

ASPECTS OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN ROMANIA

Ștefănescu Florica

Universitatea din Oradea, Facultatea de Științe Socio-Umane, Oradea, str. Izvorului, 93 M, florica_stefanescu@yahoo.com, tel. 0723568620

One of the main coordinates of the contemporary economic theory is – and there is no doubt about it – represented by the problem of the sustainable development, in the wider context of the theories concerning the economic growth and development.

These theories do not belong exclusively to the contemporary thinking, for Spengler asserts that “the first elements of a theory of the economic growth can be found in the mercantilist and physiocratic works” (J.J. Spengler, 1970, p. 1)

In the meantime they multiplied and enriched themselves both regarding the content, the ways of analysing and approaching, the presupposed solutions and regarding the conceptual exactness, the used indicators and the pointing out of the interdependencies among these aspects and those related to them.

At present we are the witnesses of a re-evaluation of the problem of the economic growth and development, of the formulation of solutions in order to overcome the identified inconvenient matters, as well as of the suggesting some optimal models of economic growth and development.

Regarding the way of approaching this problem, the change is to be noticed in the economic logics, because the classic one is no longer very reliable. The latter was aiming at obtaining some finite, numerous and good quality products, with the help of the available resources, a situation in which only a part of the active particles were to be found in the finite products, as a greater part of them were eliminated in the environment: in the air, water, soil, under the form of residua which are damaging for the health of the environment and of man as an element of the environment.

The new logics aim at the total use of the active particles, a fact which is possible by recycling the wastes according to the natural pattern.

It is also doubled by some new logics of the relation between production and consume. If in the context of the classic theory, after producing some goods and services they looked for their consumers and the classic marketing consisted of the best techniques to sell the products, the modern logics change the meaning of the relation: the consumers and their needs determine the level and the structure of the production while the modern marketing tries to identify the needs of the consumers and, according to these, also the adapting of the production.

This new attitude lies at the ground of the “consume society”, of the “phenomenon of consuming” which, according to some authors (D. Gabor, V.Colombo, *Let us get out of the epoch of waste (Sa iesim din epoca risipei)*, The Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1982), perverts the system of the human needs, creates false ones, invents and stimulates new wishes, a fact that leads to waste and inverts the relation production-consume, in the sense that it is no longer produced in order to cover the consume needs, but it is consumed in order to create new reasons for producing (Galbraith), while the man is a thing manipulated by the producer by means of commercials and fashion.

Regarding the presupposed solutions, they are very varied, from the solution of “zero growth” until the one of the sustainable development.

Some specialists are right to think that the greatest deficit of these solutions concerning the economic growth and development was represented by the tendency to isolate, to make autonomous the economic domain and especially its breaking up with the political domain, having as an argument the fact that “while politics centralize, the economy decentralizes”, that “economy cannot be done with feelings, and the economic knowledge is not emotional, but the economic discourse has to get objectivity through the emancipation from ideology, from politics” (Maria Muresan, 2003, p. 313).

It is obvious that the factors of the economic growth and development are at the same time **economic** ones (resources, the productivity of work, the size of the internal market, the aggregated demand and offer, the volume and the structure of the external trade, a.s.o.), **technical** ones (the size, the quality and the structure of the production apparatus), **demographic** ones (*the population number*: both at the national level and at global level, the density of the population in different parts of the world, the increase rate of the population,

the urban overcrowd, the depopulation of the rural areas, a.s.o.; *the population structure*: the access to education, the level and the quality of education, the qualification of work, the comfort, the degree of civilisation, a.s.o.; *the health of the population*: birth rate, death rate, the diseases, the hygienic status, a.s.o.), **political, juridical, social, cultural, ethic, environmental** factors.

So, instead of the term economic development it was preferred, especially in the last decades, the term social-economic development which means that the quantitative combining of the endogenous variables is more and more correlated with qualitative changes (institutional and structural) and with the consequences of the economic growth upon people's life, without neglecting the problems of the environment, meaning the realization of the desiderate "humanizing the growth" (Toader Ionescu, 2002, p. 449).

This purpose is reached, at least a part of it, by including the concept of "sustainable development" in the economic terminology, this concept being understood as a type of economic development which ensures the satisfying of the needs of the present generations, without compromising the possibility that the future generations should satisfy their own needs as well, a development which could be included in that what A.D. Xenopol means by "long series" (Florica Stefanescu, 2003, p. 32), concerning measures which could be applied in long periods of time and with long-term effects.

The term sustainable development was used at the beginning of the 80s of the previous century at the International Conference on the Preservation of the Environment and was launched in 1987 together with the publishing of the Brundtland Report "Our Shared Future". Within the report, the objectives pursued by the sustainable development are:

- eliminating poverty
- continuing the economic growth with the preservation of the natural resources
- emphasizing the qualitative aspects of the economic growth
- the controlled increase in the number of the population
- restructuring the economic and the technological processes in order to protect the environment.

(CMED, Rapport Brundtland, *Notre avenir a tous*, Ed. Fleure, Montreal, 1987)

Synthesizing, the passing to the sustainable development means, in the context of the economic development, the transformation of man and of nature from means into purposes. And even if this fact implies additional costs, respectively a reduced productivity, these can be compensated by supplementary benefits at the level of the quality of life.

The concept of sustainable development designates the elements which are to be found at the intersection of the contents of some other three sectors: **economic development, social development** and the **environmental protection**. Some authors add a fourth sector, that is the technological development, as the latter has a strong impact on the other three, a point of view which we support, most of all because technology, which makes everything take place very quickly and sometimes too soon, is often considered the cause of the multiple social or natural problems such as war, ecocide a.s.o.

Also, nowadays the rhythm of development of the technology overcomes the ability of recovery of the environment, and sometimes also the one of the adapting of man to the changes suggested by technology causing a "feeling of anonymousness, of frustration" in relation to "a world whose complexity increases permanently" (Ionita Olteanu, 1981, p.56).

However, objectively, we have to admit that technology, even if it causes a series of lacks, of problems, it also solves many lacks and problems. It depends on whom and to what purpose he/she uses technology. And the man can use the instruments of culture in order to overcome some problems and adapt himself to others.

The economic development aims at obtaining a maximum flux of income under the circumstances of rational and efficient use of resources, especially of rare resources.

The social development aims at the socio-cultural stability, at realizing the equality both at the level of a generation (reducing all kinds of differences among states, eliminating poverty, equal chances for everybody, a.s.o.) and between generations (not jeopardizing the future, not exhausting the resources, a.s.o.). At the same time it is aimed at maintaining the cultural diversity within the "planetary village", as well as preventing or healing of some "social diseases" of the contemporary world: loneliness or foreignness (a paradoxical fact under the circumstances of the developing without precedent of the

communication and transport means), the lack of satisfaction in work (under the circumstances of a continuous narrowing of the specializations relying on the principle “to know more and more about less and less” which reduces the possibility of the worker to perceive the finite product and to understand the utility of his work), the relativizing of the values, the end of history, the uncertainties concerning the nearer or the farther future, “diseases” which are typical for the postmodern society.

Finally, the objective of the social development is the reducing of man “to the daily order” (J.K. Galbraith, 1997).

The protection of the environment follows the stability of the physical and biological systems, the development of their ability to adapt to change and less the “conservation” of a state considered ideal. Given that the environment means not only resources which can be exploited under all circumstances, that is real “cows to milk” for the entrepreneurs, it also means clean air and water, lovely landscapes, source of oxygen and ozone, absorbent of carbon dioxide and of other waste, investment opportunities for numerous economic domains and so also many workplaces, to put it shortly, a vital frame.

Nature has always provided nutrition for the workers, natural materials and energy for the economic and technological activities, getting in return only material and energetic waste, both as a consequence of the production processes and of the consume ones (Paul Bran, 1991, p. 87).

Who is actually guilty for the pollution, for the destruction of the environment? Some lay the guilt on the demographic increase which is thought to have overloaded the natural chemical and biological recycling processes. Others accuse wealth – as the wealthy countries produce the most part of the solid waste of mankind – and they praise poverty, which confers the production an ecological character. Some accuse the inborn aggressiveness of man, “the cruellest and the most unmerciful species that has ever lived on the Earth”; others lay everything upon the things that man has been learning; some clerics see the essence of evil in the profit, which determine the damaging of the environment; some historians incriminate the religion which supports the idea that the only reason of nature’s being is to serve the man; some politicians lay the guilt on technique, because it pollutes the air, the water, the soil as long as it is out of control; some ecologists accuse the politicians which do not make laws for and not apply the measures suggested by the ecologists; some lay the guilt on capitalism, and some accuse everybody (Barry Commoner, 1980, p. 10-13).

No matter what the answer or the answers might be to the questions regarding the causes and the agents of pollution, this problem has also an ethical dimension, both regarding the relations between generations and the relations within the same generation, because it is just a part of the people who pollute, but the whole population has to endure the effects of pollution, and the equality of chances also means equal possibilities of enjoying the purity, the beauty and the gifts of nature (Ion Pohoata, 2003, p.27).

The equality within a generation regarding the pollution would mean that the polluter is also the only “beneficiary” of its effects, a fact practically impossible. At the same time we have to keep in mind that the penalties for pollution, no matter how high their value is, do not totally repair the damage done to the environment.

In order to ensure the equality between generations, the economists David Pearce and Jeremy Warford suggest the realization of some compensations between generations by means of two methods:

- either by transferring some resources for the future by means of constituting a compensatory sum calculated according to the formula: $S=X/(1+r)^T$, where
 - **X** – costs determined by an action of the present generation, but payable by the next generations;
 - **r** – rate of interest
 - **T** – the period (in years) after which the costs X appear;
- - or by compensating with the help of a certain capital, calculated through the formula: $K=K_m+K_h+K_n$, where
 - **K** – the total amount of transmissible capital
 - **K_m** – material capital
 - **K_h** – human capital
 - **K_n** – natural capital; (David W. Pearce, Jeremy J. Warford, 1994, p. 51-54)

Even if the idea of the compensation between generations is a good one as well as its including in a mathematical formula, both formulas are relative: the actual costs are not at the same level after a longer period of time; the rate of interest is permanently changing; the elements of the material capital – machines, constructions, infrastructure – suffer in the course of time a process of moral damage; the elements of the human capital – knowledge, abilities, level of qualification, state of health – change according to the standards used in their evaluation; the elements of the natural capital – resources, the quality of water, of the air, of the soil, a.s.o. – can be rethought in other terms.

The factors which could contribute to the reaching of the objectives of the sustainable development are: the free market, the intervention of the state between certain limits, international organizations, to which a factor is added which is very important for practising the idea of equilibrium: education.

I mean an education based on interdisciplinary views, which should overcome the fragmentation characteristic for the actual educational system and which should permit the understanding of the phenomena of the world in which we live in their whole complexity. An education which should develop a global view upon the world, which should induce attitudes and desirable behaviours as well as it should form competences in order to give solutions for the problems which the contemporary world is facing. An education which should determine a civic attitude matching the objectives of the sustainable development: harmonizing the logic of profit with the logic of the quality of life; modifying the emphasis from the trade value to the use value; choosing lasting objects to the disadvantage of the one-time-use ones, choosing good quality things and not necessarily “in fashion”; understanding the great necessity to recuperate the recycling materials. A moral education in the spirit of equality and fairness towards the other people, either contemporary or from the next generations.

The sustainable development gets a great importance in the context of integration and globalization, a context in which the intersection of the economic, social, technological and environmental sector is more and more obvious.

If we accept as a definition for globalization “the free increasing over-border circulation of goods, services, money, people, technology and ideas” (H. & W. Wallace, 2004, p. 52-53), the up-mentioned statement does no longer need argumentation.

On the other hand, the integration can be seen as a particular form of globalization, which is produced in certain places, normally, neighbouring ones. It represents “the creation and the maintaining of some models of economic, social and political, intense and various interactions between units which were earlier autonomous” (William Wallace, 1990, p. 81).

The European Union, the greatest, strongest and the most famous integrative structure, considered “the integrative model of the future”, faces beside the political and economic problems also some other ones: environmental problems, collective security ones, geopolitical stability, health, the distribution of the incomes, the quality of goods and services a.s.o. Actually it is the very European Constitution the one which mentions the value of the “equilibrated development” – the term meaning the same as sustainable development – beside known values such as: freedom, democracy, human dignity, respecting the law. The “equilibrated development” imposes an integration of the decisions concerning the economic, social and environmental development which should ensure the maximizing of the benefits under the circumstances of preserving a healthy environment.

Unanticipated in 1957, when the European Economic Community was founded through the Rome Treaty, “the environmental politics moved from silence to stridence in only 30 years” (H. & W. Wallace, 2004, p. 302). So that in the 70s-80s of the previous century the “green” governments imposed the “lazy” environmental standards which overcame the ones existing at the national level. There was a series of realizations at the legislative level in this domain as a consequence of the compromises between the member states, which were all aware of the necessity to protect the environment, but also of the efforts needed to this purpose.

The stridence of these politics diminished in the 90s as a consequence of the impact produced by the unification of Germany, “the fief of the green”, of the increase of unemployment, of the economic constraints imposed by environmental restrictions under the circumstances of the amplification of the global competition, leaving a wider action space for the national initiative.

However, the problem of the environmental protection and implicitly of the sustainable development continue to be the preoccupation of the European organizations under several aspects: “the role of the traditional instruments of the type command and control, the role of the public administrations in relation

to the ecologist groups, the need for environmental politics, the stimulation – including the fiscal one – of the firms to voluntary reduce the polluting activities (“eco-taxes”), the role of the European Agency for the Environment, the strengthening of the sanctions, of the penalties a.s.o. (H. &W. Wallace, 2004, p.303).

The problem of the environmental pollution is not a national or a regional one, but a global problem, a fact which made the General Gathering of UNO overtake in 1998 the concept of sustainable development as an adequate concept for the strategies of this organization. At the same time, the Business Association for Sustainable Development was founded as well as the Industrial Forum for Environment and Development and the International Organization for Standardizing which also elaborates the Environmental Management Systems.

But when we put the problem of pollution near other problems that the contemporary world is facing such as: the underdevelopment in some areas on the Earth, the rhythm of the demographic increase, the accelerated urbanization a.s.o., we notice that there appears a vicious circle, which we can hardly escape.

So the increase in the number of the population means the increase and the diversifying of the consume needs, that is the growth of the production volume which implies the growth of the consume of production factors, at the same time with the intense development of the various economic branches; in its turn, this causes the increase in the degree of pollution and the danger of exhausting the resources.

On the other hand, a non-polluting or anti-polluting technology means not only important additional costs, but also a decrease of the productivity in certain economic branches, a fact that could in its turn mean an increase of the prices for different goods, an increase which will affect first of all the poor.

That is why the greatest problem that needs solutions is the one of matching the economic development with the social, technological one and with the environmental protection, to put it shortly, fulfilling the objectives of the sustainable development.

The two industrialization centuries which followed the industrial revolution caused the accumulation of some negative effects, which have nowadays become, to a great extent, uncontrollable and unimaginable.

At the end of the 19th century the great Romanian historian and economist A.D. Xenopol stated: “When the blue sky of Romania is dirty because of the black smoke of our factories, when instead of the shepherd’s flute which makes our mountains so delightful the infernal sounds of hammers and machines can be heard, when our towns are turned into large working camps, then and only then ... we can be sure of our existence and we can look faithfully towards the long future” (Florica Stefanescu, 2003, p.242). It is clear that Xenopol, and not only, saw only the virtues and not also the disadvantages of industrialization. He was actually right to think that *then* when Romania was in the middle of an increasing industrialization, a desired fact, given the development level of the industrialized countries.

It was the time when it was considered that all the countries have to follow the way of the developed economies, have to reach certain stages of economic growth. Only in the middle 70s of the previous century they began to discuss “development alternatives” which aimed at a new equilibrium between the technical-economic and the human side of the values.

Nowadays it is thought that the impasse in which the industrialized countries are is a consequence of an “over-industrial economy at a global scale” which characterizes Herman Kahn’s “great transition”, that is the passing from the pre-industrial to the post-industrial stage between 1800 and 2200 (Ionita Olteanu, 1981, p. 23).

In the 20th century there appear other polluting economic branches beside industry: agriculture and transport. The spectacular development of agriculture in the 20th century can be compared only to the time following the discovery of America (the 15th century). But then it was a consequence of the acclimatization of some new kinds of plants and species of animals, while in the 20th century it was a consequence of industry, especially of the machine constructing and chemical one. In the 15th-16th centuries the explosion of agro-alimentary products managed to stop the hunger in Europe, in the 20th century it caused the over-saturation of some markets, which actually coexist with areas on the Earth, where people die because of starvation.

But the modern techniques used nowadays in agriculture, as well as the “medicines” and the stimulants used in order to improve the vegetal and animal production (chemical soil fertilisers, growth hormones, insecticides, fungicides, genetic modifications a.s.o.) have damaging effects on the environment, being more and more contested by the consumers and by the ecologists for several reasons: the arable land changes its composition, the vegetal rests do no longer decompose, the waters contain more and more

damaging substances, the humus content of the soil is less and less as a consequence of its intensive use for the cereal production, but not also for grass, the fixation of the azoth in the soil through the action of the bacteria stops when having to face the inorganic azoth a.s.o.

The considerable progress of the agrarian economy, caused by the increase of the work productivity in agriculture, has been proved nowadays, to a great extent, to be counterproductive due to the economic, social and environmental costs which it generates. Important side effects of the industrialized agriculture consist also of “the endangering of the traditional peasantry, the danger that the archaic village disappears and the progressive destruction of the environment” (Werner Rosener, 2003, p. 7).

We can state that the new agricultural technology is an economic success, if we consider agriculture as like the industry from the point of view of the intense development, of the economic efficiency, of successes a.s.o., but, at the same time, it is also an ecological and partly a social failure.

However, the giving up on these advantages would cause dramatic effects regarding the volume and the aspect of the agricultural products, the very alimentary security would be endangered, actually a too big responsibility, which the producers and the public authorities are not willing to take.

An alternative solution is suggested by Werner Rosener, that is the modifying of the regime of the agrarian property, more exactly of the dimension of the agricultural exploitations and the partial reorganizing of the agrarian activity within the small property: “in many regions it is the very peasantry agriculture which is indispensable for the conservation of the landscape and of the natural resources. The peasant becomes this way the cultivator of the landscape and the one who guarantees an agrarian economy which harmonizes the agrarian production with the environmental protection” (Werner Rosener, 2003, p. 16).

The solution should not surprise us, especially if we take in analogy the situation in the industry and in the services, where, parallel with the multi- or with the trans-national companies or societies, there coexist the small and middle enterprises. In the European Union for example their number is about 17 billion, while they detain 70% of the number of employees and have as a main advantage the ability to adapt rapidly to the demands of the market.

Why would a similar solution not be viable also in agriculture, where, in addition to that, there could be avoided also the ecological problems generated by the big property and there could be obtained ecological, healthy products? “... the optimal efficiency of the production would be the merit of the big households; through them the further conservation and development of a satisfying alimentary production would be ensured, having a good efficiency at a high level. But the small and middle households would have to reduce the intense aliments production and, in its place, to overtake on a wide scale the fulfilment of new tasks in the domain of nature and landscape protection. In many regions the peasantry agriculture remains actually indispensable for preserving the landscape and the natural environment” (Werner Rosener, 2003, p. 239).

In this situation the Romanian agriculture should not entirely follow the European model, but should keep, at least to a small extent, the small peasantry properties.

Actually the small peasantry property is compatible with the “trivalent enterprise” which responds to the “efficiency criteria, to the ecologic and social restrictions”, because “it allows the restructuring of the strictly specialized enterprises, by creating a real small and middle enterprises family around them, which should overtake a part of the products, under-products and residua and, by means of further adaptations, should use them, avoiding losses and pollution and creating new workplaces” (Maria Popescu, 1999, p. 109-110).

By means of creating new work places, the peasantry household stabilizes the population in the rural area and can produce superior quality goods, of course, with greater prices, so that the producers can get a satisfactory profit.

Also, the breeding of animal races and plant kinds resisting the damagers would be possible, the use of natural fertilisers, the production of cultures which ensures the fixating of the azoth in the soil, the alternation of the cultures and the resting of the soil, the use of some treatments, vegetal sprayings, the diversification of the production structure, practicing agro-tourism, the protection of the biotope, of the environment a.s.o. It is also the point of view of N. Georgescu Roegen who pleas for an organic agriculture, less intense, in order not to dry the soil and which should use its own products instead of chemical substances (N. Georgescu Roegen, 1996, p. 31)

For the consumer there would be more satisfaction obtained, which obviously has to be paid either directly, through price, or indirectly by means of subvention of the prices for these goods. At the same time the society would not have to face crises of agrarian overproduction any longer.

Even by admitting also elements of the critical theory on the rural life (Th. Adorno) which characterizes the peasants' village and households as "forced and coercive ... incapable of getting mature ... which prevent their own emancipation and clarifying", the solution of Werner Rosener remains a viable one given that the aspects related to civilization, especially those concerning the infrastructure, will be very close to the ones in the urban areas (Werner Rosener, 2003, p. 9). This would be possible if the rural communities which refrain themselves from polluting benefited from a compensation which should cover the costs for the modernization of the infrastructure and for other elements typical for the urban civilisation.

On the other hand, the members of the peasantry household could obtain sufficient incomes as a consequence of the use of the products at prices which include all the costs needed for their producing, including those related to the refraining from polluting.

It is a known fact that the agriculture represents the economic sector in which the European integration process lasted the longest. The Common Agrarian Politics (CAP), founded in 1966, has been reformed five times until today (1972, 1988, 1992, 1999, 2003), a sign that agriculture can always be improved. So that today, CAP, near objectives such as: the increase in the agrarian productivity, the stability of the markets, the increase in the incomes of the agrarians, the alimentary security, accessible prices for the agro-alimentary products, follows also other objectives such as: the realization of a "lasting agrarian sector in terms of respecting the environment, which should contribute to the preservation of the natural resources, of the natural patrimony and of the beauty of the landscapes" ("*The Agenda 2000*", elaborated on the occasion of The European Council in Berlin); or, the use of some "reliable production methods, allowing the delivery of quality products which should respond to the consumers' demand" (Nicolas Moussin, 2002, p. 378).

Synthesizing, we consider that for the European Union the agrarian solution consists of the existence, beside the great agricultural exploiting responsible for the alimentary security, of the small rural households which should preserve and protect the environment, should ecologically produce and should ensure, at the same time, through adequate measures, appropriate incomes for the peasants.

Once more could education contribute, to a great extent, to the overcoming of these problems, by making the agents aware of the necessity to include in the "benefit" also some non-monetary components, but which play an important part in the improvement of the quality of life: a clean environment, health, qualitative education, the beauty of the landscapes a.s.o.

Victor Platon tries to include in the total economic value the ecologic resources (VET) of the following components: the contribution of the environmental factors to the production and consume factors, the value of the indirect services of the environmental factors (the natural filtration of water, the planting of woods, the fixation of the azoth in the soil, of the carbon in the air a.s.o.), the prise given by some consumers for some unused ecological goods (for example, the protection of the biodiversity), as well as the monetary value of the satisfaction of knowing that certain ecologic resources are not and will not be used (Victor Platon, 1997, p. 14-16). In this way the relation benefits/costs would be improved and a closeness between the producer and the consumer would be realized.

There are also optimistic opinions according to which "the past demonstrates that the people will not remain without solutions to the ecologic and environmental problems ... if some of the conditions, which have lead to the great scientific and technological process in the last centuries, will continue multiplying themselves, then we do not have any reason to be pessimistic regarding the future" (Daniel Chirot, 1996, p. 194-195)

But it is necessary that the research in the area of the environment should be an interdisciplinary one, meaning "an organic cooperation among the members of a team, whose researcher talents and abilities to be open to other disciplines make the scientific sectism fail" (*Interdisciplinary Views* ... 1986, p. 482)

The researcher needs to come out of the laboratory, it is necessary that he should cooperate with simple people, with the ones affected by the researched problem in order to find the best efficient solutions to solve it. Otherwise, "the too developed and too narrow specialized analytical methodology of science and of the modern technique cannot allow, in many cases, the finding out of all the problems of the environment" (*Ibidem*, p. 512).

The conclusion is that we have to learn to survive, and in order to survive “we have to close the circle. We have to learn how to give back to nature the richness that we have borrowed from it” (Barry Commoner, 1980, p. 295). We have to approach the economic life out of the holistic perspective, so as a subsystem which has to match the other subsystems of reality and especially the socio-cultural and the natural one.

We have to reconsider the way of producing by making use of the rationality of using the material, financial and human resources as well as by means of developing the productions, the industries and the clean technologies, for example as N. Georgescu Roegen said, a radical change in the technical way of producing by means of an energetic re-conversion – similar to those produced through the discovery of fire, respectively of the energy produced through the burning of the fossil combustibles – consisting of the reorientation towards the sun energy (N. Georgescu Roegen, 1996, p. 31); we also need to reconsider the way of consume in the sense of avoiding the waste, the useless, the artificial, the false needs as well as “our unsaturated hunger for giant things” (*Ibidem*, p. 31); we have to reconsider the man in its quality of socio-cultural being, as a purpose not as means; we have to reconsider the concept of the quality of life and understand it not only as the material gift, but also as the social and cultural one; we have to implement an environmental management which should pursue: “reducing the quantity of waste and diminishing the exhaustion of resources, reducing or eliminating the polluting factors in the environment, projecting the products so that their impact upon the environment can be reduced ... promoting the environmental awareness among the employees and the members of the community” (M. Manoliu, C. Ionescu, 1998, p. 90).

Bibliography

1. Bran, Paul, *The Economy of Value*, Science Publishing House, Chisinau, 1991
2. Chirot, Daniel *Societies in Transition? Changing Societies*, Athena Publishing House, Bucharest, 1996
3. CMED, *Rapport Brundtland, Notre avenir a tous*, Fleure Publishing House, Montreal, 1987
4. Commoner, Barry *The Closing Circle*, The Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1980
5. Gabor, D., Colombo, V., *Let Us Get Out of the Waste Epoch*, the Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1982
6. Galbraith, J.K., *The Perfect Society. The Daily Order: the Welfare of Man*, Eurosong & Book, 1997
7. Georgescu Roegen, N., *The Law of Entropy and the Economic Process*, Expert Publishing House, Bucharest, 1996
8. *Interdisciplinary Views in the Human Sciences*, The Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1986
9. Manoliu, M., Ionescu, C., *Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection*, HGA, Bucharest, 1998
10. Muresan, Maria, coord., *Two Centuries of Romanian Transition. Studies*, The Economic Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003
11. Nicolas Moussin, *Guide de politiques de l'Europe*, (6e edition), Editions Mols, Les editions Europeennes, Belgique, 2002
12. Olteanu, Ionita, *The Limits of Progress and the Progresses of Limits*, The Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1981
13. Pearce, David W., Warford, Jeremy J., *World without End. Economics, Environment and Sustainable Development*, Published for the World Bank, Oxford University Press, 1994
14. Platon, Victor, *The Environmental Protection and the Economic Development*, The Didactic and Pedagogical Publishing House, Bucharest, 1997
15. Pohoata, Ion, *The Economic Philosophy and the Politics of the Sustainable Development*, The Economic Publishing House, Bucharest, 2003
16. Popescu, M., *Globalization and Trivalent Development*, Expert Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999

17. Rosener, Werner, *The Peasants in the History of Europe*, Polirom Publishing House, Iasi, 2003
18. Spengler, J.J., *Theories de la croissance economique*, Paris, 1970
19. Stefanescu, Florica, *The Economic Thinking of A.D. Xenopol*, Oradea, 2003
20. Wallace, Helen, Wallace, William, *The Political Process in the EU*, The Arc Publishing House, 4th edition, 2004, p.52-53, 1st edition, Oxford, 2000
21. Wallace, William, *The Dynamics of European Integration*, The Royal Institute for International Affairs, London, 1990