting. Romania remained by this way the country with the most primitive social structure of the peasant state, across Europe.

*“I will not bother to recall in the most different occasions that we were the longest European peasant society and what sets us apart in the landscape of European integration is the status of post-peasant society more than society post-communist. In other words, the banality that we come from peasant - and yet we pulled everything [4].*

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Merce Emilian, USAMV Cluj-Napoca, [emerce@usamvcluj.ro](mailto:emerce@usamvcluj.ro)

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Merce Cristian Călin, USAMV Cluj-Napoca, [ccmerce@yahoo.com](mailto:ccmerce@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Mureșan Iulia, USAMV Cluj-Napoca, [icmuresan@gmail.com](mailto:icmuresan@gmail.com)

In fact those that transformed, at least partial Romania in a post-peasant society, were the communists. After 1989 the Romanians did not know to take advantage of this progress. Too bad for the sacrifices!

Nostalgic projections on traditional Romanian village may be quoted, at best, in a playful register. In the media, in the political circles and, unfortunately, even in those of scientists, can be heard statements about the destruction of the Romanian village and its traditions. It is often said that the evolution from the communist Romanian village installed a long period of stagnation. That most villages were amazed legally urban, as they were inherited from generation wars because peasants had no economic power to build new homes or to upgrade existing ones. Statistical data show that it is not so.

## MATERIAL AND METHOD

Scientific truth can be revealed only by evaluating the concrete realities of the Romanian village throughout history. The figures represent an important part of the research. The data about this kind of information can be found in the Agricultural Register of any city halls, holding rigorous information on property owners and on the realization of the houses year. Were analyzed the urban background data on a sample of 12 villages located in different geographical areas of the country, and by total 2705 households.

The main method of investigation and data processing was the index method. The evolution of the Romanian village municipal fund was investigated by comparative analysis between the interwar period (1919-1947) and the communist period (1948-1989).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The statistical analysis of the two periods mentioned, prove unquestionably that some judgments about material degradation during the communist Romanian village are exaggerated and propagandistic. It is true that the Romanian village is still lacking basic facilities for a decent living, but this handicap has very deep historical roots. When the communist regime, peasant villages properties Romanians were not even in the back garden landscaped private primitive. Field research on a sample of 12 villages in Transylvania and Moldova, representing 2705 households using data from the Agricultural Register municipalities have led to results which confirm the municipal fund modernization of the Romanian village in the communist period (Table 1).

Table 1

Evolution and structure of the municipal fund of Romanian village, two historical periods							
No.	Village	Year of commission					
		Number of households			Percentage (%)		
		Until 1947 <sup>4</sup>	1948-1989 <sup>5</sup>	Total	until 1947	1948-1989	Total
1.	Ghigișeni (Bihor)	16	255	271	5.90	94.10	100,00
2.	Valea de Jos (Bihor)	5	133	138	3.62	96.38	100,00
3.	Sârbești (Bihor)	12	111	123	9.76	90.24	100,00
4.	Lunca (Bihor)	17	295	312	5.45	94.55	100,00
5.	Cămărașu (Cluj)	37	340	377	9.81	90.19	100,00
6.	Cătina (Cluj)	40	229	269	14.87	85.13	100,00
7.	Sâmboleni (Cluj)	25	186	211	11.85	88.15	100,00
8.	Mastacani (Iași)	11	91	102	10.78	89.22	100,00
9.	Hilița (Iași)	52	63	115	45.22	54.78	100,00
10.	Pustoaia (Botoșani)	30	162	192	15.63	84.38	100,00
11.	Bilca (Suceava)	112	164	276	40.58	59.42	100,00
12.	Cuza Vodă (Galați)	64	282	346	18.50	81.50	100,00
T O T A L		<b>421</b>	<b>2284</b>	2705	15.56	84.44	100.00

<sup>4</sup> Inter-war Period

<sup>5</sup> Communist Period

In the historic areas there are some differences, historical prints generated by different rulers and could not be completely eliminated even during the communist period (Tables 2 and 3)

Table 2

Evolution and structure of the municipal fund Romanian village in Transylvania

No.	Village	Year of commission					
		Number of households			Number of households		
		Until 1947	1948-1989	Total	Until 1947	1948-1989	Total
1.	Ghighișeni (Bihor)	16	255	271	5.90	94.10	100.00
2.	Valea de Jos (Bihor)	5	133	138	3.62	96.38	100.00
3.	Sârbești (Bihor)	12	111	123	9.76	90.24	100.00
4.	Lunca (Bihor)	17	295	312	5.45	94.55	100.00
5.	Cămărașu (Cluj)	37	340	377	9.81	90.19	100.00
6.	Cătina (Cluj)	40	229	269	14.87	85.13	100.00
	TOTAL	127	1363	1490	8.52	91.48	100.00

Table 3

Evolution and structure of the municipal fund Romanian village in Moldavia

No.	Village	Year of commission					
		Number of households			Number of households		
		Until 1947	Until 1947	Until 1947	Until 1947	Until 1947	Until 1947
1.	Sâmboleni (Cluj)	25	186	211	11,85	88,15	100,00
2.	Mastacani (Iași)	11	91	102	10,78	89,22	100,00
3.	Hilița (Iași)	52	63	115	45,22	54,78	100,00
4.	Pustoaia (Botoșani)	30	162	192	15,63	84,38	100,00
5.	Bilca (Suceava)	112	164	276	40,58	59,42	100,00
6.	Cuza Vodă (Galați)	64	282	346	18,50	81,50	100,00
	TOTAL	294	948	1242	23,67	76,33	100,00

The truth is that during the communist period the Romanian villages suffered the most major modernization from their entire history. By comparison, the housing of the communist period is 84.44%, 15.56% dated to before 1948. Exceptions from this fact are the Swabians and Saxon Villages, part of the Hungarian Villages and some villages from Marginimea Sibiului, Tara Fagarasului si Bucovina de Nord.

Regional differences demonstrate in Moldova was retained a substantial share of the interwar urban fund (26.67%), the main housing being held in the geographical area of the communist period (76.33%). The development rhythm in the communist period was less substantial in Moldavia, with less industrial area, with fewer employees to other areas, which resulted in a rate of less spectacular urban fund.

## CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the Romanian village still has strong connotations centered particularly on the analysis of unilateral communist period.

Romanian-Romanian War deep affected and the Romanian village. And if he survived the communist period and revived economic destruction has been sealed in the post-revolutionary attitude array of naive and opportunistic propagandists were garnished with governing bodies of this country and Romania have made a captive country.

We need to have the lucidity and courage to tackle the country's future in close agreement with the peculiarities of our secular economic and social history, to end the war between Romania and Romanian, preserve Romania's economic victories few different historical periods. Glorifying some historical periods and authors blame Nazi "in integrum" other, both unrealistic attitudes we

prepared, in fact, the ground for our wanderings through the transition. Economic development strategies and social harmonization of the country were mired in the transition period in a few axioms and slogans loaded false perceptions about Romania wars and economic history of the country and the world in general. Propaganda initiatives fate Romanian village in the communist period, as confirmed by statistics, is a typical, but not the only one handling the effects today are beginning to look more and more obvious "fruits".

Striking contrast between the slogans uttered on the destruction of the Romanian village in the communist period and realities on the ground, proving that we are possessed of globalization handling. The mood of the intelligentsia, especially, is affected by censorship consensus. I mean, no one dares to make an objective analysis of economic development in communist Romania. Communism, as a practical reality in Romania was "a game against nature." This means that in a communist period has not worked, that were achieved significant economic objectives. But mostly it is unfounded to say that Romanians, mostly, lived better before communism.

To bring its real historical truth and true coordinates, submit to the reader and a series of images about the plight of the Romanian village in the interwar period.



*House and coop*  
Nadășu, jud. Cluj, 1926, Denis Galloway

---

<sup>6</sup> *House and coop* - Nadășu, jud. Cluj, 1926, Denis Galloway



7

*Dinner*  
Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1927, Denis Galloway



8

*Alley*  
Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1927, Denis Galloway

---

<sup>7</sup> *Dinner* - Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1927, Denis Galloway

<sup>8</sup> *Alley* - Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1927, Denis Galloway



*Yard*

Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1926 (?), Denis Galloway



*Casă cu arminden*

Lunca Cernii de Jos, jud. Hunedoara, 1928, Denis Galloway

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BLAGA Lucian (1937) – Elogiul Satului Romanesc... discurs de primire în Academia Română;
2. DANIEL Preafericitul Părinte (2011) - Cuvântul inaugural rostit cu ocazia primirii titlului academic de Doctor Honoris Causa din partea Universității Babeș Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca;
3. MERCE Emilian (2011)– Tranziția la români; Editura Academiei Române, București;
4. MIHĂIESCU Vintilă (2014) - Strigarea peste țară, Dilema veche, nr. 520.
5. RICARDO David (2007) - Economistul genial; Editura Risoprint.

<sup>9</sup> *Yard* - Poienița Voinii, jud. Hunedoara, 1926 (?), Denis Galloway

<sup>10</sup> *Casă cu arminden* - Lunca Cernii de Jos, jud. Hunedoara, 1928, Denis Galloway